

Council,  
August 25, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "Written objections must be delivered to the City Clerk at City Hall at least two days prior to the time of the said meeting."

Alderman Butler: "I was interested in getting Mr. Munnich's reaction to this plan marked 'after' which Miss Wambolt has submitted to us. On that, the notation here is that the green area, 7,000 square feet, represents 39% of the total area. I wonder if that in any way answers the objection that he has put forward from lack of space, other than that occupied by building and parking areas. Has that influenced him at all when he sees it down in percentages? Looking at the plan sometime ago, it did seem rather skimpy but then when you see it, in that form, it does represent quite a large percentage of the land in question. Does this have any effect on his thinking?"

As Mr. Munnich did not make the calculations submitted, he felt that, possibly, the green area was exaggerated on the plan. He also felt that there may be more than 10 cars which would have to be parked.

Alderman O'Brien: "My position on this matter is briefly this: On the new lot, where the new building is to be, there seems to me to be a very, very little green space. The 39% may come from the overall two lots because there appears to be quite a bit more green space on the lot which has the older apartment building. On the lot which has the older apartment building, there are less than the number of apartment spaces which our new law would require; and, we, of course, are not in a position to require of that particular lot, which would be 14 parking spaces. If there is, under our new law, a deficiency in parking space there, I don't see how we can take the extra green space that that makes possible, to counteract the shortage of green space on the new lot, which is short of green space mainly because there isn't enough land for all the parking required and the building, and a reasonable amount of green space, too. I'm opposed to this particular rezoning."

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that the recommendation of the Director of Planning be approved and the application refused.

Alderman O'Brien: "The recommendation was against the rezoning."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

The Town Planning Board's report was submitted and read as follows:

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Town Planning Board  
Date: July 5, 1960  
Subject: Rezoning - Davis Street (R-2 - R-3)

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date, considered the matter of rezoning Davis Street from R-2 to R-3.

This matter was referred back from City Council to the Town Planning Board.

On motion of Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Butler, the Board approved the request to rezone Davis Street from R-2 to R-3 and recommended to City Council that a date be set for a public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

Alderman O'Brien: "This is the second Public Hearing on this question. I understand the applicant has tried to reach a compromise by reducing the number of apartments in the new building; was that the proposal presented to the Town Planning Board?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, it was."

The motion was then put and passed.

REPORT - FREE PORT COMMITTEE

August 25, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Free Port Committee, held on August 16, 1960, a report was submitted from Alderman Lloyd suggesting that a sub-committee of this Committee be appointed to undertake the initial preparation of a financial and administrative plan in connection with the Trade and Cultural Fair.

In view of the extensive use which would be made of the Forum Commission property, he advised that he had discussed the matter with Mr. H. R. Nicholson, Forum Manager, and he has agreed, subject to the approval of the Commission, to make available both his personal services and office facilities to the proposed sub-committee.

He further suggested that the personnel should be the Chairman of the Committee and two or three members along with Mr. Nicholson, as he felt a small Committee would make faster progress with the initial reports required.

The sub-committee would undertake the gathering of information on the general sources of revenue to and the financial commitments of the sponsors of trade fairs. It would generally concern itself with such matters as space rates for facilities, the limits on the number of exhibitors, the capital

Council,  
August 25, 1960

expenditures on temporary buildings and equipment, the extent of Federal and Provincial Governments' participation both as exhibitors and financial supporters. The sub-committee in the light of its survey of revenues and expenditures should proceed next to its consideration of staff requirements and the best type of organization, Independent Commission or Council Committee, to be responsible for the project. The sub-committee should also report on the timing and extent of direct contact with the governments of Latin-America.

Your Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Trade and Cultural Fair be further examined.
2. That the suggestion of Alderman Lloyd be approved, provided that Mr. Nicholson will receive no remuneration for services rendered in this connection.
3. That the Chairman, Mr. R. J. Strand, be authorized to visit Nova Scotia industrial firms to ascertain their attitude towards participation in the Fair.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

Alderman Lloyd: "The Committee we now have is really a Committee to study the feasibility of this project. They have advanced enough in their studies so that we may go to the next stage which is to come to grips with the more serious and specific problems of financing and facilities. In order to do that, the Forum Commission Manager, Mr. Nicholson, has kindly agreed to co-operate with us. He should be added to a sub-committee for this purpose because undoubtedly, their facilities would be required. Another factor, too, is: Mr. DeBard is no longer with us and we've got to try to distribute the work loads a bit on these matters. We thought with Mr. Nicholson's knowledge of his facilities, we could reach a more definite statement for the guidance of the Council. Certainly, we must examine the financial implications of such a proposal most carefully before the Committee would be in a position to make any specific recommendations to the Council."

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

ALTERATION TO A SUBDIVISION - NO. 11 YOUNG AVENUE

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Town Planning Board  
Date: August 16, 1960  
Subject: Alteration to a Subdivision - #11 Young Avenue

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

Council,  
August 25, 1960

a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of an alteration to a subdivision at #11 Young Avenue, shown on Drawing No. P200/183; 00-9-14900, in accordance with Section 727C of the City Charter and that no public hearing be held.

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

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

HOUSING AUTHORITY - AMENDED SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET --  
MULGRAVE PARK

August 25, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee, held on the above date, an amended supplementary budget covering personnel and office equipment for the Housing Authority to operate the Mulgrave Park Housing Project, was submitted showing the following:

TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUE-----	\$ 11,937.00
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES-----	40,875.35
ESTIMATED DEFICIT-----	\$ 28,938.35

Your Committee recommends that the amended supplementary budget be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

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

CONVERSION TO A DUPLEX -- NO. 49 RUSSELL STREET

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

From: Town Planning Board

Date: August 16, 1960

Subject: Conversion to a Duplex -- #49 Russell Street

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending against an application to convert a single-family dwelling at #49 Russell Street to a duplex dwelling, in accordance with Part IV, Paragraph 2, of the Zoning By-Law.

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

Alderman Connolly was recorded as being "against".

