

Council,  
May 1, 1968

CITY COUNCIL

SPECIAL MEETING

M 1

on May 16, 1968 and; that representatives of the Said Company be invited to attend such meeting and

(b) the Council declare its intention to take action to ensure the retention of a transit system in the City of Halifax. Motion passed.

10:20 p.m. meeting adjourned.

HEADLINES

Possible Acquisition - Spry Investments Limited 1987-89 Upper Water Street	397
Expropriation - Salvation Army Building 2035-45 Barrington Street	397
Mayors' Convention - Edmonton	397
Transit System	398

Mr. Alderman Black, Abbott, Ivany, A. W. Butler, Macpherson, LeBlond,

Ahern, Connolly, Doyle, Fitzgerald and H. W. Butler.

Also Present: City Manager, City Solicitor, Deputy

City Clerk, City Engineer and other Staff.

ALLAN O'BRIEN  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

The Deputy City Clerk advised that the Council was

called especially to consider the Sale of the Halifax Sewer

System.

8:57 p.m. Council adjourned to meet as Committee of

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that the Committee

concern itself first with the principle of the matter: whether

or not it wishes a utility operation as separate from the

present one. If the decision is that the sewer system be

operated by a separate utility, the matter of which body,

whether the Public Service Commission or another utility,

can be considered.

CITY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MINUTES

Committee of the Whole,  
May 8, 1968

The following report dated May 3, 1968 was submitted  
from the City Manager:

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.,  
May 8, 1968,  
8:05 p.m.

At the meeting of the Finance and Personnel Committee on  
February 9th, 1967, His Worship the Mayor referred to a  
letter to the members of City Council from A. M. Butler.

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

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

Present: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman and  
Aldermen Black, Abbott, Ivany, A. M. Butler, Meagher, LeBlanc,  
Ahern, Connolly, Doyle, Fitzgerald and H. W. Butler.

Also Present: City Manager, City Solicitor, Deputy  
City Clerk, City Engineer and other Staff members.

The Deputy City Clerk advised that the meeting was  
called especially to consider the Sale of the Halifax Sewer  
System.

8:07 p.m. Council adjourned to meet as Committee of  
the Whole.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that the Committee  
concern itself first with the principle of the matter; whether  
or not it wishes a utility operation as separate from the  
present one. If the decision is that the sewer system be  
operated by a separate utility, the matter of which body,  
whether the Public Service Commission or another utility,  
can be considered.



Committee of the Whole,  
May 8, 1968

The following report dated May 3, 1968 was submitted from the City Manager:

"At the meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee on February 9th, 1967, His Worship the Mayor made reference to a letter to the members of City Council from Alderman A. M. Butler respecting the Halifax Sewer system. On motion, the letter was referred to a subsequent meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council for consideration. At the same time, His Worship the Mayor requested the City Manager to "circulate to members of Council, the reports which had been prepared and are referred to by Alderman A. M. Butler in his letter; also, to present to the Committee of the Whole a report making any comment he deems to be pertinent to the matter of the sale of the sewer system, and submitting any information which is relevant and which will be of assistance to the Aldermen in reaching a decision as to the disposal of the assets of the sewer system."

Herewith are copies of an uncirculated report dated June 22nd, 1964, a draft report dated May 31st, 1965 and a report dated December 31st, 1965 which was submitted to Council. (Copies of the reports referred to are attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting).

Members of Council will find in the reports several reasons for and against disposing of the sewer system assets and relegating control to a separate agency. It is the opinion of the undersigned, however, that there would be distinct advantages to the City in selling the system. It should be noted that all of the reports, both circulated and uncirculated, were prepared two to three years ago. It should not be inferred that the submissions are now irrelevant, but it is respectfully pointed out to Council that the proposition should be considered in the light of the present and foreseeable circumstances respecting the City's budgetary situation, both Capital and Current. It does not seem sufficient to say that because the City has had efficient operation of its sewer system in the past and will probably continue to do so, it should therefore not consider an alternative. The main considerations are financial and seem to support a transfer; there is no implied or expressed criticism of the present method of operation per se.

Members of Council are well aware of the Capital problems facing the City, and by far, one of the major Capital undertakings foreseen in the City's recent brief to the Provincial Government is the need for large scale revamping and renewal of the City's sewer system, including the cost of sewage treatment plants. The estimate contained in the brief was of the order of \$45,000,000. The brief stated:

Committee of the Whole,  
May 8, 1968

"If these expenditures are not made, all of the salt water in the metropolitan area may become unfit for recreational purposes."

As of the moment, the expenditure would be, to a large extent, voluntary on the City's part. It is probably quite reasonable to assume, however, that in the relatively near future, actual or potential levels of pollution in the metropolitan area waters will cause the senior governments to insist that the City take the necessary measures to control it. Even phasing the re-development of the sewer system over a substantial period of time would obviously have a serious impact on the City's Capital Budget, irrespective of whether financial assistance were available from senior governments.

