

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Rehabilitation - North Common
prohibition of trucks on the street but would vote 'against' the
motion.
MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Abbott

that, as recommended by the Committee on Works, the proposed
Alderman LeBlanc referred to the fact that the Larry
O'Connell Playgrounds is at the corner of Newton Avenue and
Chebucto Road and possibly the Recreation Commission might have
some views on the matter.

MOVED by Alderman LeBlanc, seconded by Alderman Meagher,
that this matter be deferred until a report is received from the
Recreation Commission expressing its views. Motion passed.

Quinn Street - Access To and From West Bound Lane of
New Chebucto Road

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Abbott
that, as recommended by the Committee on Works, access to Quinn
Street from the north lane of Chebucto Road be limited to emer-
gency vehicles only, such as police, fire, doctors and ambulances.

Alderman Meagher stated that certain members of Staff
had suggested that if there is a change in the present plans for
the Chebucto Road traffic improvements it would have to have the
approval of the Department of Highways. He further stated that
it was his understanding that the Department of Highways had
indicated to him that they would have no objections to having
access to Quinn Street from the west bound lane of Chebucto Road.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that the recommendation
be approved on a trial basis at least and if it is found that it
does not work out properly, then the matter can be reopened and
further considered at a later date.

The motion was put and passed with Aldermen Meagher
and LeBlanc voting 'against'.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Rehabilitation - North Common

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Abbott that, as recommended by the Committee on Works, the proposed mounds to be included in the rehabilitation of the North Common be eliminated and that same be graded, levelled and sodded so as to produce the most number of ball diamonds.

Alderman Matheson was of the opinion that mounds in two corners of the Common would make it more attractive. He suggested that the Police could see over the Common under the new scheme of lighting.

In answer to a question from Alderman O'Brien, the Chief of Police stated that, from a Police point of view, he would prefer to see no mounds at all.

Alderman Matheson suggested mounds at the northeast and northwest corners.

The Director of Recreation stated that the idea of mounds in the first place, was to channel traffic into pathways across the Common.

It was then MOVED by Alderman Richard, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the mounds be reduced in size to a maximum of three feet and be so placed with the approval of the Chief of Police. Motion passed.

Tenders for Demolition

MOVED by Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Matheson. that, as recommended by the Committee on Works, the tender of George Redmond, the only tender received, be accepted for the demolition of the following buildings:

- (1) 1755 Lower Water Street - in the amount of \$1,600.00, subject to a Performance Bond in the amount of \$3,200.00 being deposited by him with the City;

Council,
September 30, 1965.

- (2) 2527-29 Gottingen Street - in the amount of \$690.00, subject to a Performance Bond in the amount of \$1,400.00 being deposited by him with the City.

Funds for Group One have been provided in Capital Account No. 59-25 Waterfront Development. Funds for Group Two have been provided in 1964 Capital Account No. 59-24 (Uniacke Square).

Motion passed.

Report - Test Areas - Sidewalk Snow Removal

The following report was submitted from the Committee on Works:

"A report was submitted from the City Manager respecting sidewalk snow removal in test areas during the months of January and February, 1965, and it was suggested that it might be wise to continue the program until December 31, 1965, before reaching a final decision.

It was moved by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the City undertake sidewalk snow removal this winter.

The motion was put and lost as follows:

For:

Alderman Matheson
Alderman Abbott

Against:

Alderman Trainor
Alderman Meagher
His Worship the Mayor

- 2 -

- 3 -

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the City of Halifax undertake a sidewalk snow removal program this winter.

Alderman Moir addressed Council in support of the motion and stated that it was his opinion that the citizens of Halifax want sidewalk snow removal and that the members of Council, as elected representatives, have a responsibility to give such a service. He preferred to see the service paid for on a per-foot frontage basis but if the motion passed Council to institute sidewalk snow removal and charge it to general taxation, that Council can appeal with more strength to the Province for permission to

Council,
September 30, 1965.

change the method of financing to a per-foot frontage basis.

Alderman Matheson suggested that Council might be able to persuade the Legislature to approve a service charge as he was of the opinion that the members of the Private and Local Bills Committee did not understand what was being explained to them. He said there are many older citizens who can't remove snow from the sidewalks and find it, in many cases, impossible to locate someone to clear the sidewalks for them. He said the Ordinance requiring that the snow be removed from the sidewalks is not being enforced. He contended that sidewalk snow removal should be instituted.

Alderman LeBlanc stated that Council should consider that a charge for sidewalk snow removal might work a hardship for many taxpayers in the North End of the City. He said he had no request for such a program from anyone in his Ward. He suggested that the service be provided for those persons who wished to pay for it but he would vote against imposing a charge on the entire City.

