

Council,
September 30, 1965.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Black, that the City not oppose the application before the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities.

The motion was put and lost, 5 voting for the same and 7 against it as follows:

For: Aldermen Black, Abbott, Moir, Matheson
and LeBlanc - 5

Against: Aldermen Lane, Meagher, Connolly,
Doyle, Richard, O'Brien and
H. W. Butler - 7

Alderman O'Brien contended that Council is now in a position where there should be a motion to object, the grounds to be stated and that the City Solicitor appear on behalf of the City of Halifax.

It was then MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Lane,

That the City Solicitor be directed to appear before the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities when a hearing is called and oppose the application of the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited for increased trolley coach fares on the grounds that the City believes that more long-range plans involving a fundamental solution in terms of the efficiency of the transit operation are required.

Alderman Lane opposed the application on the grounds that she felt it would be an unfair burden on the citizens who are users of the public transportation and it would have an adverse affect on the merchants and that it is not particularly good for the community at large while she was in sympathy that the Company is having its problems. She felt that further research into another method rather than raising fares would have to be found.

Alderman Matheson was of the opinion that Alderman O'Brien's motion should make some reference as to what remedy

Council,
September 30, 1965.

the City of Halifax proposes for this ailing business as there has to be some cure. He felt that the City of Halifax is not discharging its responsibility in the matter and that it is incumbent upon the City to do more than oppose the application as the City has a long term responsibility. He suggested that the City should have been working on this matter for the last six months rather than waiting for this meeting to be concerned about it.

Alderman Lane stated that the City subsidizes other things and it may be that the City will have to give the citizens assistance in public transportation and this has been suggested before or else the City might take over the operation of the utility. She stated that some members of Council have worked long and late on this problem through the years and this is not the first time Council has heard it. She felt that the Board could say to the City of Halifax "if you don't want a fare increase, what are you prepared to do about it" and then Council would consider what it is prepared to do but until that day comes, she felt Council should not take that step. In the meantime, she did not think that the average citizens who uses the trolley coach should have to pay more money for what she called inadequate service.

Alderman Black was of the opinion that the motion made by Alderman O'Brien is to the effect that the Company has not given the matter any study and therefore the City should oppose the application on that ground. He said he could not vote for such a motion.

Alderman O'Brien replied that he felt that the

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Company had done some study on the matter and the brief presented to Council does support their request for the application but he contended that the Public Utility Board has to find some temporary means. The choice is to grant the application, to apply the formula that is in the legislation, to come back to the City and ask for a subsidy. Any one of these is a temporary solution and the purpose of the motion is to focus attention at the Public Utility Board to the need for more long-range planning which the City of Halifax should be involved in. Every time an application comes before the City of Halifax, the City never seems to get down to a study. He was of the opinion that there was to be studies by the City and Company Staffs to come up with proposals to the City involving parking on the routes or whatever is required to make the system more efficient and also such larger questions as the Metropolitan Commission.

The motion was then put and passed, 7 voting for the same and 5 against it as follows:

For: Aldermen Lane, Meagher, Connolly,
Doyle, Richard, O'Brien and
H. W. Butler - 7

Against: Aldermen Black, Abbott, Moir,
Matheson and LeBlanc - 5

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman LeBlanc, that this meeting do now adjourn and that the remaining items on the Order of Business be considered at the special meeting of Council called for October 6, 1965. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned: 12:00 o'clock midnight.

HEADLINES

Minutes - August 17 and 30, 1965	727
Approval of Order of Business - Additions or Deletions	727
Motion - Alderman Black Re Mayor's Report, dated August 9, 1965, respecting Bridges & Armdale Rotary	728
Sale of Sewer System to Public Service Commission	728