Disposal of the sewer system to a utility, whether the Public Service Commission or a body established for the particular purpose, would, of course, immediately relieve the City of responsibility for the operation, maintenance, renewal and expansion of the sewer system. Users of the system would presumably be charged commensurate with the benefits received, such charges, of course, being subject to approval by the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. In other words, the utility would be a self-supporting operation, not financed by taxation. From the point of view of the individual beneficiary, the inequities worked by the present system, wherein all sewer costs are paid by taxation irrespective of the benefits received, would be removed. It would be possible, in other words, to gear charges to water usage and to the resulting usage of the sewer system. This would appear to be a method preferable to payment for sewer service through general taxation. One of the effects of the transfer of the assets would be the elimination of a significant proportion of the City's debt and debt carrying charges. Such action would help make it possible for the City to face some of the other capital projects for which the need is pressing. It may be argued, of course, that the individual taxpayer does not benefit by the sale of the system because any reduction in the proportion of his tax dollar brought about by eliminating the sewer debt would be offset by the user charges levied by the proposed utility. There is probably some validity in such a point of view, except that with respect to sewer service the individual would in all likelihood be paying in direct proportion to the service used, rather than on a basis which might be said to be essentially arbitrary under the present system. It would also mean that properties that are at present exempt from taxation would bear their fair share of the services provided.

Presumably the proceeds of the sale of the system would consist mainly of bonds, the income from which would be used as current revenue and in effect reduce or eliminate the debt service charges for the present system.



Committee of the Whole,  
May 8, 1968

It seems most logical that if the sewer system is to be sold to a utility, the Public Service Commission would be the logical purchaser. Operation of the system would be compatible with the kind of service now rendered by the Commission, with the mechanics of measurement of use, billing and maintenance quite possibly capable of being carried out with modest staff increases, if any. Transfer of the system to the Public Service Commission could encounter legal difficulties as evidenced by the opinion given on pages 15 and 16 of the report dated December 31st, 1965. The extent of these difficulties would have to be fully investigated before a final decision could be made in favour of a transfer.

Mention has been made in the attached reports of the difficulty that may be experienced in the event that refinancing is necessary, rather than bondholder approval. This could be avoided if it were accepted that the sewer system would still belong to the City of Halifax and that therefore there is no need to recover capital costs paid in the past. It might be possible for the City to bill the sewer utility for current debt service charges, thus passing them directly on to the users."

Alderman A. M. Butler agreed with the approach suggested by His Worship the Mayor and he referred to an editorial in the local newspaper of today's date which, in his opinion, was balderdash and did not contain true facts. He referred to the Staff reports which had been distributed and also to a brief which he had prepared in 1966 relating to the matter. He indicated his agreement with the opinion expressed in the Staff Report dated June 22, 1964.

After further comments on the newspaper editorial, Alderman A. M. Butler suggested that the whole matter of the sewer system should be studied in depth by a special committee, and he nominated the following Aldermen to that committee:

Alderman Abbott	Alderman LeBlanc
Alderman Ahern	Alderman Connolly
Alderman Ivany	Alderman A. M. Butler

He further suggested that the committee prepare a report on the studies and submit a recommendation to City Council at a

later date.

Alderman Black then listed the following reasons why, in his opinion, the sewer system should be conveyed to a public utility:

1. that the rates, capital or consumption, can be set and should be restricted to the capital invested;
2. the people in the annexed areas who do not have sewers at the present time will not have to pay for something that they do not have, which would mean fewer complaints when the tax bills are sent out.
3. large industrial complexes and high rise apartment buildings can pay in accordance with their ability to pay or their usage of the service. Any large building should pay more in relation to the amount of use made of the facility to equitably distribute the cost.

He felt that these things should be worked out within a public utility concept. He said that if the system is turned over to another public body, that body will be subject to the provisions of the Public Utilities Act.

8:23 p.m. Alderman Sullivan arrives.

Alderman Meagher said that this would mean that in any renewal of the sewers, the new body would become responsible for this debt and pay it off in due course. He asked how this would be done?

Alderman Black thought that the financial details are something that would have to be worked out. He was of the opinion that if the principle is adopted that the system should be operated by a public utility, it should be under the Public Service Commission. He felt that greater coordination would be effected if one body were responsible for the necessary street excavations required in connection with



Committee of the Whole,  
May 8, 1968

the installation of water and sewer services. The Public Service Commission, he said, have the technical staff available to operate the system. He concluded by saying that he sees no insurmountable problems in turning the sewer system over to the Public Service Commission.