At this time, it was MOVED by Alderman Richard, seconded by Alderman Connolly, that consideration of this matter be deferred until the tests are carried out as recommended by the City Manager.

Alderman Connolly stated that not once was he asked about sidewalk snow removal in Ward 5 when he visited many homes last year. He was of the opinion that the people in Ward 5 are not interested in it and that the people in the Ward do a good job in clearing their own sidewalks.

Alderman Black stated he was not in favour of City-wide sidewalk snow removal because of the increased taxes involved. He

Council,
September 30, 1965.

said that one suggestion made to him was that the Ordinance should be enforced to make people shovel the snow and for those who do not shovel, the City would do it and add the cost to the tax bill.

Alderman O'Brien felt that sidewalk snow removal should come sometime but it is a question of how it is to be done and the financing of the same. He suggested that the City explore the possibility of putting it on a utility basis by having the Public Service Commission investigate it and make a proposal as to the basis on which it might undertake it. Legislation would have to be sought and the Commission might be able to charge and it might conceivably make sections of the City where a petition would warrant putting in the service while other sections would not. He said there are those people who can afford to pay for it want it as a service to be supplied and those people who are conscious of every cent spent, prefer to shovel their own snow. He said he found this division in his own Ward last year. If there is a way to get it on a local option for awhile at least, it should be considered. He said he was supporting the motion to defer for further testing but while such testing goes on, he would like to see some consultation with the Public Service Commission to see if it would examine the records of the tests and come up with a proposal that might perhaps cost less.

Alderman Moir suggested that the cost of \$164,500.00 would be about 1.6% of the total City budget so that for a person paying \$200.00 in taxes he would pay only \$3.00 and on a tax of \$300.00, the charge would be \$4.50 for the year.

Alderman Black pointed out that there would be vast expenditures for heavy equipment if sidewalk snow removal were put into effect.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

After further discussion, the motion to defer was put and passed, 10 voting for the same and 3 against it as follows:

For the Motion: Aldermen Lane, Meagher, LeBlanc,
Trainer, Connolly, Doyle, Richard,
O'Brien, H. W. Butler and Black - 10

Against: Aldermen Abbott, Moir and
Matheson - 3

It was then MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the City of Halifax again apply to the Legislature of the Province of Nova Scotia to be empowered to recover the costs of sidewalk snow removal by imposing a service charge against the abutting-assessed owners on a frontage basis and that the City Solicitor be directed to prepare the necessary legislation. Motion passed.

REPORT - SAFETY COMMITTEE

Council considered the report of the Safety Committee at a meeting held on September 23, 1965 as follows:

Alteration - Staff Establishment - Fire Department

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Trainer that, as recommended by the Safety Committee,

1. the manning requirements to implement the second and final phase of the proposed changes in working conditions as mutually agreed upon by the City and Local 268, International Association of Fire Fighters, include the appointment of 12 men to the Department and a promotion of two men to the rank of Captain and two men to the rank of Lieutenant, effective January 1, 1966;
2. the Division of Maintenance be increased by one man by transfer from the Fire Fighting Division and that the sum of \$360.00 be included in the 1966 Budget as additional pay for special skills applicable to this appointee;
3. the alterations to the establishment of the Fire Department be approved.

Motion passed.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Alderman Black asked when the Development Committee would be meeting to consider the matters which have been referred to it. He pointed out that the matter of obtaining Industrial lands outside the City was one item but His Worship the Mayor replied that the matter was deferred pending receipt of a report from the Atlantic Development Board's survey of sites in the area.

Alderman Black then asked when the Committee would be meeting to consider a location for a new Fire Station to which His Worship the Mayor replied that the Committee will certainly meet as the matter has been drawn to its attention.

Alderman Matheson suggested that the Development Committee meet promptly to consider this matter.

Survey - Fire Defences of the City of Halifax

MOVED by Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Lane that, as recommended by the Safety Committee, the Nova Scotia Board of Fire Underwriters be requested to make a survey of the Fire Defences of the City of Halifax, similar to the survey carried out in 1958. Motion passed.

REPORT - PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMITTEE

Council considered the report of the Public Health and Welfare Committee at a meeting held on September 21, 1965 as follows:

Request - Family Service Bureau - Funds for Clothing Needy Children

To His Worship the Mayor and Members
of the City Council

The Public Health and Welfare Committee at a meeting held September 21, 1965, considered a report from the City Manager respecting a request from the Family Service Bureau for funds to provide children of needy families with shoes and clothing; and suggesting that funds in the amount of \$1,500.00 be included in the 1966 Budget of the Welfare Department for this purpose. It was pointed out that these articles fall within the terms of the Social Assistance Act; and, therefore, two-thirds of the money spent on

Council,
September 30, 1965.

these items would be recoverable from the Provincial Welfare Department under the cost sharing arrangements.