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Motion - Alderman Connolly Re: Site for New Home for Special Care	728
Motion - Alderman Richard Re: Group Life Insurance Plan	729
Public Hearing - Rezoning Land North Side Liverpool St. between Dublin & Windsor Street from R-2 Zone to R-3 Zone	730
Public Hearing - Alteration - Claremont Subdivision Lot #26 and Lot #27 Dudley Street	732
Hearing - Appeal from the Refusal of the Inspector of Buildings to Issue an Occupancy Permit Under Section 739 A(3) of the City Charter - Tavern, North Side of Hood Street and West Side of Kempt Rd.	733
Possible Acquisition - Vacant Lots - Corner of Barrington and Cornwallis Streets	735
Possible Acquisition - #2400-2402 Brunswick Street	735
Possible Settlement - #2350-2352 Maitland Street	736
Possible Acquisition - #2416 Brunswick Street	736
Property Acquisition - #2348 Maitland Street	736
Acquisition - Property #92 - City Plan #P500/46 - Africville	736
Acquisition - Properties #72 & #74 - Africville	737
Acquisition - Properties #65, #66, #67 and #68 City Plan #P500/46 - Africville	737
Acquisition - Properties #141, #142 and #143 - Africville	738
Request - Red Cross Society - Building, Anderson Square	738
Sale of Land & Buildings of the Halifax Mental Hospital to the Halifax Children's Hospital	738
Pre-Retirement Leave	739
Furniture Allowance - Mr. & Mrs. Leon Steede- \$1,000	739
Supplementary Appropriations - 316"C" City Charter:	
(1) Vocational Sch. - \$4,985.67	(5) Police Dept. Motor
(2) City Prison - \$3,642.87	Vehicle - \$520.00
(3) Welfare Dept. - \$103,880.00	(6) School Board \$2,500.
(4) Pavement Markings - \$4,000.	(7) Recreation Dept. \$352.20
	(8) Aquarium Committee - \$4,000.
	739
Permission to Overdraw 1965 Appropriations	741
Resolution Re: Freedom of City to the Right Worshipful The Mayor of Halifax, Yorkshire, England, Councillor H. Ludlam, J.P.	741
Request - Board of Trade to Meet with Representative of Urwick, Currie Limited	742
Additional Staff - Property Management Division	743
Tenders - Bond Issue - \$1,000,000.00	743
Bond Resolution	744
Resolution Re: Repeal & Proclamation of City Charter Sections	745
Bond of Indemnity - Loan 150 Tables from Department of National Defence (Army)	745
New Home for Special Care	746
Closing Newton Avenue	746
Quinn Street - Access to and from West Bound Lane of New Chebucto Road	747
Rehabilitation - North Common	748
Tenders for Demolition	748
Report - Test Areas - Sidewalk Snow Removal	749
Alteration - Staff Establishment - Fire Department	752
Survey - Fire Defences of the City of Halifax	753
Request - Family Service Bureau - Funds for Clothing Needy Children	753

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES

Council,
September 30, 1965.

Rezoning - R-3 Zone to C-2 Zone - #2554-76 Maynard St.	754
Resubmission - Alteration to a Subdivision - #6011-25 Quinpool Road, #2014-22 Robie Street and #2015-25 Parker Street	754
Modification of Sideyard - #6531 Berlin Street	755
Modification of Front and Sideyards - #2560 Oxford St.	755
Modification of Lot Frontage, Area and Front Yard Lot Northeast Corner Windsor and Hood Streets	755
Modification of Lot Frontage - #2776-78 Dublin Street	756
Amendment to Part VII Zoning By-law - C-1 Zone - Local Business	756
Rezoning C-1 Zone Locations	757
Zoning of Land Adjoining the Dingle	758
Motion - Alderman Moir Re: Amalgamation - Suburbs	759
Motion - Alderman Richard Re: Changes of Ward Boundaries and Ward Seats in Council	760
Accounts Over \$1,000	763
Appointment to Board of Directors - Centennial Aquarium	763
Letter - Warden Ira Settle Re: Harbour Crossing	764
Report - Recreation Commission Re: Site for Municipal Indoor Swimming Pool	765
Report - Recreation Commission Re: Use of Buildings Located on Gottingen St., Rainnie Dr. & Cogswell St.	766
Letter - Nova Scotia Light & Power Company Limited Re: Application to Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities for Adjustment in Transit Fares	766

CHARLES A. VAUGHAN,
MAYOR & CHAIRMAN.

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK

**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL
M I N U T E S**

Council,
October 6, 1965.

- 3. Notices of Motion.
- 4. Questions.
- 5. Centennial Celebrations Committee.

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.,
October 6, 1965,
7:40 p.m.

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

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

There were present His Worship the Mayor, Chairman, and Aldermen Abbott, Black, Moir, Matheson, Meagher, LeBlanc, Trainor, Doyle, O'Brien and H. W. Butler.

Also present were P. F. C. Byars, L. Mitchell, Q. C., W. J. Clancey, R. B. Grant, G. F. West, J. L. Leitch, G. H. Brundige and K. Munnich.

The meeting was called specially to consider the following

Order of Business:

- 1. Staff Report - Call for Development Proposals - Spring Garden South Redevelopment Project.
- 2. Staff Report - Letter from Spring Garden Area Business Association
- 3. Letter - Bryant Realty and Leasehold Company Re: Spring Garden Road Development
- 4. Joint Staff Report - Economic Analysis for Redevelopment Planning - Central Business District
- 5. Letter - President, Downtown Halifax Business Association Re: Economic Analysis for Redevelopment Planning
- 6. Downtown Parking Garages

ITEMS NOT DEALT WITH AT THE SEPTEMBER 30, 1965 MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL, AND REFERRED TO THIS MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION:

- 1. Report - Special Committee Re: Second Harbour Crossing
- 2. Motion - Alderman Black Re: Mayor's Report dated August 9, 1965 respecting Bridges and Armdale Rotary.

Council, Council,
October 6, 1965. 6, 1965.