Alderman Abbott referred to a remark made by Alderman A. M. Butler in his comments that the City has not sufficient representation on the Public Service Commission. He pointed out that City Council appoints all the members of the Commission. He felt the suggestion of Alderman A. M. Butler to appoint a special committee was a good one, as there were many details to discuss, but he thought that any decision should be made before January 1, 1969 when annexation takes place.

Alderman Ivany expressed his agreement with the suggestion of Alderman A. M. Butler.

Alderman Black thought that His Worship the Mayor should be a member of the special committee, if one is appointed, also that a representative should be included from Ward Seven.

Alderman A. M. Butler agreed with Alderman Black and he said that since it appeared that Council wished to make an early decision on the matter, the special committee, if appointed, should have a report submitted to Council before June 30, 1968.

Alderman Sullivan suggested that a representative from Ward Six should be included on the special committee and suggested that Alderman Doyle become a member.

Committee of the Whole,  
May 8, 1968

Alderman Connolly indicated that he was willing to permit Alderman Doyle to take his place on the special committee.

It was then MOVED by Alderman A. M. Butler, seconded by Alderman Meagher that:

1. a special committee be appointed to examine all the reports of staff, question staff, study the matter in depth and make recommendations to City Council as to whether or not the sewer system should be sold to the Public Service Commission, to another public utility under the control of the City of Halifax or retained on the present basis;
2. the special committee be comprised of the following persons:

His Worship the Mayor	Alderman A. M. Butler
Alderman Abbott	Alderman LeBlanc
Alderman Ivany	Alderman Ahern
Alderman Doyle	Alderman H. W. Butler
3. the final report of the committee, with recommendations, be placed before City Council before June 30, 1968.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that perhaps a motion should be adopted which relates to the principle that the sewer system be operated by a public body other than the City directly.

It was then MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Fitzgerald that City Council declare the fact that it favours the principle of operating the sewer system on a utility basis.

Alderman LeBlanc was against such a motion since it would restrict the special committee in its studies. He felt that if such a committee is appointed it should have no particular terms of reference but should study every phase of the subject.

Alderman Ivany agreed with Alderman LeBlanc.

Alderman Abbott said that since some members of Council do not appear to accept the principle set out in his motion, he would withdraw same, if Alderman Fitzgerald concurred.



Committee of the Whole,  
May 8, 1968

Alderman Fitzgerald agreed to withdraw the motion.

Alderman Abbott then asked if the special committee will meet with staff of the Public Service Commission during their studies.

Alderman A. M. Butler was of the opinion that the special committee should be permitted to meet with anyone who could assist in the study.

A short discussion followed as to whether or not the special committee should meet privately or publicly and it was agreed that such meetings should be open to the public.

The motion was then put and passed.

At this time, His Worship the Mayor referred to the private conference which Council agreed should take place with respect to the transit operation and he asked if it is the intention of Council to formulate a position, similar to a bargaining position as related to Union negotiations, in which case such meeting should be held in private.

The Committee of the Whole agreed that this was the intention of the meeting.

8:53 p.m. Council reconvened, the same members being present.

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman Abbott that, as recommended by the Committee of the Whole Council:

1. a special committee be appointed to examine all the reports of staff, question staff, study the matter in depth and make recommendations to City Council as to whether or not the sewer system should be sold to the Public Service Commission, to another public utility under the control of the City of Halifax or retained on the present basis;

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES

Council,  
May 8, 1968

2. the special committee be comprised of the following persons:

His Worship the Mayor  
Alderman Abbott  
Alderman Ivany  
Alderman A. M. Butler  
Alderman LeBlanc  
Alderman Ahern  
Alderman Doyle  
Alderman H. W. Butler

3. the final report of the committee, with recommendations, be placed before City Council before June 30, 1968.

Motion passed.

Alderman Ivany asked if the brief referred to by Alderman A. M. Butler, which he presented in 1966, could be distributed to all members of Council.

It was agreed that the Deputy City Clerk would attend to this request.

His Worship the Mayor said that he has a letter from the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company which is to be distributed, and when members of Council have had time to digest the contents of the letter, a private conference will be called.

8:55 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

ALLAN O'BRIEN  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

W. J. CLANCEY  
DEPUTY CITY CLERK



SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
M I N U T E S

*Record*

Committee of the Whole  
May 14, 1968

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N.S.  
May 14, 1968  
8:05 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 Deputy City Clerk, joined in reciting the Lord's Prayer.

Present were: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen Abbott, Ivany, Matheson, Meagher, Ahern Connolly, Sullivan and H.W. Butler.

Also present; City Manager, City Solicitor, Director of Finance, Deputy City Clerk, Director of Recreation, Development Officer, Committee Clerks and other Staff members.

The meeting was called to consider the County Master Plan.

8:07 P.M. Council adjourned to meet as a Committee of the Whole.