Your Committee recommends that \$1,500.00 be included in the 1966 Budget of the Welfare Department for the purpose of providing funds to furnish children of needy families with shoes and clothing.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD
CITY CLERK

MOVED by Alderman LeBlanc, seconded by Alderman Richard, that the report and recommendation be approved. Motion passed.

REPORT - COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

REPORT - TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Council considered the report of the Town Planning Board at a meeting held on September 21, 1965 as follows:

Rezoning - R-3 Zone to C-2 Zone - #2554-76 Maynard Street

MOVED by Alderman Richard, seconded by Alderman Doyle that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, permission be granted for the rezoning of the property at #2554-76 Maynard Street from R-3 Residential to C-2 Commercial use, as shown on Drawing No. P200/1900, and that a date be set for a public hearing on this matter. Motion passed.

Resubmission Alteration to a Subdivision - #6011-25 Quinpool Road,
#2014-22 Robie Street and #2015-25 Parker Street

MOVED by Alderman LeBlanc, seconded by Alderman Doyle that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, an alteration to a subdivision at #6011-25 Quinpool Road, #2014-22 Robie Street and #2015-25 Parker Street, as shown on the revised Drawing No. P200/1908-00-9-16317 be approved in order that the owner may resubmit survey plans to the Halifax Registry of Deeds, as the former drawing No. P200/1695-00-9-16160 approved by City Council on April 29, 1965, contained a number of minor discrepancies in the dimensions of the

Council,
September 30, 1965.

lots. Motion passed.

Modification of Sideyard - #6531 Berlin Street

MOVED by Alderman Doyle, seconded by Alderman Richard that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, the modification of sideyard requirements at #6531 Berlin Street, as shown on Drawing No. P200/1899, to permit the conversion of a single family dwelling into a duplex by the addition of a second storey and a small addition to the front of the building, be approved. Motion passed.

Modification of Front and Sideyards - #2560 Oxford Street

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Doyle that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, the modification of front and sideyard requirements at #2560 Oxford Street, to permit the conversion of a single family dwelling into a duplex by constructing a two-storey addition at the rear, as shown on Drawings No. P200/1901-1906, be approved.

The Director of Planning explained the proposal for the information of the members of Council.

The motion was put and passed, 8 voting for the same and 5 against it as follows:

For the Motion: Aldermen Matheson, Meagher, LeBlanc, Trainor, Connolly, Doyle, Richard and H. W. Butler - 8

Against: Aldermen O'Brien, Black, Abbott, Moir and Lane - 5

Modification of Lot Frontage, Area and Front Yard -
Lot Northeast Corner Windsor and Hood Streets

MOVED by Alderman Richard, seconded by Alderman LeBlanc that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, the application for modification of lot frontage, lot area and frontyard requirements at the northeast corner of Windsor Street and Hood Street,

Council,
September 30, 1965.

to permit the erection of a duplex dwelling on a vacant lot, as shown on Drawing No. P200/1907, be rejected. Motion passed.

Modification of Lot Frontage - #2776-78 Dublin Street

MOVED by Alderman Doyle, seconded by Alderman

H. W. Butler that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, the modification of lot frontage at #2776-2778 Dublin Street to permit the conversion of the existing duplex dwelling into a four-unit apartment building by an addition to the north side of the building, as shown on Drawings No. P200/1896-98, be approved. Motion passed.

Amendment to Part VII Zoning By-law - C-1 Zone - Local Business

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Moir

that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, the Zoning By-law be amended as follows:

BE IT ENACTED by the City Council of the City of Halifax under the authority of the Town Planning Act, being Chapter 292 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1954, and amendments, as follows:

1. Part VII of the Zoning By-law of the City of Halifax, passed by the City Council on the 11th day of May, A. D., 1950, and approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the 15th day of August, A. D., 1960, as amended, is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefore:

Part VII

C-1 ZONE

(Local Business Zone)

1. No person shall, in any C-1 Zone, erect, alter, or use any building, in whole or in part, or use any land for any purpose other than one or more of the following uses, namely:

- (a) R-1, R-2 and R-3 uses, as hereinbefore set out;
- (b) Stores for the purposes of retail trade only;
- (c) Bank, community hall, office, municipal building, hairdresser, beauty parlor, restaurant, receiving office of a dry cleaner or dyer, except when in the opinion of the Inspector the operation of same would cause a nuisance;
- (d) Any use accessory to any of the foregoing uses.