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

Council,  
August 25, 1960

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

Alderman Wyman: "In connection with that, I was reading the minutes of the Town Planning Board; and I was a little disturbed to notice that there was something said, at that time, about there being a number of second density uses in this area which is a first density area. The City Manager remarked at that time that they must have been there before the Zoning By-Law. That was zoned by the Halifax Relief Commission before there was a building on it. It's been first density ever since. I think there must be something there. Sometime ago, if you will recall, some of us felt that there was really a wish among the people of that whole area to be second rather than first density. A proposal was brought forward to change that whole first density zone to second. There was some opposition and the part in which the opposition was centred, was not rezoned but the remainder was. I'm not actually speaking to affect the decision at all; but there are points in connection with it that I felt should be understood."

The motion was put and passed.

TENDERS - STREET LIGHTING EQUIPMENT

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Committee on Works  
Date: August 25, 1960  
Subject: Tenders - Street Lighting Equipment

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a tabulation of tenders as submitted by the Acting City Manager and City Electrician for Street Lighting Equipment.

Acceptance of the following tender was recommended:

Northern Electric Company - \$68,520.86.

On motion of Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Macdonald, the Committee approved the recommendation of the Acting City Manager and City Electrician and recommended the same to City Council. Aldermen O'Brien and Trainor were recorded as being "against".

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

Council,  
August 25, 1960

Date: Alderman Trainor: "There's close bidding there."

Subject: His Worship the Mayor: "At least, we have a difference in the total amount."

COMMITTEE ON WORKS at a meeting held on the 23rd day of August, 1960, considered the recommendation of tenders as submitted by the City Engineer, and the following report was presented:  
MOVED by Alderman Macdonald, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the report be approved.

Alderman O'Brien: "Before this goes through, I would like to state my objection to it. Last year we called for tenders a second time and saved the City some money because the Marlite firm, I believe, was able to come in with a lower price on certain items which had been tendered on earlier. This year, the Marlite firm is pretty much in line; therefore, I think the situation is even worse than it was a year ago. I, for one, would like to protest. I don't know what good a protest does, but perhaps the way we deal with this, it can have some long-range effect. I think we have to have the lighting. What has been installed in the last year has meant a very substantial improvement in the City. I'm not really convinced that the recommendation of our staff on this matter is the recommendation that we should follow. I think the two items which Northern Electric are low on, by themselves, should be given to them; but that we should find another way of dealing with the others. I would like to ~~keep the decision open~~ for some time either by calling for new tenders or permitting the firms to revise their tenders for a month or so, so that if any of them were willing to step out of line, we could have the advantage for the taxpayers of the City. There doesn't seem to be any competition in this field at the moment, and I think we ought to try to get some on behalf of the taxpayers of the City if it is at all possible. One way, where the tenders are equal, is to award the job to Westinghouse, because they got it last year and if the other firms are kept out two years in a row, they may be willing to come lower again. I would give them a chance to do that this year before awarding it to Westinghouse."

The motion was put and passed with Alderman O'Brien wishing to be recorded against.

QUOTATIONS - FLOAT OPERATED FLOW RECORDER - SEWERS

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

From: Committee on Works

Council,  
August 25, 1960

Date: August 25, 1960

Subject: Quotations - Float Operated Flow Recorder - (Sewers)

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a tabulation of tenders as submitted by the Acting City Manager and Commissioner of Works for a Float Operated Flow Recorder (Sewers).

Acceptance of the following tender was recommended:

Leupold & Stevens Instruments, Inc., - Portland, Oregon, U. S. A. -  
- \$218.25.

On motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Committee approved the recommendation of the Acting City Manager and Commissioner of Works and recommended the same to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

REPORTS - REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

- A. DECLARATION OF WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT AREA
- B. DECLARATION OF SPRING GARDEN SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT AREA
- C. CLYDE STREET PARKING LOT
- D. REZONINGS - SPRING GARDEN SOUTH AREA
- E. WITHHOLDING OF PERMIT - #47 BRENTON STREET

August 25, 1960

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

A meeting of the Redevelopment Committee was held on the above date at which time the following recommendations were made to Council:

A. That the area bounded by the northern boundary line of the property of H. M. the Queen, known as Queen's Wharf (on the south), by Water Street (on the west), by the northern boundary line of property of H. M. the Queen, known as the Central Victualling Depot of H. M. C. Dockyard (on the north), and by the Harbour (on the east), be declared a Redevelopment Area;

B. That the area bounded by Spring Garden Road (on the north), Queen Street (on the east), Morris Street (on the south), and Brenton Street (on the west), and known as the Spring Garden South Area, be declared a Redevelopment Area, and that the overall plan of redevelopment of this area, as proposed by the Director of Planning in a report dated March 4, 1960, be approved; and further, that His Worship the Mayor be authorized to negotiate with the representatives of the Federal and Provincial Governments for approval and financial participation in the scheme.

C. That immediate action be taken to acquire land for a parking lot on Clyde Street as outlined in the proposal of the Director of Planning so that off-street parking facilities will be available in the area before expiration of the agreement with the Province of Nova Scotia covering the operation of the present Spring Garden Road Shoppers' Parking Lot; and that the City Solicitor be authorized to appoint appraisers to assist in the acquisition of the necessary properties.

Council,  
August 25, 1960

D. That Council proceed with the rezoning of the remaining blocks in the Spring Garden South Area from C-2 (General Business Zone) to R-3 (Multiple Dwelling Zone).

E. That the attached report from the Director of Planning dated August 25, 1960, respecting the withholding of a permit to carry out repairs and alterations at Civic No. 47 Brenton Street, be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

W. J. CLANCEY,  
DEPUTY CITY CLERK.

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of the Redevelopment Committee  
From: K. M. Munnich, Director of Planning  
Date: August 25, 1960  
Subject: Proposed Alterations - Civic No. 47 Brenton Street

Civic No. 47 Brenton Street is located on the east side of Brenton Street between Spring Garden Road and Morris Street. Its location also coincides with the projection of the proposed service lane to be constructed in conjunction with the Spring Garden Area Redevelopment Plan.

An application has been received from the owners of this property to carry out certain repairs and alterations to basement rooms which when completed, will be rented as a self-contained basement apartment. The estimated cost of this work has been placed by the owner at approximately \$1,400.00.