At this time His Worship the Mayor welcomed the following persons to the meeting:

Councillors R.D. Bell, R.J. Allen, D.J. Butler, J. Hussey and R.A. Street from the County of Halifax; Messrs. M. Wright, R. Mussett, A. Halse and P. Osborne of the City Housing Committee; and Mr. Rudd G. Hattie, Municipal Clerk & Treasurer, Mr. R. Gough, Director of Planning for the County of Halifax.

Committee of the Whole  
May 14, 1968

His Worship the Mayor opened the meeting by stating that there were present members of the City's Housing Committee, who were interested in knowing the general plans of the areas which will be annexed by the City on January 1, 1969 so that they will be in a better position to carry out the necessary work in connection with the annexation. He stated there were also present at the meeting Councillors from the areas involved, and as special working guests Mr. Hattie and Mr. Gough of the County Staff who were going to present the Master Plan to the meeting. He also stated that the purpose of the meeting was not to make decisions but to provide members of the City Council and the Housing Committee with background information on which to base future decisions. He pointed out that there would be many opportunities in the future for picking up information, and it is intended that members of the City Council or The Annexation Committee would meet with representatives from the areas to be annexed to hear their views and to learn their needs - following which decisions will have to be made as to what should be done about them. He said the meeting this evening would deal with the County's Master Plan in so far as it affects the part of the suburban area to the west, either by coming into the City through annexation, or being adjacent to that area.

Mr. Gough, Director of Planning for the County, then proceeded to explain to those present through use of



maps, what plans had been developed for the areas. He stated that in 1963 a Toronto firm had been engaged to prepare some sort of Master Plan which involved urbanizing the areas around Halifax and Dartmouth, which action became necessary due to the population explosion of approximately 4,000 people per year, and it was felt that some form of orderly development should be attempted. The first thing the planners did was to break the area down into a rural area and an urbanizing area. (The plan Mr. Gough displayed showed basically the urbanizing area, and it depicted all land use presently in existence.) At the same time the planners had looked into drainage as related to costs for installing a sewer system, and studied existing road and bridge locations, as well as taking into account roads and bridges already envisioned in the near future. They had then drawn up a future land-use pattern, and Mr. Gough explained how the different colours on the map represented various land usages. The symbols were as follows:

Green: Existing water-shed land and potential watershed area.

Blue: Land to be retained for major industrial usage. Much of this area centered around the harbours of Halifax and Dartmouth, since the planners felt that the basic reason for the existence of these two cities was their harbours, and it therefore followed that the harbour should be the focal point from which all industrial growth should stem. These industrial sites are also close to existing expressways, or were serviced by arterial roads which would lead directly to an expressway.

**Yellow:** Land designated for residential use; the planners made no stipulation in this regard as to what type of housing was envisaged - but simply termed it "residential".

**Red:** Community centers. The planners felt that each area should have a focal point or community center - such area to be connected with an expressway by arterial roads. High Schools, major food stores, cultural institutions, etc. would be located in this area

**Black:** The black lines depicted the arterial roads which connected the community centers with the expressways.

High-rise dwellings would be built just outside the areas designated for community center projects, tapering off finally to an area of single-dwelling units. Here again, the planners made no firm resolution that shopping facilities, etc. could not be placed in these outer regions to service the residents of them.

Mr. Gough stated that when the planners were considering the various land uses, they did some geological studies from maps, etc. and discovered there were certain areas in and around Halifax which could not be considered suitable for economical development at this time, either by reason of being too rocky and thus involving costly excavation costs, or because of drainage problems which would necessitate expensive sewer construction. The planners felt that the areas of Sackville and Bedford were the best areas for development, since excavation costs would not be excessive.



Committee of the Whole  
May 14, 1968

Mr. Gough then invited questions from those present before proceeding with an explanation of the maps covering the individual areas to be annexed, and some of the questions raised brought out the following:

The building of the proposed arterial roads would not require the tearing down of any of the new houses recently built, since it had been required of the developers of the land that they leave sufficient frontage to allow for building of arterial roads. In response to a question from His Worship the Mayor concerning coordination between the Regional Planning Commission and the Department of Highways concerning the location of highways, Mr. Gough stated that basically the artery roads shown on the Master Plan agreed with what the Department of Highways had in mind, but that the Municipalities and the Highways Department did not always see eye to eye on this question, since the latter were primarily concerned with getting the road from A to B with the least cost. The County, however, felt more consideration should be given to locating artery roads since the housing developments were dependent to a great extent on locating at a height of land sufficient to allow for a natural flow of sewer outlet and thereby eliminate expensive pumping requirements.

His Worship the Mayor asked if there were in existence a zoning plan covering the areas shown on the map where housing developments were already in existence.

Mr. Gough replied that such a plan had been drafted to suit the type of land-use under discussion, but to date it had not been presented to the County Council or Board since it was felt that with annexation due it would not be fair to either the people in the County or the City to do so, in the event someone wanted to change the zoning at a future date. He added, however, that at the present time, all housing in the areas to be annexed was in one type or another of zoning.