Council,
September 30, 1965.
September 30, 1965.

2. Any persons carrying on a business may place upon and parallel to the front of a building a non-illuminated signboard not exceeding three feet in height and limited to the space immediately above the ground floor store windows extending the length of such front and appertaining solely to the ownership of the business conducted therein.

Illuminated signs may be erected if in the opinion of the Board, they are of suitable proportions and design and will not constitute a nuisance to the property owners in the area.

3. The basic height of buildings in this zone shall not exceed thirty-five feet (35').

4. The building line laid down for the adjacent residential buildings shall also apply to those buildings hereafter erected or altered to C-1 uses. If, however, it is intended to erect or alter a building for C-1 uses between two existing buildings of C-1 uses, neither of which encroach over the street line, then such erections or alterations may be carried out in line with the two adjacent existing buildings.

5. Buildings erected, altered or used for R-1, R-2 and R-3 uses in a C-1 Zone shall comply with the requirements of R-1, R-2 and R-3 Zones respectively, as detailed in Parts IV, V and VI above.

6. Sideyards are not required for C-1 uses in C-1, C-2 or C-3 Zones and that a public hearing be held on this matter.

Motion passed.

Rezoning C-1 Zone Locations

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Moir that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board, the following C-1 Zone locations be rezoned so as to render them as non-conforming uses:

1. Corner of Fenwick Street and South Park Street
2. Corner Point Pleasant Drive and Tower Road
3. Corner Oxford Street and South Street
4. Corner Henry Street and Jubilee Road
5. Corner Walnut Street and Jubilee Road
6. Corner Quinn Street, between Quinpool Road and Churchill Drive

Motion passed.

The City Clerk advised that the matter would have to be referred to the Regional Planning Commission for consideration and report and that a public hearing would have to be held on each item at some future date.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Zoning of Land Adjoining the Dingle

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman O'Brien
that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board,

- (a) Formal support be given to the County proposals to rezone the total area adjoining the Dingle from C-1 Commercial to R-1 Residential, and
- (b) Immediate action be taken by the Staff to determine the area in the vicinity of the Dingle which should be acquired for public recreation purposes and the City proceed with steps to purchase the area by agreement and failing that, by the use of compulsory acquisition powers.

The Director of Planning displayed a plan showing a part of Fleming Park and pointed out various areas of land contained in the plan. He advised that there was a recent application for rezoning the County area in the vicinity of the Park for apartment development but the application was refused. Subsequently, it was found by the County Planning Officers that there is an area of land which is zoned for commercial use at the moment which would permit the erection of an apartment building. He said that the County had initiated a rezoning of the commercial area to R-1 use. In the meantime, Staff has suggested that the City should consider the acquisition of this commercial area for Park purposes and include it in the Park itself. He pointed out that if the County rezoning to R-1 use is defeated, then the area is open for apartment development because it will still be zoned for commercial use.

His Worship the Mayor then read a resolution approved by the Regional Planning Commission at its meeting held on September 22, 1965, as follows:

"The Regional Planning Commission requests the City of Halifax, to acquire by negotiation or expropriation, the land on the south eastern side of the Dingle adjoining Fleming Park, for the purpose of extending and protecting the amenities of Fleming Park."

Council,
September 30, 1965.

His Worship the Mayor stated that Council should record its appreciation for the action taken by the Council of the Municipality of the County of Halifax in rejecting the application to erect a multi-storey apartment building so close to the Memorial Tower.

The motion was then put and passed.

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the City of Halifax record its appreciation to the Municipality of the County of Halifax for recognizing what the City has attempted to do over the years and expressing the satisfaction of this Council for the action taken by the Council of the Municipality of the County of Halifax in rejecting the application to rezone land in the vicinity of Fleming Park. Motion passed.

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the foregoing recommendation of the Town Planning Board be referred to the Committee on Works for a report to Council at a later meeting.

Alderman Meagher suggested that the City and the Municipality of the County of Halifax should jointly acquire land along the shore of the Arm to protect the Park area.

It was agreed that the report to Council make reference to the land north of the City's present holdings.

The motion was then put and passed.

MOTIONS

Motion - Alderman Moir Re: Amalgamation - Suburbs

His Worship the Mayor requested Alderman Moir to defer this motion until the next regular meeting of Council until it is known what areas are now seeking amalgamation with the City.

Alderman Moir then requested deferment of his motion which was agreed to by Council.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Motion - Alderman Richard Re: Changes of Ward Boundaries
and Ward Seats in Council

MOVED by Alderman Richard that Council make representations to the Board of Commissioners of the Public Utilities regarding changing of the Ward boundaries in order to give more equitable representation on City Council and also that the individual Ward seats be so distinguished that any candidate for Alderman will contest one or the other of the Ward seats.