An inspection of the building reveals that all accommodation that will be provided will meet Ordinance No. 50, minimum standards, and since the basement has been used prior to 1950 and within the last two years as an apartment, the fact that the building and lot do not conform to the Zoning By-Law is no ground for refusal since such use is considered a "non-conforming use." However, since there is a strong possibility that the City will be acquiring this property in the very near future to implement the Spring Garden Area Redevelopment Plan, I consider that a permit to do the above work should be withheld for a period of six months or until the final disposition of the property is established. The authority of withholding a building permit for six months from the date of application rests with City Council under Section 970 (1) of the City Charter.

I RECOMMEND, therefore, that this Committee refer a recommendation to City Council that the application for permit for repairs and alterations at Civic No. 47 Brenton Street be withheld for a period of six months or until the final disposition of this property relevant to the Spring Garden Area Redevelopment Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

K. M. MUNNICH,  
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING.

The previous report was considered paragraph by paragraph.

MOVED by Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the recommendation contained in paragraph one be approved.

Alderman O'Brien: "I think this should be explained a bit, perhaps by yourself, the Director of Planning or the Solicitor as to the legal implications."



Council,  
August 25, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "We went into this in detail this afternoon. The Solicitor can explain what the effect would be on the area, what we must do, what we can do and what we cannot do."

City Solicitor: "By declaring this an area for redevelopment, it enables you, for a period of six months, to withhold any Building Permit and so on. What you have to do is to draw an official redevelopment plan. May I further explain that even though you do that, you do not commit yourself nor are you obliged to carry out whatever project you show on your redevelopment plan."

His Worship the Mayor: "No person can be issued a permit in that six month period?"

City Solicitor: "No."

Alderman Wyman: "What happens at the end of the six month period?"

City Solicitor: "Nothing can be done which is contrary to that plan."

Alderman Lloyd: "Does that go on and on in a six month cycle?"

City Solicitor: "No. You have to make your mind up in six months."

His Worship the Mayor: "The City Council can vary the plan from time to time."

City Solicitor: "Yes, they can."

Alderman Butler: "Are we invoking a new procedure?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, we are, arising out of our legislation which was enacted this year."

Alderman Wyman: "I'm not quite clear on the procedure yet. Do we have to have the plan before we act tonight?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Wyman: "We take the action tonight and it gives us six months in which to adopt the Ordinance for the plan?"

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right. It would give time to prepare the plan."

Alderman O'Brien: "I am happy with this phase of it. This allows for the overall plan which needs to be drawn, but it carries it a little further south than the scheme which was here before."

Alderman Wyman: "What did we do before? We adopted something."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "We accepted the report in principle which would have no effect except to give our Officers directions to prepare something."

Alderman Wyman: "In a sense, it was the first step and this is the second. The adoption of the necessary Ordinance would be the third."

His Worship the Mayor: "The first step is a very informal one because there is no holding action."

Alderman Wyman: "But there was no guide to anyone as to what we were thinking until that was done."

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Lloyd: "To make sure, Mr. Munnich could point out the plans for the area."

The Director of Planning then submitted a plan for the information of Council.

Alderman Butler: "When we considered this plan previously, we could have then taken the same action as we are taking tonight, could we not?"

His Worship the Mayor: "We didn't have the authority at that time."

City Solicitor: "The legislation was only passed on April 13, 1960."

Alderman Macdonald: "If this redevelopment plan is effected, and there were developments accepted by the Council; it extends for six months. If the Ordinance is approved in that time, then there can be no further permits issued for any alteration, building or whatever in that particular area."

His Worship the Mayor: "If Council tonight adopts the motion now in the report, this is declared to be a redevelopment area and no permits would be issued for a six-month period. That period gives the Town Planning staff an opportunity to prepare the plans in detail for submission to us for us to have adopted as part of the official town plan."

Alderman Macdonald: "That is good for all time unless the Council decides otherwise?"

His Worship the Mayor: "The adoption of the official plan then."

Alderman Lloyd: "The Ordinance, which governs the development of the area; if that passes, then it is governed for all time."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right."

Alderman Lloyd: "If the Ordinance fails before the six months, then persons can apply for permits."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right."

A plan showing the proposal was submitted and explained by Mr. Munnich for the information of the Council.

Alderman Butler: "I would presume that permits would be granted for necessary repairs?"

His Worship the Mayor: "For only that."

Alderman Butler: "Can a person owning property within that area sell their property, subject to the action that has been taken tonight?"

His Worship the Mayor: "They could sell it subject to any restriction as to use of the land."

Alderman Butler: "How about the ownership or title to the land? When this Ordinance is passed, will the lands then become subject to expropriation?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It can be but not necessarily."

Alderman Butler: "What kind of a redevelopment would this be; one that the City would undertake jointly with some other body?"

His Worship the Mayor: "That is for the Council to decide on the presentation of plans."

Alderman Lloyd: "But we must decide that within six months."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes. Actually, it means action by Council within four months because it takes two months to pass the Ordinance."

The motion was put and passed.

Alderman O'Brien: "While we are on this item, the Redevelopment Committee had before it this afternoon, a proposal to act at the present time on one part of this and this proposal is really in keeping with one of the points that Mr. Smilestone makes in his memorandum dated August 19th, when he says that if the City is really going to expropriate, let it do so without delay. The Committee this afternoon decided not to proceed at this moment, desiring some further information of a financial nature."

His Worship the Mayor: "That procedure was proposed by Mr. Munnich."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

Alderman O'Brien: "That is right, but it seemed to me that the matter ought to be drawn to the attention of Council just in case Council wishes to give further consideration to this tonight, in spite of the Redevelopment Committee's stand or failure to take action on it this afternoon. There has been some criticism in the past when Council didn't have a chance to discuss part of this issue when the Works Committee took a decision on it; and I felt it was only reasonable that it be drawn to Council's attention in case they want to proceed with a definite recommendation for an expropriation of part of this area at the present time. The information is here in Mr. Munnich's memorandum which was before the Committee today. It depends on whether those members of Council who are not on the Redevelopment Committee, want to consider this further tonight or not."