3. Notices of Motion.
4. Questions.
5. Centennial Celebrations Committee.
6. Master Plan of the City.

STAFF REPORT - CALL FOR DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS -
SPRING GARDEN SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

A report was submitted from the City Manager dated September 27, 1965 to which was attached a copy of a staff report in respect to the recent call for development proposals for the Spring Garden South Redevelopment Project. (A copy of the report is attached to the official copy of these minutes.)

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that Council take no action on the matter at this time but that the report be tabled for six months pending possible action on the Central Redevelopment Area so that potential developers of the Spring Garden Area will have an indication of how the City is developing; and pending receipt of the economic feasibility study being carried out by Canadian Urban Economics Limited.

Alderman Trainor contended that the matter should not be deferred and that the area can be developed immediately by people who are interested.

He said that the reason no proposals had been received was because the ground rules were too restrictive for any reasonable developer to be able to make a fair return on his investment.

Alderman Abbott stated that he would support the motion because the City has everything to gain and nothing to lose by deferring the matter and he said that during the period of deferrment, discussions could be carried on with developers. He contended that the Spring Garden South Area is one of the choicest locations in the City for commercial development and that land values in the area will

Council,
October 6, 1965.

not depreciate.

Alderman Matheson referred to the fact that the call for development proposals appeared to be quite restrictive and he asked if the methodology followed in preparing the Call is the same as that used by other older cities who have carried out major redevelopment schemes, or if the City's Call was something unique.

The Development Officer stated that basically, the form of the call for proposals used for the Spring Garden South Redevelopment Area is the same as that used by the greater majority of Canadian cities which have undertaken redevelopment projects.

He said that the actual restrictions contained in the Call are based on individual cases. He said that the following point should be made at this time. When the Spring Garden South Redevelopment was first to be undertaken, it was indicated that there was to be a grade level parking lot and upon examination, it became obvious that this was not to be too economical a proposition because of land costs and the resultant carrying charges. In addition, the City was faced with a loss of tax revenue. Therefore, it was decided to proceed with a grade level parking lot initially and at the appropriate time, the land would be offered for development purposes.

Alderman Matheson asked if it would be possible to specify a portion of the area for parking purposes and offer the balance for development without any restrictions, and he asked if there is any precedent to this type of approach.

The Development Officer said that this is not done in any city where urban renewal is being carried out in partnership with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

He said that it had been felt that if the City offered

Council,
October 6, 1965.

the land for development purposes without making the developer accept some responsibility for financing a parking area, the City could be left in a loss position or in the position of having to provide the parking and having to accept the loss.

Alderman Matheson: "What makes us so all wise that we know that everything that is good for the City's planning is good for the City's economic life and legislate these restrictive leasing agreements for the future development of the City? Don't we have any faith in free enterprise anymore? -- that they will build in response to the demands of the area and will meet the needs of the area? I am not so sure we should not defeat the motion. I hope the motion will be phrased so that the door will be left open for people with initiative who will suggest to the City that 'We do not know all the answers', and that some project might be the answer to the Spring Garden South area.' I shudder to think that Government is going to reach the stage where it will plan everything down to the last nail and the building that is to go up there. I think we should recognize the value of planning to the degree that is necessary and not try to strangle free enterprise by applying a formula and decide what is good for Halifax. This is contrary to the philosophy of a great many people. I think we should have planning only to the degree that is necessary and allow the laws of economics to operate and only become involved where these things do not produce; and we do not know whether they will produce because we have not tried them. We have tried to legislate everything. We should have a master plan for the overall Halifax of the future, but surely this is all we need; and we should allow the initiative of the developer to reflect the needs of the community to the extent that is possible in this complex world of today. I think the way to handle this is to table the report but not for six months. I would like to see the City

Council,
October 6, 1965.

leave the door open and invite developers to come to the City and say: 'We know what is needed', and let them do it."

Alderman Moir said the intent of his motion was that the matter must be brought forward to Council within six months and a simple motion of Council will permit it to be discussed within that time.

Alderman Black pointed out that the area had been available to private enterprise for development for over 200 years and that no initiative had been shown, with the result that the land had degenerated to slums or semi-slums.

After further discussion, Alderman Matheson suggested that the motion be reworded as follows:

That the report be tabled; that the call for proposals not be issued again for six months; and, in the meantime, potential developers be invited to make suggestions to the City relating to the development of the Spring Garden South Redevelopment Area.

8:05 p.m. His Worship the Mayor left the Chair to address Council from the floor and the Deputy-Mayor assumes the Chair.

His Worship the Mayor contended that Council would be making a mistake by tabling the document without first examining it in depth.

He said that the basic problem is that the call for proposals required any developer to provide parking in a high-cost area and he contended that the City must assume responsibility for parking in a multi-level device or alternatively permit high-density development in order for the developer to make a profit.