His Worship the Mayor asked if there was a plan of implementation - that is phasing of certain facilities to be put in such as sewers, water, etc. and if so were the County up to date in putting such a plan into effect; Mr. Gough replied that such a program existed and it was up to date in its implementation.

Mr. Lubka asked if there existed a record of the vacant serviced lots in the annexed area. Mr. Gough stated a survey had been carried out in this regard, and it was his belief that there were about 20,000 lots in the areas to be annexed that either already had necessary sewer and water services available, or could have them available without undue difficulty or expense. This 20,000 figure was based on 4.2 lots per acre.

8:38 P.M. Alderman Fitzgerald arrived.

Alderman Matheson stated that the Housing Committee at their last meeting had discussed the possibility of



Committee of the Whole  
May 14, 1968

embarking on housing development in the annexation areas, and it was his belief that one of the purposes of the present meeting was to try to identify areas which were actually ready, or near-ready, for such development. He then asked Mr. Gough if the County had plans from which the Housing Committee could determine the land immediately available for development. Mr. Gough replied that the plans on the Council Room table would give this information.

Alderman Matheson then asked Mr. Gough if it were true that at the moment the sewer systems in the areas under discussion were already taxed to capacity. Mr. Gough replied that there were some problems in this regard, but that Canadian-British were doing a study on the matter and had offered suggestions that would remedy the situation in many locations without too much difficulty. Upon being asked by Alderman Matheson if there were any areas at present where no such problem existed, and where large-scale development could begin immediately, Mr. Gough answered in the affirmative, stating that, in fact, such development was presently going on. He stated that what problems had arisen in getting public housing off the ground in these areas, related not to the land itself, but rather to the fact that the parties concerned in the development were unable to reach an agreement on the details involved in such projects.

Committee of the Whole  
May 14, 1968

Alderman Ivany asked Mr. Gough if it would be possible for someone on his staff to take some of the Alderman on a personal inspection of the areas under consideration, and Mr. Hattie answered the question stating that it could be arranged.

Mr. Gough at this point then moved to the map covering the Fairview-Rockingham area. He pointed out the boundaries of Bedford Basin, Bi-Centennial Drive and Kearney Lake Road. The same colour code for depicting expressways, arteries, etc. was employed on this map. Mr. Gough stated that the Fairview-Rockingham area was projected to eventually provide for 40,000 people. In reply to a question as to how many persons presently lived in the area, he replied the figure to be about 15,000-16,000. Mr. Gough mentioned that the map indicated land considered suitable for school sites and suggested that consideration be given to purchase of such sites now, as after development took place the price would probably rise.

The discussion again took up the question of a sewer system, and Mr. Gough was asked if he felt eventually it would be necessary to construct a storm sewer to service the Fairview-Rockingham area. He said that as long as the natural streams and brooks were kept clear of debris, they should serve the purpose. At this point His Worship the Mayor stated it would be necessary to



insure that the land on either side of the natural water flows was purchased by the City to prevent a private developer building alongside, and then due to flooding that might occur to such houses, the City would have to cover the water over. He mentioned several examples where such a situation had arisen.

In reply to a question from Alderman Matheson Mr. Gough stated that the present sewer system was designed to handle about 20 people per acre in an R-1 Zone. His Worship the Mayor then asked Mr. Gough to indicate on the map where there was land that would support a higher density of housing, and Mr. Gough pointed to land around the Clayton Park area which was recommended for high-density housing. He also pointed to areas around the community centers which were projected for high-rise building that would accommodate a density of 30/60 persons per acre. Mr. Gough informed the gathering that the estimated densities that had been proposed for the different areas had been recorded and were available. The figures were mainly based on the number of people the existing sewer system could service, and he added that the figures were, of course, much lower than for comparable areas in the Halifax area. He said the County's basis for calculating these density figures was 60/100 persons per acre for apartment dwellings, 30/60 for row-housing, and 15/25 for single units. He Worship the Mayor stated that probably the Housing Committee

should be thinking in terms of 50/75 density, and he asked Mr. Gough if he knew how far advanced the County's sewer planning was, so that if desired the City could increase the density figure in any given area, stating that if they stayed at too low a density, it would not be possible to get a transit service in the area. Mr. Gough stated that from the beginning the planners had decided since there was an abundance of land, there was no need to have a high density development. His Worship the Mayor stated that the City should strive for a balanced figure which would allow for comfortable living, but at the same time be high enough to support a transit system and other public services for the area. that the whole planning concept was based on fairly big

A map depicting the Fairview-Clayton Park area was displayed, and Mr. Gough proceeded to indicate the layout of the community center, roads, etc. In reply to a question from His Worship the Mayor as to whether the arterial roads were open, Mr. Gough said that a dispute which had arisen between two developers in the area was holding up completion work, but he had hopes that they would settle their differences shortly and allow for completion of the routes by this summer. His Worship the Mayor asked who was going to pay for the roads, and Mr. Gough said the sub-dividers. When asked in what condition they would have to put the roads, he replied they were to be brought to grade and gravelled. Mr. Gough was again asked what serviced land was immediately development.