Alderman Trainor: "I would like to ask further to Alderman O'Brien's remarks on the meeting this afternoon. I think we should also tell the other side of the story to the rest of the Council."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think we should have a free discussion on it."

Alderman Trainor: "Yes, as we had this afternoon."

Alderman Lloyd pointed out that there was no recommendation from the Committee and he asked if the matter was properly before the meeting.

His Worship the Mayor stated that the matter could be considered under the item: "Reports - Redevelopment Committee."

Alderman Lloyd: "Then, the meeting is open for motions. We had a motion sometime ago defining a rough area to be expropriated. I'll move that resolution as it was originally worded and put to the Council."

Alderman O'Brien: "That is not the present recommendation."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, it is broadened out quite a bit--to be part of a scheme for immediate implementation."

Alderman O'Brien: "I'll move that the report from Mr. Munnich be read to the Council meeting so that we can then decide whether it wishes to secure the necessary time."

The motion was seconded by Alderman Trainor.

Alderman Macdonald: "I don't know whether it is quite fair to consider this matter tonight in respect to this report from Mr. Munnich. Also, I

Council,  
August 25, 1960

received a letter from Mr. Smilestone which I didn't have time to read. I only received it today. I would like to have the opportunity to read that along with this report, because I can't get the full benefit of it by hearing it read. Possibly I can, but not enough to make a decision properly. I don't feel that it should be considered tonight. It might be considered but I don't think we can take any action tonight."

His Worship the Mayor: "We will give it an airing anyway. We will go through it, listen to it and it won't do any harm. Because of the implications of it, I think we should hear it now. The public will get the Press and be aware of what is going on. I think we should have it read and Council can decide whether it wants to proceed, or not."

Alderman Macdonald: "That is fair enough."

Alderman Lloyd: "If you merely read it, you have no right to discuss it. I think you better couple with it a resolution to resolve ourselves into the Committee of the Whole, when you can have the discussion."

Alderman Macdonald: "If no other complications develop, I'm satisfied with that."

It was agreed to convene as a Committee of the Whole Council so as to permit a freer discussion of the matter.

9:15 P. M. Council adjourned to convene as a Committee of the Whole.

The following report from the Director of Planning was then read:

CITY OF HALIFAX  
PLANNING OFFICE

August 24, 1960

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of the Redevelopment Committee

WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT AREA  
FERRY PLAZA - PHASE 1

OVERALL SCHEME

A proposal for the development of the waterfront area between George Street and Buckingham Street illustrated by drawing No. P856/2, was submitted to the Redevelopment Committee on March 31, 1959 and approved in principle. The summary of recommendations contained in that report is as follows:

1. The site of the proposed service station at 1-3 George Street and 5½-7 Upper Water Street and the premises of the Scotia Flour and Feed to be acquired by the City for the improvement of Upper Water Street, and eventual redevelopment in accordance with the overall plan for the area.

Council,  
August 25, 1960

2. The area bounded by the northern boundary of the Navy Depot, Upper Water Street, City Wharf and the Harbour should be declared a redevelopment area.

3. A detailed plan should be prepared to show the comprehensive redevelopment proposals for the area including:

(a) Public promenade along the waterfront from George Street to the Cogswell Street extension.

(b) New street lines for the adequate alignment and widening of Upper Water Street.

(c) Phased commercial redevelopment by private enterprise.

4. Controls should be established governing private development including the reservation of certain areas for public use as part of waterfront promenade.

These recommendations were accepted in principle by the City Council on March 31, 1960.

#### FIRST PHASE

The Ferry Plaza proposal which is the subject of this report constitutes the first phase of redevelopment of the waterfront which was approved in principle by the Council and is shown on drawing No. P856/5.

The proposal takes in the properties at the north-east corner of Water Street and George Street whose acquisition was recommended as the first step in the original redevelopment proposals. However, in order to allow for satisfactory and workable initial scheme, it was necessary to enlarge the first phase area to include additional properties for immediate acquisition and clearance.

The reasons for selecting this particular area for immediate redevelopment are as follows:

1. The section of the waterfront at the foot of George Street is of extreme importance to the whole of the downtown area. It will provide much needed access for the general public to the Harbour, an amenity which is now completely lacking. It will also terminate the important vista of George Street round which are centered the principal business and administrative activities of the City. The new Plaza should provide rest and recreation areas for downtown workers and also an attraction to the tourists who will be able to enjoy the view of harbour activities from an attractive observation point.

2. The Federal Government have commenced the construction of the Post Office extension between Bedford Row and Lower Water Street. They have already completed the R.C.M.P. garage on that street and there is also a proposal for a new Department of Fisheries Laboratory north of the existing Fisheries Experimental Station at the foot of Prince Street. All the Federal buildings on the eastern side of the street are set back to allow for street widening. These buildings, and especially the Post Office will generate a heavy volume of traffic and this, together with the existing traffic conditions, make it essential that the improvement of Water Street should be implemented as soon as possible. This improvement forms part of the redevelopment proposal for Ferry Plaza, and extends south of Ferry Plaza to the foot of Prince Street taking advantage of building setbacks.

Council,  
August 25, 1960

3. The properties within the area of the proposed Ferry Plaza are in poor condition and their clearance need not be delayed because of the nature of their present use. Some of these properties have been condemned by the Building Inspector and are, in part, vacant.

4. A large portion of the area is already in the City's ownership and with comparatively small amount of additional acquisition the whole section can be made available for comprehensive redevelopment.

#### DESCRIPTION OF AREA

The land area of the Ferry Plaza proposal measures some 65,900 square feet, of which 39,400 square feet are already owned by the City, with an additional area of 12,000 square feet needed for improvement of Lower Water Street southward to the foot of Prince Street of which 2,500 square feet are owned by the City. The area is at present occupied by the following:  
(Drawing No. P856/6 refers)

1. Old Tavern Building, Civic Nos. 11, 13 Upper Water Street, largely vacant, upper floors condemned by the Building Inspector.
2. Vacant lot at the back of 11, 13 Upper Water Street.
3. Vacant lot, Civic Nos. 1, 5, 3, 7½ Upper Water Street, the site of the proposed service station.
4. Scotia Flour and Feed Building, Civic No. 1 George Street.
5. Fisherman's Market and apartments above, Civic No. 2 George Street.
6. Chick's Restaurant and apartments above, Civic No. 4 George Street.
7. John Martin's Grocery Store and apartments above, Civic No. 229 Lower Water Street. Upper floors vacant.
8. Warehouse, Civic Nos. 223, 225 Lower Water Street.