He concluded by saying that conditions will not improve in six months as the same basic factors that applied six months ago apply tonight, and he suggested that one change which might make the proposition a little more attractive would be to adjust the car parking allowances to permit three car spaces for each one thousand

Council,
October 6, 1965.

square feet of development.

8:15 p.m. His Worship the Mayor assumed the Chair.

8:15 p.m. Aldermen Lane and Richard arrived.

During a discussion as to the parking requirements provided for in the call for proposals, the Development Officer stated that in the first Call, there was a specific requirement of 250 car parking spaces plus one space for every one thousand feet of space put to other usage. This was changed to a straight four spaces per one thousand square feet of development with a minimum of three hundred spaces.

His Worship the Mayor: "We should have the matter brought before the Development Committee to examine it now because if our requirements are too high, we should be examining them. We should have an exercise by the Development Officer to work out the figures, including the economics of it."

Alderman Trainor stated that there has been divided opinion as to whether or not the City should get into the business of public parking, and he pointed out that the City is now involved in public parking and he referred to the Grafton Street parking lot and the Maitland Street parking lot, and he contended that one of the responsibilities of a Municipal Government is to provide public parking.

He said that there are many areas in the City where the City, in partnership with private developers, could provide some type of parking facilities.

At this time, it was agreed to hear Mr. Peter Andrewes, Chairman of the Spring Garden Area Business Association.

Mr. Andrewes stated that while he was not speaking on behalf of the Association, part of what he had to say represents a consensus within the membership of the Association. He said that the Association would be happy to see this question tabled for the

Council,
October 6, 1965.

moment, but without a time limit being placed on it as his Association might be able to offer a solution to the dilemma now faced by the City.

He said that as the Mayor mentioned, either increased development density must be permitted, or the City must decide to go into public parking. One way of overcoming the problem might be to remove parking from the 1.5 floor space index ratio. This would permit private money to develop the land and for the City to satisfy the 300 car spacing requirement. He said that he would like to see the matter tabled pending explanation of this suggestion by the City Staff or other appropriate body.

The suggested solution involves separating the land areas into two areas to fit the two factors - parking and commercial development; two-thirds of the land to be used for parking and one-third for commercial development. If this solution were adopted, parking spaces could be increased eventually by adding additional levels and the remaining one-third could be thrown open to private development; and he suggested that such development be as unrestricted as possible.

After further discussion, it was moved by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that items one, two and three on the Order of Business, be referred to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

8:45 p.m. Council adjourned for a short recess in order that the items one, two and three on the Order of Business could be considered by the Town Planning Board.

8:55 p.m. Council reconvened, the following members being present: Aldermen Abbott, Black, Moir, Matheson, Meagher, LeBlanc, Trainor, Doyle, O'Brien, H. W. Butler, Richard and Lane.

A report was submitted from the meeting of the Town Planning Board held on this date recommending that the following

Council,
October 6, 1965.

items be referred to a Special Committee composed of the members of the Development Committee and two members appointed by the Town Planning Board, namely Aldermen LeBlanc and Moir:

1. Staff Report - Call for Development Proposals - Spring Garden South Redevelopment Project
2. Staff Report - Letter from Spring Garden Area Business Association
3. Letter - Bryant Realty and Leasehold Company Re: Spring Garden Road Development

MOVED by Alderman Richard, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the recommendation of the Town Planning Board be approved.
Motion passed.

JOINT STAFF REPORT - ECONOMIC ANALYSIS FOR REDEVELOPMENT PLANNING -
CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT

A report was submitted from the City Manager to which was attached a copy of the report of the joint staff committee containing comments and conclusions reached during the examination of the report of Canadian Urban Economics Limited. (A copy of the joint staff report is attached to the official copy of these minutes.)

After discussion, it was moved by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Lane, that:

- (1) City Council concur in the recommendation of the joint staff committee that, based on the report of Phase 1 of the report of Canadian Urban Economics Limited, it is not necessary to revise the development plan for the central business district;
- (2) Canadian Urban Economics Limited be requested to proceed with Phase 2 of the study;
- (3) Council reserve judgement as to the validity of the findings and projections of the report on Phase 1 until the full report has been submitted.

Motion passed with Aldermen LeBlanc and O'Brien voting against.

LETTER - PRESIDENT, DOWNTOWN HALIFAX BUSINESS
ASSOCIATION RE: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS FOR REDEVELOPMENT PLANNING

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Lane, that the letter from the Downtown Halifax Business Association dated August 5, 1965 referring to the economic analysis for redevelopment planning be deferred for consideration until receipt of the report of Phase 2 of the study to be carried out by Canadian Urban Economics Limited.
Motion passed.

Council,
October 6, 1965.

DOWNTOWN PARKING GARAGES

This matter had originated in the Development Committee at the meeting held on May 5, 1965 and had been referred to the Town Planning Board which had submitted the following recommendation to City Council on May 27, 1965:

It is recommended that the City

- (1) Immediately approach the owners of Tex-Park to see if the facility can be increased in capacity;
- (2) Defer consideration of the request of the Downtown Halifax Business Association until such time as the Market Analysis is received and Capital Expenditure priorities have been established.