There was no seconder to the motion.

Alderman Richard said he understood that this motion would be followed by a report from the City Solicitor and City Clerk with their recommendations to be forwarded through to the Board so that the new Ward boundaries would be in effect when the civic election is held in October 1966.

Alderman Moir was of the opinion that Council should first see the reports of these two Officials before they are directed to the Board to which Alderman Richard agreed.

Alderman Matheson requested that the present legislation be explained to Council and stated that the second part of the proposed motion was a matter for the Nova Scotia Legislature to consider. He was of the opinion that Council should study these matters first.

The City Solicitor stated that when the Municipal Boundaries and Representation Act was approved, it also set up the Municipal Board and it provided that towns and municipalities must do a redistribution by a certain date but cities were excluded. He advised that the Outhit Report criticized the three Cities in the Province on the matter of Ward boundaries due to the fact of the number of voters in each of the Wards. The present City Charter which was put into effect before the Municipal Boundaries and

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Representation Act took effect, gave the City of Halifax power by Ordinance, to alter its Ward boundaries but, with the proclamation of the Municipal Boundaries and Representation Act, this has superseded the City's powers and now the boundaries can only be altered by the Municipal Board which would be an application from the City Council to the Board with a supporting brief as to the suggested changes that the Board should make. Once the application is made and the evidence is presented to the Board, they are not bound by the representation made by the City, they could use it as a guide, but as to the actual Ward boundaries, it is a decision of the Board itself.

Alderman O'Brien suggested that a Committee of Council should do some preliminary work on this matter and then present a report to Council on certain principles that are involved before it is handed to Staff and eventually to the Public Utilities Board. If the City expects there will be amalgamation, there will have to be representation for County areas joining the City. If a Committee of Council were to examine the matter, it might come to the conclusion that there should be 8 or 9 Wards of one alderman each in the present City boundaries to make room for an addition of so many Wards in the County at the time of annexation. He felt this should all be considered on the basis of general principle first. He indicated that he was not certain that it is necessary for the City to go to the place where every alderman represents only one Ward. There are those who believe that it might be reasonable to have 4 large Wards of three aldermen each. In the City of Vancouver, with a small number of Aldermen, they run for the whole City. He considered that this system is not good because of the size of the City. He suggested that Council should look at these various

Council,
September 30, 1965.

possibilities very seriously and quickly enough so that it will have effect in the next civic election.

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Black, that this matter be referred to the Finance and Executive Committee for consideration and report back to Council.

Alderman Matheson stated that there is a matter of timing involved. If there is to be amalgamation, there will have to be a revision to give representation to the annexed areas and this is the time the question of Ward boundaries should be determined for the new and larger City. He suggested it would have to be done twice if it is going to be done at the present time.

His Worship the Mayor was of the opinion that an examination by the Committee will bring out a lot of points.

Alderman Moir suggested that the Finance and Executive Committee should give serious consideration to the forming of a small Committee to do the investigation.

Alderman Richard stated he would go along with the motion to refer provided the City Solicitor and City Clerk form an integral part of the Committee that will investigate this matter.

Alderman O'Brien then stated that it might be wise if Council anticipates amalgamation, to plan to reduce the Council in size before the next election to leave some scope. When amalgamation occurs, the Council is then added to so there does not have to be a further redistribution within the present City boundaries.

Alderman Richard pointed out that Ward 6 has approximately 12,000 eligible voters. Wards 1 and 4 are around 4,000 each. This is precisely the reason why he felt that Ward 6, being represented by only two Aldermen, is not receiving fair representation in the Council because it is perhaps three times the size

Council,
September 30, 1965.

of some of the other Wards.

Alderman Matheson pointed out that Alderman Richard was talking about revising the Ward boundaries while Alderman O'Brien was talking about reducing the number of Aldermen in Council and these are two different matters.

Alderman O'Brien advised that his suggestion was also to include the redistribution and the equalization.

Alderman Matheson stated that the motion did not deal with reducing the number of Aldermen in Council.

Alderman Moir stated that Alderman O'Brien had suggested to him a very clear plan which the Finance and Executive Committee should look at. If the number of voters in the City proper is taken, it could be visualized that Wards 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 each represent approximately 5,000 people so that if one alderman represented each Ward, then there would be representation for 5,000 people in each. Wards 6 and 7 represent on an average of 10,000 people each so these Wards would continue to have two aldermen each which would make 9 aldermen elected from the City. There would then be an additional 5 aldermen for the amalgamated areas which would envisage about 25,000 voters in the area to give equal representation.