In addition there is the Ferry Building, consisting of a waiting room with partly vacant office accommodation above, located on land leased by the City to the Dartmouth Ferry Commission.

All the aforementioned buildings with the exception of the Fisherman's Market and the warehouse on Lower Water Street are mainly of timber construction.

#### REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The redevelopment proposal for the Ferry Plaza consists of the following main components shown on drawing No. P856/5.

1. Improvements of Water Street to overall width of 70 feet with a 48 foot pavement with modifications to the area at the junction with George Street to improve traffic circulation allowing also for some planting and car parking.
2. The Waterfront Plaza itself with decorative paving, planting, landscaping and facilities for rest and recreation. These will include the provision of garden benches and fishing and observation pier using the improved existing ferry jetty. This jetty could also serve for harbour excursion boats. It is proposed that the Ferry Building be made more presentable with the removal of the upper storey which in any case is not used for ferry purposes and obstructs the view of the harbour.
3. Vehicular access to the Ferry Building with parking space for 20 cars.
4. An office building on Lower Water Street forward of the Western

Union Cable Building which would be available for development by private enterprise or land sold or leased by the City in accordance with the overall scheme. This building could include a restaurant facing the Ferry Plaza. Floor area would be approximately 15,000 square feet on three floors only to allow view of the harbour from George Street.

5. A service road to the proposed office building which would also provide access to the Western Union Cable Building, the Snow Wharf and a small private parking area.

The proposals now submitted are designed for immediate implementation. However, the first phase area must be planned in conjunction with further redevelopment to the north which was indicated on the overall scheme approved in principle by the Council. This will only be possible when detailed plans are prepared for the next phase of redevelopment adjoining the Ferry Plaza and at that time it may be found desirable to modify the layout to some extent by possibly introducing an upper deck over part of the Ferry Plaza and developing further the car parking provision. At that time it should also be possible to reconsider the ferry dock arrangements which, in the present scheme, are being largely retained in their existing form to avoid additional costs at this stage. The second phase could also include a new Ferry Building linking with other buildings to the north and providing modern accommodation for waiting rooms and refreshment facilities. The first phase scheme, therefore, is so planned that future modifications would not result in excessive abortive expenditure and the only permanent building proposed is on the south side of the Plaza which would not be affected by second phase development. This also applies to permanent planting.

The proposal now submitted does not include the clearance of the Western Union Cable Building and storage shed, on the Western Union Wharf. Ideally, however, to make final redevelopment complete and layout of the public waterfront area fully satisfactory these buildings should ultimately be cleared and the area developed as part of the Waterfront Plaza, using the Western Union Wharf for pleasure boats and other small craft after the removal of the existing storage shed which obstructs the view of the harbour and George's Island from the proposed public Plaza. This may become possible if and when the present use of the land becomes obsolete or uneconomical.

COSTS

The cost of the proposed scheme can only be given in outline at this stage due to the variations which will occur in the purchase price of the properties in the area and as a result of detailed engineering study.

Assessed value of properties within the Ferry Plaza scheme	\$116,450.00	
Plus 5%	5,825.00	\$122,275.00
Assessed value of Federal land for Water Street improvement	12,000.00	12,000.00
Ferry Plaza - paving, landscaping, lighting, etc., - approximately	35,000.00	
Water Street - widening - approximately	30,000.00	65,000.00
T O T A L:		\$199,275.00

K. M. MUNNICH,  
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING.



Council,  
August 25, 1960

Alderman Trainor: "We dealt with this matter this afternoon in the Redevelopment Committee. I will have to say that I think it is a very fine proposal by Mr. Munnich."

Alderman Lloyd: "Hear, hear!"

Alderman Trainor: "There is only one thing we have to caution ourselves on; would it be too rich for our blood at this time? The capital expenditures that we have undertaken or are planning to undertake, such as Mulgrave Park, Westwood Park, downtown parking garage site area, Spring Garden Road, Jacob Street redevelopment, and so on; considering what we have to spend out, less our receivables from those; and, as you indicated to us this afternoon, that you are having the Acting City Manager bring us in a report of all our expenditures of a capital nature on a long range. I think before we deal any further on this, we should have that report; the Council should thoroughly study it and then go into the wisdom of a redevelopment scheme on Lower Water Street, as presented by Mr. Munnich."

Alderman Lane: "Since Alderman Trainor and I presented a united front at the Redevelopment Committee meeting on this, I would like to add my comments to the general discussion. It is starting to be rather unfashionable to count the costs of anything these days. When anybody raises the idea that too much money is being spent, you are regarded as a reactionary. However, I do think that he opened the point and it was a point well taken—that we should know exactly where we sit as far as capital outlay is concerned, both in what we have promised to do and what we have already done, and its cost to the citizens with the resulting impact on the tax rate. It is my opinion that some of our critics, notably the local Press, who urge us to go ahead with these expensive details, would hesitate to make capital expenditures of that sort in their own business without counting the cost to them. After all, this is their money as well as everybody else's, and I think just a spot of caution at this point is in order. I was glad to have Alderman Trainor start the discussion since his youth protects him from being called a reactionary."