At that time, Council had deferred consideration of the matter until after receipt of the report on the economic analysis by Canadian Urban Economics Limited.

His Worship the Mayor asked if the question of downtown parking garages hinges on Phase 2 of the study by Canadian Urban Economics Limited or whether Council should recognize the lack of parking facilities in the downtown area and should establish a policy of providing some type of facility in the area.

Alderman Trainor stated that he had advocated parking garages for the downtown area and Council had asked Staff to consider the feasibility of adding two or three levels on the Grafton Street parking lot, which report he had never seen.

He referred to the experience of the operators of the Tex-Park Garage and the Argyle Garage, both of which are operating close to capacity which would indicate that there is a need for additional facilities. He said that if the City did not wish to go into the parking garage business on its own, consideration could be given to a partnership arrangement with private enterprises, such as oil companies who would not only operate them but would help to finance them. He said that such an arrangement can be profitable and it would

Council,
October 6, 1965.

fill a need in the City.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the matter be referred to the Special Committee composed of the members of the Development Committee and two members of the Town Planning Board for consideration.

Alderman Moir asked that when discussing the matter of parking garages, the Committee give serious consideration to the establishment of a Parking Authority and that the Staff be directed to report to the Special Committee arguments for and against the establishment of such an authority with an indication as to the extent of the scope of the authority. Motion passed.

ITEMS NOT DEALT WITH AT THE SEPTEMBER 30, 1965 MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL, AND REFERRED TO THIS MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION:

Report - Special Committee Re: Second Harbour Crossing

The following report was submitted:

TO: Members of City Council

FROM: His Worship the Mayor and Members of the Special Harbour Crossing Project Committee

DATE: September 29, 1965.

SUBJECT: Second Harbour Crossing

The Special Harbour Crossing Project Committee has held several meetings and now recommends the attached report for adoption by City Council. The Committee wishes to proceed with the submission and requests authorization by City Council to appear before the Councils of the City of Dartmouth and the County of Halifax. It is hoped that as a result of an appearance by the Committee and the submission of this Brief, the Cities of Halifax and Dartmouth and the County of Halifax can agree upon the project before approaching the Provincial Government as stipulated in the Premier's letter dated August 6, 1965.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
Clerk of the Special Harbour Crossing Project Committee

(A copy of the report of the Special Committee is attached to the official copy of these minutes)

Council,
October 6, 1965.

Alderman Richard stated that on his own initiative, he had written to all members of the Cabinet of the Government of Canada requesting that they give their utmost consideration to the matter of financial assistance to a South Harbour Crossing if and when the matter is submitted to the cabinet.

He said that he had received replies from ten members of the cabinet, each of which indicates that the question of Federal assistance would receive consideration if a request is presented to the cabinet.

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the Brief dated September 29, 1965 respecting the Second Harbour Crossing prepared by the Special Harbour Crossing project Committee of City Council be approved; and that the said Committee be authorized to appear before the Councils of the City of Dartmouth and the Municipality of the County of Halifax to seek their concurrence in the conclusions reached in the said Brief; also that the Brief be supported by copies of ten letters from Members of the Cabinet of the Government of Canada, received and tabled by Alderman Richard, each of which indicates that the question of Federal Assistance would receive consideration if a request is presented to the Cabinet.

After a lengthy discussion, the motion was put and passed unanimously.

Motion - Alderman Black Re: Mayor's Report dated August 9, 1965, respecting Bridges and Armdale Rotary

Deferred.

Notice of Motion - Alderman Meagher Re: Chebucto Road Improvements

Alderman Meagher gave notice that at the meeting of City Council scheduled for October 14, 1965, he will move that the resolution passed by Council at a meeting held on September 30, 1965, respecting Chebucto Road improvements, be rescinded.

Council,
October 6, 1965.

Question - Alderman O'Brien Re: Legislation Respecting Compensation to Property Owners in the Area of the Bicentennial Drive Entrance

Alderman O'Brien asked if consideration could be given to the preparation of legislation respecting compensation to property owners in the area of the Bicentennial Drive Entrance and if it could be processed in sufficient time for presentation at the next session of the Legislature.

His Worship the Mayor said that the City Manager would be directed to process the matter so that draft legislation would be submitted to Council as soon as possible.

Question - Alderman Trainor Re: Capital Budget

Alderman Trainor asked when the capital budget for 1965 would be presented to Council.

The City Manager stated that he had been asked the same question at the previous meeting of Council when he had said that he was unable to produce the capital budget for this year until the priority on the various projects had been set.

His Worship the Mayor asked: "Who is going to set the priorities?"

The City Manager stated that this is a decision for Council or a Committee to make.