The motion to refer was then put and passed.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Accounts Over \$1,000.00

None

Appointment to Board of Directors - Centennial Aquarium

His Worship the Mayor nominated Mr. C. P. Ruggles, Chief Biologist of the Department of Fisheries, (Canada), as a replacement for Dr. R. R. Logie on the Board of Directors of the Centennial Aquarium.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Abbott,
concerning this problem.
that the nomination be approved. Motion passed.

Letter - Warden Ira Settle Re: Harbour Crossing

The following letter was sent to Warden Ira Settle from
the Mayor:

September 27, 1965

Warden Ira S. Settle,
Municipal Administration Bldg.,
Dutch Village Road,
P. O. Box 300,
Armdale Post Office,
Halifax, N. S.

Re: Additional Crossing, Halifax Harbour

Dear Warden Settle:

A Committee set up by Halifax City Council to meet with representatives of the Province and the other municipalities re the above matter has requested that all information with regard to the construction of a tunnel under Halifax Harbour be made available to the County of Halifax and the City of Dartmouth. This information is now in the process of being assembled and will be transmitted to you as soon as possible.

I therefore request, at this time, that you do recognize the stand of the City Council as one that should be considered more fully by municipal associates in the area and that you do not take any action with respect to an additional crossing until such time as the information mentioned above is sent to you. This should be in your hands before the end of this week.

Yours very truly,

Charles A. Vaughan,
Mayor.

The following reply was received from the Warden:

September 28, 1965

Mayor Charles A. Vaughan,
City of Halifax,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.

Dear Mayor Vaughan:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 27th, re additional crossing of Halifax Harbour.

I know that the Committee appointed by our Council to work in conjunction with the other Municipalities would appreciate

Council,
September 30, 1965.

any information that is available to keep them fully informed concerning this problem.

To: Again, thanking you for this information, I remain

From: Recreation & Playgrounds Commission Yours very truly,

Date: September 24, 1965 Ira S. Settle
Warden

Subject: Use of buildings on the recently acquired D. V. D. It was agreed that this correspondence be considered

along with "Report Special Committee Re: Second Harbour Crossing".

At a meeting held on Monday, September 20, 1965, the following motion was

Report - Recreation Commission Re: Site for Municipal Indoor Swimming Pool

To: Members of City Council

From: Recreation and Playgrounds Commission

Date: September 24, 1965

Subject: Requested designation of land for a Municipal Indoor Swimming Pool

At a meeting of the Recreation and Playgrounds Commission held on Monday, September 20, 1965, the following motion was tabled by Alderman L. E. Moir and seconded by Alderman H. W. Butler:

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman H.W. Butler, that the City Council be requested to designate the open space associated with the property bounded by Cogswell Street, Rainnie Drive and Gottingen Street, which Council recently acquired, as the site of the long awaited Municipal Indoor Swimming Pool, and further that Council be requested to ask City Staff for a report on the following: siting, lay-out, estimate of cost and the type of construction recommended for an indoor swimming pool.

Yours very truly,

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

Jack Wolman, Chairman
Recreation & Playgrounds
Commission.

Dear Mr. Stoddard: MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman H.W. Butler,

that the letter be referred to the Town Planning Board to consider the matter of siting. Motion passed.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Report - Recreation Commission Re: Use of Buildings located on
Gottingen Street, Rainnie Drive and Cogswell Street

To: Members of City Council
From: Recreation & Playgrounds Commission
Date: September 24, 1965
Subject: Use of buildings on the recently acquired D.N.D.
Property

At a meeting of the Recreation and Playgrounds Commission held on Monday, September 20, 1965, the following motion was tabled by Alderman L. E. Moir and seconded by Alderman H.W. Butler:

That the Commission request from City Council the use of the buildings associated with the recently acquired land bounded by Cogswell Street, Rainnie Drive and Gottingen Street.

An explanation of the proposed use of the buildings in question is supplied under separate cover.

Yours very truly,

Jack Wolman, Chairman
Recreation & Playgrounds
Commission

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman H.W. Butler,

that the letter be referred to the Town Planning Board for consideration and report. Motion passed.

Letter - Nova Scotia Light & Power Company Limited Re: Application
to Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities for
Adjustment in Transit Fares

The following letter was submitted and read:

August 30, 1965

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

Dear Mr. Stoddard:

At a meeting of City Council on February 25, 1965, a motion was passed requesting that the City be advised at least 90 days in advance the Company's application to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities for an adjustment in transit fares.