Alderman Lloyd: "I most heartily agree with the proposal to have all of your financial planning integrated and in balance and control. I don't think anybody disagrees with that fact at all. You have tonight, however,

Council,  
August 25, 1960

taken an action, as I understand it, which would prevent any development in this area, which you may have to acquire at a later date. In the next six months, for example, you would not have to pay for the cost of acquiring a service station should one be built. Is that not correct? I mean, in the next six months, we must come forward with an Ordinance governing this area, expressing the plan of Mr. Munnich or some modification thereof. Part of your considerations, as the Alderman has pointed out, are the financial implications of this plan related to the overall plan for redevelopment in this part of the City. I think if we take tonight the first step, indicate to the owners of property in the area that the City Council unanimously, as I understood the vote, favour a redevelopment of that district, and want control of it; and don't want any further structures erected therein until they have a six month's opportunity to complete their specific proposals for redevelopment. Isn't that, in essence, what we have done tonight?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "Surely, we do this quite consciously, subject to the financial implications. I think probably it is the financial implications mainly that cause us to be a little cautious and prudent about this matter. On the other hand, if we can overcome that difficulty, then it appears that Council generally favours this redevelopment scheme or some modification of it for this area. Generally, this is so; otherwise, you wouldn't pass the resolution that you did. Therefore, I see no harm in us taking advantage of our procedure and taking the time that is presented to us to get the information which the Aldermen require. Certainly, if they require financial information, we certainly all require this financial projection if we are going to be prudent about our plans. That shouldn't take too long, I wouldn't think, judging from this part of the proposal at least. Mr. Munnich has done a splendid job in giving us the general skeleton and outline of what he proposes here; and I don't think the additional information would be too difficult to establish.

"I presume we will finally get into a discussion of redevelopment versus other needs of the City. That will be a very difficult thing to project. We may have to take into consideration the thing we can see and

Council,  
August 25, 1960

this regardless of the cost. From my point of view, that is an interesting  
can measure to see if it is generally prudent. I don't know how you are  
going to measure the needs of the School Board as against this particular  
redevelopment; that might be a difficult thing for the Acting City Manager  
to project. What he can do, at least, is to give an indication of our  
commitments as they stand and as they are foreseeable, generally."

"I suppose he could check the figures and the projections of the  
Town Planning Engineer for this specific proposal. And, in the light of that  
information, we should be able to come to a reasonable conclusion in a short  
space of time. I see no harm in taking a reasonable length of time in  
examining the financial implications."

Alderman Butler: "Mr. Munnich mentions two other phases of this  
project which had been entered into to reach the ultimate plan or proposal.  
I wonder if there is any projection as to the cost involved in reaching that  
point. The reason I bring this point up is this: That if we are only going  
to implement this first proposal, or the first phase of it, say \$200,000.00;  
I question whether it is worthwhile or not because you cannot get the view  
without tearing down the Cable Building. It is not as that plan presents it  
now. To develop it the way it should be developed, it requires the three  
phases."

His Worship the Mayor: "Before you go on, I think Mr. Munnich was  
talking about removing the Cable Storage Shed on the wharf, only to afford  
a better view from the Ferry Wharf, itself. This would not, in any way,  
affect, I think, the betterment of the view from George Street at the  
present time."

Alderman Butler: "I wasn't clear on what the Planner meant there. My  
feeling is that once you start, you are more or less obligated to complete  
it. I wonder what the overall cost would be. Is it a million dollar project?  
Are buildings to be constructed and facilities to be created, wharves to be  
improved, and so on? It is not simply what is down here as cost. It involves  
\$200,000.00 or some greater number of dollars. I wonder if there is any  
idea what that number is; and I wonder if the Redevelopment Committee would  
still have made the recommendation they did if the three phases were correlated  
as far as costs are concerned; or would they have decided to go ahead with  
Projects."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

this regardless of the cost. From my point of view, that is an interesting point."

Alderman Abbott: "It should be pointed out that this figure, \$200,000.00, does not include the Cable Wharf, the Union Cable Building. There is, as I understand, nothing in here at all for business disturbance. This figure could very easily double just for this phase alone."

His Worship the Mayor: "It would not be more than half a million dollars."

Alderman Abbott: "The Committee is not recommending to go ahead with this."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, no!"

Alderman Abbott: "The Committee recommended that we declare this a redevelopment area to give ourselves six months to look at it. In all possibility, it could be modified or it might not be gone ahead with at all. On the other hand, it might go ahead."

Alderman Butler: "In other words, to make it clear from my point of view, the Committee is not recommending anything but that they are recommending that it be further studied and that the land be closed, so to speak, until the studies are completed. Is my understanding correct?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes. Insofar as our redevelopment program so far is concerned, our costs, without recovery, would roughly be in the nature of \$600,000.00 for Mulgrave Park; \$80,000.00 for Maitland Street; \$100,000.00 for Jacob Street; \$300,000.00 for Clyde Street; \$325,000.00 for Westwood Park, making a total of \$2,205,000.00."

Alderman Ferguson: "We haven't spent that much, have we?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, we haven't. These are pretty well commitments."

Alderman Ferguson: "Is that estimate based on 5%? These are limits you're talking now. For instance, in any one of those projects, if the cost was in at \$100,000.00, plus 5%, which is \$105,000.00; and it runs \$200,000.00; is that going to mean less work or more money?"

His Worship the Mayor: "In most of these cases, I am making an allowance. For instance, there are the Westwood Park and Mulgrave Park Projects."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

Alderman Ferguson: "I wasn't thinking about those; I was thinking about other areas."

His Worship the Mayor: "Take \$2,500,000.00 as your total amount. There is no allowance in that at all for recoveries. In our housing recoveries, we draw back from the Partnership, as a payment on our mortgage, on a 40-year basis. We fund for it on the basis of 20 years. We have done this in the case of Bayers Road and in 13 years' time, when our portion of the borrowing is paid off on the Bayers Road scheme, then what comes back to us from the Partnership, is capital earned--earnings on our capital investment. This can go back either in the form of money for the rate making or it can be used by the Council for the carrying of bonds as a result of redevelopment. There is also nothing in that amount by way of recoveries for capital sales of land, such as we anticipate in the Jacob Street area and the Clyde Street area. Nothing is quoted in the \$2,500,000.00 for anything by way of income with respect to parking lots or anything else in the Maitland Street area or otherwise."

Alderman Lloyd: "There is no inclusion therein of the difference between the tax revenue as against the potential new tax revenue. These you get from commercial areas to which you do not have to supply services at a loss."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, and I have not included either the taxation recovery at all on the new buildings at Mulgrave Park and Westwood Park. As you said, the increased assessments which are certainly bound to develop out of the redevelopment of these areas, which cannot help but develop. I don't think that the picture is so black as some of us want to paint it. I think, as a matter of fact, that our redevelopment program is in good hands. I recently read the report of the Kingston City redevelopment program, as suggested by Professor Stephenson, and I am very happy to think we are in a position so far different than that of Kingston."