He said that the lack of a capital budget for 1965 is somewhat of an advantage to the City due to the fact that any capital item for which application has been made to the Municipal Development and Loan Board has qualified for a loan because it has not been budgeted for. He explained that projects included in capital budgets would not be qualified for loans under the Act. He said that in the final analysis, the City is not suffering as the result of a lack of a capital budget and he stated that he would like to have all the projects enumerated as to priority.

Council,
October 6, 1965.

Question - Alderman Trainor Re: Central Redevelopment Area

Alderman Trainor submitted the following questions and asked that the City Manager submit his answers in writing:

- (1) Recently we received an announcement by a Halifax group, the Halifax Development Company Limited, that they were interested in developing the downtown area. Is the City formally or informally inviting proposals for the Central Redevelopment Area?
- (2) Is the City technically in a position to accept proposals for the development of this area?

Centennial Celebrations Committee

His Worship the Mayor stated that he proposes to call a general meeting of representatives of service clubs, churches and other organizations for the purpose of discussing the question of Centennial celebrations, and out of the representatives, to form a major Committee and Sub-Committee to formulate a programme of events to celebrate the Centennial year of Confederation.

He said that the intention is to get as wide a representation as possible on the Committee so that all segments of the population would be represented; and, therefore, he proposes to recommend to Council his appointees for such a Committee after the general meeting has been held.

MOVED by Alderman LeBlanc, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that Council endorse the proposal of His Worship the Mayor to call a general meeting of all interested groups and to recommend to Council the structure of a Committee and Sub-Committee for planning the Centennial celebrations in the City. Motion passed.

Alderman Matheson suggested that the Committee could be broadened to include representatives from the County of Halifax.

The motion was passed.

Question - Alderman Moir Re: Centennial Project

Alderman Moir asked that the Staff or Committee be directed

Council,
October 6, 1965.

to submit a report as to the timing of the Centennial project, as the timing of such project is important and of direct interest to the City because of the fact that the grant is subject to a provision that the project be completed in 1967.

His Worship the Mayor said that the planning and architectural design of the Aquarium is proceeding and that if a construction start is made by the spring of 1966, the project can be completed by 1967. He said that the Board of Directors of the Aquarium have already met and have indicated that they are desirous of getting on with the job as soon as possible.

Master Plan of the City

A report was submitted from the City Manager setting forth the progress made to date on the preparation of the Development Plan for the City.

His Worship the Mayor stated that the report had been submitted to the Town Planning Board on October 4 and action had been deferred by the Board to give all members of Council an opportunity to study the report and to give the Staff an opportunity to make a further report.

It was agreed to take no action at this time pending receipt of a report from the Town Planning Board.

10:00 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

HEADLINES

Staff Report - Call for Development Proposals - Spring Garden South Redevelopment Project	780
Joint Staff Report - Economic Analysis for Redevelopment Planning - Central Business District	786
Letter - President, Downtown Halifax Business Association Re: Economic Analysis for Redevelopment Planning	786
Downtown Parking Garages	787
Report - Special Committee Re: Second Harbour Crossing	788
Motion - Alderman Black Re: Mayor's Report dated August 9, 1965, respecting Bridges and Armdale Rotary	789

CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES

Council,
October 6, 1965.

Notice of Motion - Alderman Meagher Re: Chebucto Road Improvements	789
Question - Alderman O'Brien Re: Legislation Respecting Compensation to Property Owners in the Area of the Bicentennial Drive Entrance	790
Question - Alderman Trainor Re: Capital Budget	790
Question - Alderman Trainor Re: Central Redevelopment Area Centennial Celebrations Committee	791
Question - Alderman Moir Re: Centennial Project	791

C. A. VAUGHAN,
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK

MINUTES

No minutes were submitted for approval at this time.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS - ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The Order of Business was approved as follows:

Abbott and Moir after the following items were added:

20(a) Release of Performance Deposit - Metropolitan Telephone Limited - Block "F" - Public Utility Commission

20(b) Setting date for First Meeting of Council for 1966

and after amending Item 7(a) by changing the date of the meeting for 1965, instead of July 15, 1965.

Motion - Alderman Black Re: Knapton Park - Respecting Services and Amenities

It was agreed to refer the same to the next meeting after the Mayor announced that the Knapton Park Planning Project Committee is scheduled to meet with the City Council at 7:00 p.m. on October 15, 1965, and will be the subject of the agenda for that meeting.

CITY COUNCIL
M I N U T E S

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.,
October 14, 1965,
8:30 p.m.

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

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

There were present: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; and Aldermen Black, Abbott, Moir, Matheson, Meagher, LeBlanc, Trainor, Connolly, Doyle, O'Brien and H. W. Butler.

Also present were Messrs. P. F. C. Byars, R. H. Stoddard, W. J. Clancey, D. F. Murphy, J. L. Leitch, R. B. Grant, G. F. West, V. W. Mitchell, G. H. Brundige, K. M. Munnich and Dr. E. M. Fogo.