Operating results to date this year, and anticipated results based on present trends for the remainder of 1965 and 1966

Council,
September 30, 1965.

indicate a continued decline of revenue passengers. The Company feels that it must now apply for increased fares to become effective as early as possible in 1966.

We enclose herewith a brief outlining the Company's proposal for consideration by City Council in the hope that Council will see fit to support the Company in its application before the Board. I would like to appear before Council or the Finance and Executive Committee and the City Council to answer any questions and to provide any additional information which may be required.

It would be appreciated if Council could deal with this matter as quickly as possible in order that the Company might apply to the Board for public hearing sometime in late November or early December.

Yours very truly,

K. W. McGrail,
Assistant General Manager.

A brief was also submitted from the Company, entitled "Proposed Adjustment in Transit Fares in Connection with the Operation of the Transit Division of Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited". Copies were furnished each member of Council for their information.

At this time, Mr. K. W. McGrail, Assistant General Manager, addressed Council in support of the application.

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. McGrail why the Company is now seeking an adjustment in transit fares which would obviously have only one result that of a decline in riders on the system. He then read legislation obtained in 1963 relating to the Company charging transit operation losses against the electric power service. He asked Mr. McGrail why the Company is proceeding with an application for a fare increase rather than taking the course the Company is empowered to use since 1963.

Mr. McGrail replied that no matter what course is resorted to, the additional money will have to come from some source whether it comes from a surcharge on the electric rates or an

Council,
September 30, 1965.

increase in the fares. The Company stand is primarily based on the fact that the present fare is a very low average. The average fare works out to 11.9¢ while the average fare across Canada works out to something like 14.5¢. Therefore, the Company does appreciate the legislation of 1963 because it does give protection in case riding continues to drop off. Be that as it may, the Company still feels with the present rates so low, and with these adjustments which will represent an increase of \$127,000.00, that it should follow the course of action proposed rather than the actual surcharge on electric rates. He asked why should electrical users in Halifax pay more for their electricity than the user in Dartmouth as long as the average fare paid for transit is so far below the average fare paid across Canada. This is the Company's position. He said that with the legislation it might be proper to obtain a fair and reasonable return on rate base. If this were the case, income tax would be involved and this would mean possibly the domestic user in the City of Halifax might very well have to pay a surcharge of approximately \$10.00 or \$12.00. He maintained that the user of the transit system should bear the cost of his transportation.

His Worship the Mayor pointed out that the transit system, except for the one across the bridge, is supplying a service to an area of 7½ square miles which is one of the smallest areas in Canada. He felt that the Company has to pro-rate the average fare to the number of transit miles available to the patrons. He referred to the fact that if it cost 14¢ say in Winnipeg where people can travel 15 miles on transit as against an average of 3 or 4 miles in Halifax, it seems to be a different

Council,
September 30, 1965.

proposition entirely. He felt it is unfair for the Company to go to the Public Utility Board with such an argument without giving all the facts.

Mr. McGrail stated that the 14.65¢ fare is based on information received from 34 centres across Canada. He advised that the City of Windsor has gone to a cash fare of 25¢. He further advised that Company opinion is that revenue per coach mile is below and that the proposed fare increase is the fairest course to take. He again advised that there had not been a fare increase in quite some time. 1957 was the last major increase when the cash fare went up from 10¢ to 15¢. He suggested that the increase proposed might give the Company a break-even position next year. The following year the Company will probably be losing another \$70,000.00 if trends continue. In view of the proposed amalgamation, there would most likely have to be a revamping of transit systems and routes. The Company policy is to hold on for another two or three years without going to this form of subsidy. If the Company is requested to extend its service and it cannot make a go of it, then obviously this legislation is there for the Company's protection as long as the service is substantially electric. He suggested that without the proposed fare increase, the Company might be faced with a loss for this year of \$120,000. He then suggested that from a point of view of this year's operation and next year's as well, the proposed fare increase is the proper method to follow.

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. McGrail how much of a service charge would be added to the electric energy bill of all the users in Halifax City as distinct from raising trolley coach fares by 33%.

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Mr. McGrail pointed out that the increase proposed would be 10% and not 33%. The cash fare is proposed to be 20¢ but the Company anticipates that the users will buy two tickets at any one time so 24% or 25% of the users presently pay a 15¢ cash fare. The Company really thinks that such an increase is not imposing any hardship on them by asking them to purchase two tickets when they board the coach. The Company anticipates that 40% of the cash riders will continue to pay cash, and the other increases proposed are considered by the Company to be very reasonable. He advised that the tickets would be sold as follows: 7 for \$1.00 and 3 for 50¢. He again pointed out that this represents a 10% increase. He also pointed out that of the 12,000,000 expected riders next year, possibly the Company would not get 300,000.