Alderman Lloyd: "In fairness to the Aldermen who have commented, no Alderman said that the financial problem was insurmountable. They just thought that as an orderly procedure of the Council, that the financial plan, such as we are talking about in this Trade Fair proposal; you must take a look at the waters you are going to sail in and whether you have the ship to sail in. That is about what it boils down to. I agree with you; I think that there is a pretty bright

Council,  
August 25, 1960

picture on the financial implications of redevelopment of the City as a whole, particularly because of the Federal Government's participation to such a high percentage in acquisition. We can afford then to do some things on our total cost on our own in some redevelopment plan. It makes it possible for us to do it because of the savings effected in other directions in other arrangements in view of redevelopment. I would not like to get the impression abroad that Council sees this as an insurmountable financial difficulty. No, what they are asking for is that before we proceed to adopt this specific plan that we follow the orderly procedure of some examination of the capital budget implications contained in it, so that the Aldermen are in a position at any time to justify whatever stand they may take in future on the matter."

His Worship the Mayor: "May I say this, too, Alderman Lloyd. I think it would be unfair for the impression to go abroad from this meeting tonight: that up to this point, that we have not been prudent in our redevelopment program."

Alderman Lloyd: "I don't think that impression has been given at all."

Alderman Trainor: "This afternoon in the Redevelopment Committee, I asked for a discussion and said: Let's take stock; let's look at ourselves in the mirror to see where we stand. I was not taking a pessimistic view at all. I think that any well-run organization has to do this: see what it has around it; see where it is heading; see what it has done, and let us look to the future. This is the time that I think we should do it, right now."

His Worship the Mayor: "We will have this for you in a matter of two weeks."

Alderman Lane: "I just want to state that in our scheme for a recap of capital expenditures, I don't think that is anyway painting a dark picture. I am sure you didn't intend it in that rather unfriendly tone. However, I do think that some of us like to know exactly where it comes from and where it is going. But, I would like to add one further thought apropos of what Alderman Butler said a few moments ago and that is: When is this going to take place? It took two hundred-odd years to get this City into its present state of beauty and desolation combined. You are not going to redevelop it in five years, ten years or possibly twenty. This is a progressive thing but if you don't take the first step, in twenty years' time, you will have taken none. That is what did happen here

Council,  
August 25, 1960

unfortunately for too long; and we are having to do some catching up on that lack of planning. I would love to see it accomplished right away, if you know of any philanthopist who is going to throw ten million dollars into the pot. It would be delightful but we know that is not going to happen. You have to be realistic—have we got it; can we afford it? I think it is still a fair question."

Alderman Ferguson: "There is one point here; it is assessment plus 5% which turns up on many of the estimate. I would ask you if the Redevelopment Officer has been asked for any appraisals."

His Worship the Mayor: "We don't have such a person on our staff."

Alderman Ferguson: "Well, the Compensation Officer or anyone in a position to give an estimate any more than 5%. Just what is this figure? I feel that if there is a figure that we should have, a figure for a guide other than this assessment plus 5%. It is obvious we are not going to get the properties we are talking about for the assessment plus 5%, at least some of them. Is that going to be assessment plus 50%, 100%? I am in favour of these schemes; I think that this scheme is a necessity but I feel we should go into it knowing what the cost is—not get into it with a small figure and let it ride on to a larger one, which will be the case."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think we are getting a tremendous amount of help in the Courts these days."

Alderman Ferguson: "I know we are getting it in the Courts but I think we can certainly get something nearer than assessment plus 5%. I'm not looking for a detailed breakdown on it. I don't think that is the case. I feel we have to get something more here. I felt the same way about Spring Garden Road where the figure was much, much larger and the land values many times the assessment."

Alderman Lloyd: "What you are looking for is the outer limits of our possible cost. I think that is what we are talking about. We want to see it defined as to the assessment plus 5%; it had a purpose and a function at one stage in a specific area, then you get spilled into other areas where it didn't apply. Now, the Court decisions and the findings of Justice Illsley in one case, I think, have shed a more realistic light on these things recently. I feel that this is all part and parcel of balancing the commercial development of this City.

Council,  
August 25, 1960

"We can't let it all go to Dutch Village Road. Otherwise, we would be dipping into our pockets many times over hundreds of thousands of dollars to make up for the loss of values which are now supporting the City. We must keep that in our mind. Mr. Romkey, as Acting City Manager, cannot project that figure for you. He can only give you the outer limits of the outlay, the expense factor. The other things you talked about--the matter of the recoveries from redevelopment, changing tax pictures--we have to take into account, too, as best we can, the implications of the changing tax picture downtown, which certainly now presents us with a problem and we have to meet it. We will only meet it if we provide attractive centres throughout the entire boundary line of this City to which people can flow freely with some degree of mobility and to seek out areas for shopping and their other activities. Otherwise, it could very well become centralized in one area to the pocketbooks of those who have millions and millions of dollars to acquire land and concentrate it in one centre. That, we have to be very realistic about and certainly, most cautious about. That, financially, concerns me much more than any other factor at this time in the history of the City of Halifax. What is happening to us? I think, in a way perhaps, planning has just come a little bit too late with some of these things. I do hope that in the very near future, our metropolitan planning will advance because every time we move in our narrow boundary line, unless there is harmony on the outside in our metropolitan planning in this matter of the usage of commercial sites for commercial purposes, we may be offset by action over which we have no control. Certainly, this whole question of determining where shall be the commercial development and what we can do to hold what we've got in the metropolitan area of Halifax, is vital to every commercial man in the entire area of Halifax, not just one little piece of George Street alone."

His Worship the Mayor: "You mention this question of the development on the western slope of the City. This gives us all cause for great concern. For years the downtown area of Halifax, especially through the dual rate, carried a great deal of the improvements we have been able to afford in the last fifteen years. Not only does the Council have the responsibility, but I think the whole business community who have a stake in the downtown area has



Council,  
August 25, 1960

a responsibility to join forces with us in finding a solution to this problem."