MINUTES

No minutes were submitted for approval at this time.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS - ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The Order of Business was approved on motion of Aldermen Abbott and Moir, after the following items were added:

- 20(a) Release of Performance Deposit - Metropolitan Development Limited - Block "P" - Exhibition Grounds;
- 20(b) Setting date for First Meeting of Council in November; and after amending Item 7(a) by changing the date to September 30, 1965, instead of July 15, 1965.

DEFERRED BUSINESS

Motion - Alderman Black Re: Mayor's Report, dated August 9, 1965 Respecting Bridges and Armdale Rotary

It was agreed to defer this item until the next meeting, after the Mayor announced that the Special Harbour Crossing Project Committee is scheduled to meet with the City Council of Dartmouth on October 15, 1965, and with the Council of the Municipality of the

Council,
October 14, 1965.

County of Halifax on October 19, 1965.

Sale of Sewer System to Public Service Commission

Further deferred.

Motion - Alderman Moir Re: Amalgamation - Suburbs

Alderman Moir requested permission to withdraw his motion in view of the fact that the matter of amalgamation will be considered under Item 10(m) of the Order of Business.

It was agreed to permit Alderman Moir to withdraw his motion.

MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION

None

MOTIONS OF RESCISSION

Motion - Alderman Meagher to Rescind Resolution of Council dated September 30, 1965 Re: Chebucto Road Improvements

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman LeBlanc, that the resolution of Council respecting Chebucto Road improvements, passed at the meeting held on September 30, 1965, be rescinded.

Alderman Meagher stated that his reason for making the motion was that the residents of Quinn Street - Westmount Street Area have requested that access to Quinn Street from the Westbound lane of Chebucto Road be maintained; furthermore, he contended that the Committee on Works had been led to believe that the Provincial Department of Highways would not approve of any change in the design of the improved Chebucto Road, but discussions with officials of that Department had elicited the information that they would not object to a left turning movement at Quinn Street.

After discussion, the motion was put and lost with only Aldermen Meagher and LeBlanc voting for same.

Council,
October 14, 1965.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Re: Extension Non-conforming Use - #6085 Coburg Road

A Public Hearing was held at this time in connection with an application to extend a non-conforming use at 6085 Coburg Road for the purpose of enlarging an existing drugstore at that location.

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

No person wished to be heard in opposition to the application.

Mr. David Fraser, Solicitor for the applicant, Mr. D. J. McNeil, President and principal shareholder of Studley Pharmacy, addressed Council on his behalf.

He stated that the applicant proposes to invest \$25,000.00 to improve the premises, without exterior alteration, except improvement of the exterior finish, in order to provide expanded and more efficient service to his customers, which involves the installation of a soda fountain.

He asked that Council approve the application in its entirety, that is, the extension of the non-conforming use and the installation of a soda fountain.

8:55 p.m. Alderman Lane arrives.

MOVED by Alderman H. W. Butler, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the application for an extension to a non-conforming use at 6085 Coburg Road be approved, in accordance with Subsection (a) of Section 1, of Part XV of the Halifax Zoning By-law, such approval to be subject to the condition that the snack bar to be installed in the said premises, shall be confined to the serving of sandwiches, hot and cold drinks and like commodities not involving cooking on the premises and that the soda fountain will be closed at 8:30 p.m. Motion passed.

Council,
October 14, 1965.

PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

Petition Re: Erection of Tavern - Kempt Road and Hood Street

A petition was submitted, containing approximately ninety-seven signatures, strongly opposing the erection of a tavern at the corner of Hood Street and Kempt Road, and requesting that Council give further consideration to the matter before granting an occupancy permit for a tavern at the said location.

The petition, which was endorsed by Alderman R. A. O'Brien, listed four reasons why the permit should not be granted.

Alderman H. W. Butler stated that he intended to give notice of motion to rescind the resolution of Council passed at the meeting of September 30, 1965, under Item 19 of the Rules of Order.

Alderman O'Brien asked if a building permit has been issued.

The Commissioner of Works replied in the negative, stating that complete plans and specifications have not yet been submitted from the applicant.

Alderman O'Brien asked if the Commissioner of Works is aware of any law which would permit abutting property owners to appeal the issuance of a building permit within fifteen days, so that Council could consider an appeal as an alternative to rescinding the previous resolution.

The Commissioner of Works stated that he was not aware of such a law but that there is provision in the City Charter for an applicant for a building permit to appeal from the refusal of the Building Inspector to issue such permit.

Alderman O'Brien asked if it would not be proper procedure for the Building Inspector to notify one of the petitioners when a permit is issued so that he could follow this course.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that it would be better

Council,
October 14, 1965.

procedure if the Commissioner of Works were to notify the aldermen in the particular ward, the City Clerk and the City Manager when he issues a permit. In this way, the aldermen would be in a position to notify the petitioners of the action taken.