Committee of the Whole  
May 14, 1968

available for development, and he replied that this information could be obtained from a study of the maps at close quarters. Once more the discussion centered on the problem of a low density development which would make costs for municipal services high in relation to population; and also the question of whether or not you could get CMHC participation on such a basis as the costs would be too great. Mr. Gough said that the density figures quoted were for a certain acreage, but of that total acreage all the population might be centered in a much smaller area - so that the actual density figure would be much greater.

Mr. Gough repeated at this point his previous statement that the whole planning concept was based on a fairly high density population immediately surrounding the community centers, with a diminishing figure as you fanned out from the centers.

A map of Spryfield was then exhibited. His Worship the Mayor asked to be shown the area where there was a proposal for housing by Metropolitan Development, and why it had never got off the ground. Mr. Gough stated that it had nothing to do with the suitability of the area, but was a matter of the three parties involved (the Province, the Municipality, and the CMHC) having failed to come to an agreement.

The rest of the discussion centered on the availability of lands in the area, and their potential for development.

Committee of the Whole  
May 14, 1968

Mr. Hattie was asked if copies of all the maps exhibited could be retained in City Hall for further study, and he replied that this could be done.

In moving to close the meeting Alderman Meagher thanked Mr. Gough and Mr. Hattie for their excellent job of presentation. He said he personally was now aware of the problems involved and had a good idea of which areas were the most suitable for immediate development. Mr. Hattie said that the County wished to be as helpful as possible, and stated that already heads of County and City departments were discussing the problems involved in annexation. He said they would gladly provide any additional information which the City might require. His Worship the Mayor stated that they certainly appreciated such a spirit of active cooperation.

9:48 PM Council reconvened with the following members present: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen Abbott, Ivany, Matheson, Meagher, Ahern, Connolly, Sullivan, H.W. Butler, and Fitzgerald.

REPORT - COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Committee of the Whole reported progress in its consideration of the County Master Plan.

MOVED by Alderman Ivany, seconded by Alderman Fitzgerald, that the report of the Committee of the Whole be accepted. Motion passed.

9:50 P.M. - Meeting adjourned.

ALLAN O'BRIEN  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

W.J. CLANCEY  
DEPUTY CITY CLERK



ORDER OF BUSINESS

CITY COUNCIL

MAY 16, 1968

8:00 p.m.

1. Lord's Prayer
2. Roll Call
3. Minutes: April 25 and May 8, 1968
4. Approval of Order of Business, Additions & Deletions
5. Deferred Items:
  - (a) Appointment of Independent Auditors
  - (b) Terms of Reference - Council - Staff Meeting
  - (c) Business Disturbance Claim - #688-90 Barrington Street
  - (d) Amendments to Ordinance #55 "Tag Days", etc. - Second Reading
  - (e) Transit System
6. Motions of Reconsideration: NONE
7. Motions of Rescission: NONE
8. Public Hearings, & Hearings:
  - (a) Public Hearing - Rezoning - #5990 Spring Garden Road -  
C-1 Zone to C-2 Zone
  - (b) Public Hearing - Rezoning - #3309-3317 (Lots 7 and 8)  
Dutch Village Road - R-2 Zone to R-3 Zone
9. Petitions & Delegations
10. Report - Finance & Executive Committee:
  - (a) Applications - Tag Days & Canvass
  - (b) Supplementary Appropriation - Section 316C of the City Charter -  
Engineering Services - Mumford Road Bridge Widening
  - (c) Lease of the Property At the Corner of Lower Water Street and  
Bishop Street - To Imperial Oil Limited
  - (d) Property Acquisition - #2326 Barrington Street
  - (e) Settlement of Claim for Compensation - #1888-1894 Barrington St.
  - (f) Parking - Anderson Square
  - (g) Shubenacadie Residential School
  - (h) Expropriation - Estate of John James Brown - #2054-56 Upper Water St.
  - (i) Supplementary Appropriation - 316C of the City Charter -  
Annexation Expenditures - City Assessor's Department.
  - (j) Conveyance of Land to and Acquisition of Land from Baron de Hirsch  
Benevolent Society
  - (k) Charges to Patients - Children's Hospital Outpatient and  
Paediatric Clinic
  - (l) Supplementary Appropriation - 316C - Mayor's Travel Account
  - (m) Nova Scotia Museum of Science

11. Report - Committee on Works:

- (a) Tenders - Chain Link Fence - Fort Needham
- (b) Agreement No.10 - Street Maintenance - Department of Highways
- (c) Tenders - Canteen Concession - Horseshoe Island
- (d) Tenders - Canteen Concession - Wanderers Grounds
- (e) Fastball Diamonds - North Common

12. Report - Safety Committee:

- (a) Sale of Unclaimed Bicycles
- (b) Tenders Station Wagon - Fire Alarm Department

13. Report - Public Health & Welfare Committee: NONE

14. Report - Committee of the Whole Council, Boards & Commissions: NONE

15. Report - Town Planning Board:

- (a) Rezoning R-3 Zone to C-1 Zone - #2770-2772 Windsor Street
- (b) Application from the Scotian Railroad Society for a  
Footpath Across City of Halifax Property
- (c) Cornwallis Park
- (d) Plans - Parking Garage Complex - Grafton Street Parking Lot

16. Motions:

- (a) Motion - Alderman Black Re: Amendment to Ordinance No. 121  
Respecting the Closing and Observation of Holidays of  
Certain Classes of Shops in the City of Halifax
- (b) Motion - Alderman Sullivan Re: Water Rationing

17. Miscellaneous Business:

- (a) Report - Housing Committee
- (b) Lord's Day Permits
- (c) Appointments - Halifax Forum Commission
- (d) Composition of City Council - Ward Boundaries and Polling  
Divisions
- (e) Report - Visitors & Convention Committee Re: Tourist Sign
- (f) Report - Civic Advisory Committee on the Preservation of  
Historic Buildings
- (g) Paving of Streets - Annexation Areas
- (h) Tenders - Wading Pools

18. QUESTIONS

19. Notice of Motion

20. Added Items



CITY COUNCIL  
M I N U T E S

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.,  
May 16, 1968,  
8:03 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 Deputy City Clerk, joined in reciting the Lord's Prayer.

Present were: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen Black, Abbott, Moir, Ivany, A. M. Butler, LeBlanc, Ahern, Connolly, Doyle, Sullivan, Fitzgerald and H. W. Butler.

Also present: City Manager, Solicitor's Assistant - Miss S. Oxner, Deputy City Clerk and other Staff members.

MINUTES

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman LeBlanc that the minutes of meetings of Council held on April 25 and May 8, 1968, be approved. Motion passed.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

The Order of Business, as prepared by the Deputy City Clerk, was submitted for approval.

At the request of the Deputy City Clerk, Council agreed to add the following items to the Order of Business:

- 20 (a) Report - Mr. Murray Jones
- (b) Part Payment of Expropriation Compensation - Howard's Company Limited - 1951-53 Barrington St.
- (c) Expropriation Compensation - Brookfield Brothers 2061-63 Upper Water Street, Settlement of Claim
- (d) Accounts over \$5,000.00
- (e) Report - Annexation Committee

8:08 p.m. Alderman Matheson arrives.

Council,  
May 16, 1968

Alderman Ahern requested that an item be added entitled "Wanderers' Grounds".

Alderman Black requested an explanation from Alderman Ahern as to why he wished to add this item.

Alderman Ahern wished Council to discuss the changes in street patterns and street lines as approved at a previous meeting, with particular reference to the closing of Sackville Street.

His Worship the Mayor advised that such a matter would require a Notice of Motion and could be raised under Item 19 on the Order of Business.

Alderman Ahern requested an item be added entitled "George Dixon Memorial".

Council agreed to add the item.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Meagher that the Order of Business be amended accordingly. Motion passed.

MOVED by Alderman LeBlanc, seconded by Alderman Ahern that the Order of Business, as amended, be approved. Motion passed.

#### DEFERRED ITEMS

##### Appointment of Independent Auditors

MOVED by Alderman A. M. Butler, seconded by Alderman Abbott that the matter of Appointment of Independent Auditors be deferred until the next regular meeting of Council.

8:10 p.m. Alderman Meagher arrives.

Alderman Ivany suggested that the matter should be considered by the Finance and Executive Committee prior to



Council,  
May 16, 1968

the next Council meeting.

Alderman A. M. Butler spoke to his motion and said he wished to consider the report of the auditors in greater detail before the matter is debated. He also said he would like the Finance and Executive Committee to review the report of the Special Committee which met approximately eighteen months ago, and bring its opinion to Council on the merits of the report. He indicated that he was not adverse to the matter being referred to the Finance and Executive Committee.

Alderman Black was of the opinion that the report to which Alderman A. M. Butler referred, being eighteen months old, was not relevant to the subject at this time.

Alderman A. M. Butler, with the approval of Alderman Abbott, amended his motion to state that the matter of the Appointment of Independent Auditors be referred to the next meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee for further consideration. The motion as amended was then passed.