Alderman Lloyd: "The City Manager will contribute to determining the outer limits of our redevelopment financing. He will give you a report and when that is available, immediately the Town Planning Board will be making its recommendations to the Council."

His Worship the Mayor: "They are working on a report which will show the capital cost of the project--the Federal Government's contribution, Provincial Government's contribution and the City's contribution on the capital basis."

Alderman Lloyd: "Just one further word of caution, Your Worship. I think, in fairness to those people whose properties we will eventually acquire, if Council so agrees, I think it must be done as expeditiously as possible because we must accept on the face of it, that the individuals are motivated by the ordinary business decisions in trying to redevelop their lands. We must also be anxious to see that money which is tied up in what they plan to do is not unduly withheld from them, by way of compensation."

His Worship the Mayor: "I agree. I don't think it would be fair to those people who do own property in the area, to be denied the use of it. It should be delayed even longer if the Council has the financial plan before them and has the plan from Mr. Munnich. We could then proceed at the earliest possible moment."

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that Council reconvene. Motion passed.

9:50 P. M. Council reconvened, the following members being present: Aldermen Abbott, Lane, Macdonald, Butler, Ferguson, Trainor, Lloyd, Wyman, Connolly, O'Brien and Greenwood.

PARAGRAPH #2 - SPRING GARDEN SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT

His Worship the Mayor: "Item 14-B is the original scheme proposed by the Council which was referred back to the Redevelopment Committee to study it for proposals for a step-by-step development. I understand now that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation feel that we can adopt the scheme, submit it

Council,  
August 25, 1960

to the Minister, and after that, even after an agreement has been reached with the Minister, we can change or vary the scheme unlike the original scheme we planned before. Maitland Street was one. We have been requested by the merchants of the Spring Garden Road area, who are facing what appears to be an early eviction from their present parking lot on the corner of Spring Garden Road and Queen Street, for some other parking facilities. We are facing, too, the construction of the Infirmary which is again going to bring further cars to the area. Something must be done to provide something in the way of off-street parking facilities for this area. The Committee, this afternoon, decided that we should go back again to the Council's original proposal with the understanding that, with your permission, Mr. Grant from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, could vary the scheme and modify it, change the lines and so on, from time to time if there is concurrence. I remember discussing this several meetings ago. Some objections were made to the service station on Spring Garden Road, and so on. We have also been assured by Mr. Grant that if we proceed to make this submission to the Minister, and proceed with acquiring the properties even prior to the approval of the Minister, the only risk we run in the acquisition of the properties in that any payment we may make over and above what they would approve, would be a loss factor to us. I am sure that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation officials will give, if not formal approval, at least, guidance from time to time in the acquisition of properties as they have."

Alderman Lloyd: "This proposal comes to us tonight recommended by the Committee?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "It includes the area right over to Brenton Street on the maps that we saw at our recent meeting?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "There is no change in the maps that were displayed?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Lloyd: "There was a suggestion of some modification."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "We are not necessarily approving the scheme in its final detail. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation want this as a vehicle to get general agreement from the Federal Government to get the thing moving. In other words, do they approve of this scheme, because the essential theme of the scheme is the parking lot. If the Federal Government is going to turn us down, then we may have to think about doing this scheme alone or some other kind of scheme."

Alderman Lloyd: "They, themselves, may ask us for some modifications."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Ferguson, that the recommendation contained in paragraph No. 2 be approved. Motion passed.

PARAGRAPH #3 - CLYDE STREET ACQUISITION

His Worship the Mayor: "In other words, in those areas shown on a plan, in the lower part of the area, which would be devoted to parking, if the total plan is approved by the Minister, City Council should strive to acquire the properties as soon as possible to provide for parking facilities."

Alderman Lloyd: "This requires a plan?"

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right. Also, I think this requires us to move on it. As I explained earlier, the only difficulty there is that we may have to pay the differential between what Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation might approve and what we would pay for prior to the planning report. I don't think it need be a particular barrier because any acquisition of properties that would be recommended to Council, the Council can judge then whether or not they should buy a particular property or not."

Alderman Lloyd: "And it is liable to be a narrow margin."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think, too, we should have the Committee outline an area for immediate approach on this; and, also, empower the City Solicitor to secure the services of appraisers."

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Ferguson, that the recommendations contained in paragraph No. 3 be approved. Motion passed.

His Worship the Mayor: "We also can get, at the next meeting of Council, the authority to approach the Liquor Commission with respect to two houses on the present Clyde Street extension. We are committed to the purchase of those."

Council,  
August 25, 1960

"They bought them; we have to buy them for the Clyde Street extension and they want to have the buildings cleared off it by the end of October in order to get their building completed."

PARAGRAPH #4 - WITHHOLDING OF PERMIT - #47 BRENTON STREET

His Worship the Mayor: "The application was made to build a basement apartment, was it not?"

Mr. Munnich: "Yes."

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

His Worship the Mayor: "If you recall, in January we had a hearing respecting zoning proposals, some of which were carried through early in July. There are still remaining two blocks in the area which seem to be necessary to be rezoned in order to carry out the total scheme--from C-2 to R-3. The Redevelopment Committee today recommends to Council that the two blocks bounded by Dresden Row, Morris Street, Birmingham Street, Clyde Street; Birmingham Street, Clyde Street, Queen Street and Morris Street, be rezoned from C-2 zone to R-3 zone."

~~A formal zoning~~ by-law, as prepared by the City Solicitor, was submitted.

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

REPORT - CITY SOLICITOR RE: BELLEVUE CASE

His Worship the Mayor: "We have now a report from the City Solicitor re the Bellevue Case and I think it best if we meet in camera and adjourn to my office. Mr. Fielding has been waiting some time and I want you to talk to the other gentleman, too."

It was agreed to adjourn the meeting and have the Council meet 'in camera'.

10:00 P. M. Council adjourned.

10:50 P. M. Council reconvened, the following members being present:  
Aldermen Abbott, Lane, Macdonald, Butler, Ferguson, Trainor, Lloyd, Wyman, Connolly, O'Brien and Greenwood.

August 25, 1960

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

I wish to report that I have received an opinion from Mr. G. P. Varcoe, Q. C., and in accordance therewith, I would recommend that the appeal to the