His Worship the Mayor again pointed out that the Legislature saw fit to pass legislation to enable the Company to find an avenue of relief in order to keep the service alive in Halifax yet the Company resists the application of this legislation.

Mr. McGrail pointed out that the problem that was confronting Mr. Harrington sometime ago in this connection was that of financing. Mr. Harrington felt that a transit that was imposing a load on the total health of the Company might very well influence the total cost money that the Company had to pay for its funds.

In answer to a question from His Worship the Mayor, Mr. McGrail said that the target date to put the new fair structure into operation would be January 1, 1966.

His Worship the Mayor further pointed out that the Company is advocating the abolition of the unlimited use of the pass by bringing it to a ticket device to which Mr. McGrail replied

Council,
September 30, 1965.

in the affirmative. Alderman O'Brien asked if Mr. McGrail could advise how many times since the Urwick, Currie Report on the Transit System was presented there have been either reductions to the service or increases in fares.

Mr. McGrail replied that in 1962 the Company applied to the Board that the pass be restricted in its use but the Board refused the application because of the system changes so there has not been an increase in fares since 1960. With respect to reduction in service, he advised that Council did approve and support the Company's application last Spring and since that time, the system has been on a basic Summer or Winter schedule. There have been no changes since that time which incorporated the curtailment.

Alderman O'Brien then asked if there were any other curtailments to which Mr. McGrail advised that there were a series of experiments after the Urwick, Currie Report was filed because it was a new system.

Alderman O'Brien asked if the Company had attempted to project in advance the reduction in riding with respect to these curtailments or changes in the revenue.

Mr. McGrail stated that the curtailments have been at hours of the day when very few passengers ride and these are a very small percentage of the number. He estimated that the Company had saved or will save approximately \$50,000.00 in this years operation.

On the basis of the Company's projection on the proposed change and the curtailment of last Spring, Alderman O'Brien asked Mr. McGrail if he had any fears that this is a kind of a spiral where the system goes down until it collapses to which

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Mr. McGrail replied that he honestly felt this way. He said the Company is carrying about 50% of the passengers it did in 1955. He also said the Company felt that it is at rock bottom with respect to curtailment of service.

Alderman O'Brien stated that the Company had not put into operation the number of diesels recommended in the Urwick, Currie Report,

Mr. McGrail replied that in the final proposal, the consultants agreed that 12 was a reasonable number. He advised that service on Chebucto Road would be dieselized and some studies have been carried out with respect to amalgamation. He could see further dieselization taking place but it costs money.

Alderman O'Brien asked Mr. McGrail what the Company sees as a long range picture of the transit system and how is the downward spiral going to be broken and put it on a healthy basis.

Mr. McGrail stated that the Company had given this question a great deal of consideration and this is why the Company is making this application as a wait-and-see program for a couple of years. Amalgamation will have a tremendous effect on the transit system. The Company has said it will support a metropolitan transit system or whatever the case may be. He mentioned the fact that it may be possible to charge zoned fares which will increase revenue but the Company sees that a metropolitan transit commission is possibly the answer.

Alderman O'Brien asked if this meant complete dieselization to which Mr. McGrail replied that it may very well be over a period of time. Alderman O'Brien then asked what would happen to the effectiveness of the legislation if the Company goes to all diesels to which Mr. McGrail replied that the legislation

Council,
September 30, 1965.

would be eliminated as the law is worded "substantially electric".

Alderman Lane believed that there are transit companies in Canada paying their way. She referred to the City of Windsor, Ontario. She asked Mr. McGrail if he had an explanation why the City of Windsor could operate in this manner.

His Worship the Mayor replied that it is municipally operated.

Mr. McGrail advised that the system in Ottawa is municipally operated. He further advised that the cities which have rapid transit feel that it is a paying proposition. He referred to traffic congestion in large cities which he gave as a reason for people being forced to use mass transportation because of stifling of traffic.

Mr. L. Currie Young advised that the Ottawa system has had a 20¢ fare for some time and since it is municipally controlled, their system of financing does not bear the same relationship as a company which is privately owned in which depreciation and other matters have to be charged. He further advised that in conferences where transit officials meet and discuss certain matters, there is no Canadian company which is making money.

Alderman Matheson stated that the Board of Public Utilities is better able to grapple with this problem than the members of Council and therefore, the Council has the alternative to either approve the application or to take no objection to it. He did not know whether Council is qualified to determine whether the Company should obtain the extra revenue through increased fares or by an increase in the electrical rate. He suggested that the matter be left with the Board of Public Utilities.