Terms of Reference - Council - Staff Meeting

Discussion arose on the above matter relating to the method by which representatives should be selected from each City Department.

Alderman H. W. Butler was of the opinion that the representative should be the Head of the Department or a person designated by him.

Alderman Black concurred in the views of Alderman H. W. Butler.

Council,  
May 16, 1968

Alderman LeBlanc felt that Council would not have a frank and honest dialogue if the Head of the Department was present.

After further discussion it was **MOVED** by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Moir that the matter be referred to the STIR Committee and that they be asked to meet with a few representatives of staff and make recommendations to Council on the method of selecting department representatives and the agenda for the meeting.

His Worship the Mayor felt that the City Manager should be invited to any meeting where the discussion takes place in the STIR Committee.

Alderman LeBlanc stated he had written to the City Manager requesting a meeting with him to discuss the STIR report and obtain his comments.

After further discussion the motion was put and passed.

BUSINESS DISTURBANCE CLAIM - #688-90 BARRINGTON ST.  
AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE #55 "TAG DAYS", ETC. -  
SECOND READING

Further deferred.

Transit System

His Worship the Mayor advised that this matter should be deferred since the conference agreed by City Council will be held shortly.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: REZONING - #5990 SPRING  
GARDEN ROAD - C-1 ZONE TO C-2 ZONE

A public hearing was held at this time in connection with the application to rezone land on the southern side of



Council,  
May 16, 1968

Spring Garden Road between Carleton Street and Robie Street in the City of Halifax, from C-1 Zone (Local Business Zone) to C-2 Zone (General Business Zone).

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

No person appeared against the proposal.

Mr. L. Mitchell, Q.C., appeared on behalf of the applicant and said that the reason for the request for the rezoning was to permit construction of an addition to the present building on the lot to provide for expansion of the applicant's office facilities.

A letter was submitted signed by the owners of seventeen properties on the south side of Spring Garden Road between Robie and Charleton Streets, which stated that the owners have no objection to the rezoning of 5990 Spring Garden Road and are in favour of the rezoning.

MOVED by Alderman Ahern, seconded by Alderman Ivany that the property at 5990 Spring Garden Road be rezoned from C-1 to C-2 Zone.

The motion was then put and passed with Alderman Connolly voting against.

A Formal By-law was submitted giving effect to the foregoing motion of Council.

MOVED by Alderman Ivany, seconded by Alderman Abbott that the Formal By-law, as submitted, be approved. Motion passed.

Council,  
May 16, 1968

PUBLIC HEARING RE: REZONING - #3309-3317 LOTS 7 & 8  
DUTCH VILLAGE ROAD - R-2 ZONE TO R-3 ZONE

A public hearing was held at this time in connection with the application to rezone #3309-3317 (Lot 7 and 8) Dutch Village Road from R-2 to R-3 Residential to permit the construction of a four-storey, 26 unit apartment building as shown on Drawings Nos. P200/2356 to P200-2360.

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

No person appeared against the proposal.

Mr. W. A. Smith addressed Council on behalf of the applicant and urged favourable consideration of the application.

MOVED by Alderman Ivany, seconded by Alderman Moir the the rezoning of #3309-3317 (Lot 7 and 8) Dutch Village Road from R-2 to R-3 Residential to permit the construction of a four-storey, 26 unit apartment building, be approved.  
Motion passed.

A Formal By-law was submitted giving effect to the foregoing motion of Council.

MOVED by Alderman Ivany, seconded by Alderman Moir that the Formal By-law, as submitted, be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

No petitions were submitted or delegations heard at this time.



Council,  
May 16, 1968

REPORT - FINANCE & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Council considered the report of the Finance and Executive Committee of its meeting held on May 9, 1968 with respect to the following matters:

Applications under Ordinance No. 55 (Tag Days, etc.)

Alderman Ivany advised that the Kiwanis Club of Armdale-Halifax wished to withdraw their application for a Tag Day on May 31st, since they would attempt to obtain funds by alternative methods.

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman LeBlanc that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the following applications for tag days, door-to-door canvasses, be approved:

Kiwanis Club of Halifax	-	September 6th (Tag Day)
Muscular Dystrophy Assoc.	-	November 15th to 17th (Tag Day)
Kinsman Club of Halifax	-	November 28th, 29th and 30th (Light Bulb Sale)
Lions Club of Halifax	-	December 11th, 12th and 13th (Christmas Nut Sale)

Motion passed.

Supplementary Appropriation - Section 316C of the City Charter -  
Engineering Services - Mumford Road Bridge Widening

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Ivany that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, a supplementary appropriation in the amount of \$21,295.00 be approved to cover payment of an invoice from J. Philip Vaughan and Associates Limited for engineering services in connection with the design of a new Mumford Road Bridge, funds for this purpose to be provided under the authority of Section 316C of the City Charter. Motion passed.