REPORT - FINANCE AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Council considered the reports of the meetings of the Finance and Executive Committee held on October 7, 8 and 14, 1965, with respect to the following matters:

Property Acquisition - #2219 Brunswick Street

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman Black that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the sum of \$10,100.00 be paid to Miss Honora V. Killeen and Mrs. Fred Short as settlement in full for all claims arising from the acquisition by the City of their property at 2219 (275) Brunswick Street, located within the Uniacke Square Redevelopment Area. Motion passed.

Property Acquisition - #2338 Maitland Street

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman Black that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the sum of \$2,500.00 be paid to John and Lillian Hemr as settlement in full for all claims arising from the acquisition of their property by the City at 2338 (108) Maitland Street, located within the first phase of the Uniacke Square Redevelopment Area (Library Site). Motion passed.

Property Acquisition - #2294 Barrington Street,
#2298-2300 Barrington Street, and
#5221 Lockman Avenue

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Meagher that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the sum of \$17,500.00 be paid to the Provincial Realty Limited as settlement in full for all claims arising from the acquisition of their properties at 2294 Barrington Street, 2298-2300 Barrington Street and 5221 Lockman Avenue, all of which are located within the Uniacke Square

Council,
October 14, 1965.

Redevelopment Area. Motion passed.

Cost of Living Assistance to Pensioners of the City

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Matheson that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, cost of living assistance to supplement superannuation payments, be approved for the following pensioners of the City in the amount indicated:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PENSION OR GRANT</u>	<u>ACTUAL PAYMENTS 1965</u>	<u>INCREMENT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Miss Frances Mullins	Grant	\$ 720.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 804.00
Arthur MacKenzie	Grant	720.00	84.00	804.00
William Power	Grant	300.00	84.00	384.00
Clifford Tanner	Grant	720.00	84.00	804.00
Marjorie Colpitt	Grant	720.00	84.00	804.00
Mrs. Mary Thompson	Grant	600.00	84.00	684.00
Mrs. Ellen Murphy	Grant	600.00	84.00	684.00
Eleanor M. Doyle	Grant	849.96	84.00	933.96
Dennis Thibodeau	Grant	720.00	84.00	804.00
Desire (Leo) Sampson	Grant	720.00	84.00	804.00
Albert Davie	Grant	720.00	84.00	804.00
Mrs. Mary Cormier	Grant	499.92	184.00	683.92
Mrs. Frances Shanks	Pension	394.68	184.00	578.68
John L. Whalen	Pension	1,047.96	84.00	1,131.96
Ernest Yeadon	Pension	1,047.96	84.00	1,131.96
William Wells	Pension	800.28	84.00	884.28
James D. Connolly	Grant	960.00	84.00	1,044.00
Reginald Brushett	Pension	960.00	84.00	1,044.00
		<u>\$13,100.76</u>	<u>\$1,712.00</u>	<u>\$14,812.76</u>

Funds in the amount of \$1,712.00 having been provided in 1965 Estimates for this purpose. Motion passed.

Halifax Relief Commission Lands - Dartmouth and Devonshire Avenues

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Black that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the Staff be authorized to negotiate with the Halifax Relief Commission for the acquisition of the vacant land at the corner of Dartmouth and Devonshire Avenues, required as a site for an additional Junior High School. Motion passed.

Possible Acquisition - Properties East Side of Barrington Street - Appointment of Appraisers

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Trainor that,

Council,
October 14, 1965.

as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the Staff be authorized to obtain independent appraisals of the properties on the east side of Barrington Street between Cornwallis Street and the Angus L. MacDonald Bridge (located within the Uniacke Square Redevelopment Project) prior to negotiating for purchase of the said properties, funds for this purpose to be provided from the City's share of the net rental revenue for the Uniacke Square Project. Motion passed.

Annual Grant - Halifax-Dartmouth United Appeal

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Matheson that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, a grant of \$18,500.00 be made to the Halifax-Dartmouth United Appeal for the 1965 Campaign. Motion passed.

Authority to Expend in Excess of \$1,000.00

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman Abbott that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the City Manager be authorized to expend funds in excess of \$1,000.00 for the following purposes:

(1) Concrete pipe and manhole sections - Belmont Sanitary Sewer	\$3,326.23
(2) Concrete pipe and manhole sections - Belmont Storm Sewer	3,203.36
(3) Concrete pipe and manhole sections - Emscote Sanitary Sewer	2,048.81
(4) Concrete pipe and manhole sections - Emscote Storm Sewer	3,255.22
(5) Concrete pipe and manhole sections - Brunswick Street Storm Sewer (Buckingham to Duke)	1,137.00
(6) Concrete pipe and manhole sections - Brunswick Street Storm Sewer (Duke to Sackville)	2,417.95
	<u>\$15,388.57</u>

funds for same being available in the following accounts: