

Council,
September 26, 1968

BOND RESOLUTION

A Bond Resolution was submitted authorizing the City of Halifax to create, issue and sell Serial Debentures of the City of Halifax in the aggregate principal amount of Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00).

MOVED by Alderman Black, seconded by Alderman A.M. Butler, that the Resolution be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY - BRUNSWICK STREET "WEST HOUSE" TO CORNWALLIS STREET - REHABILITATION

A report was submitted by Staff outlining the Terms of Reference for the Feasibility Study - Brunswick Street "West House" to Cornwallis Street - Rehabilitation.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Fitzgerald, that the Terms of Reference for the Feasibility Study - Brunswick Street "West House" to Cornwallis Street - Rehabilitation as set forth in staff report dated September 26, 1968 (copy attached to official copy of Minutes of this meeting) be approved. Motion passed.

SAFETY AND HEALTH HAZARD ON CONNAUGHT AVENUE

Alderman Fitzgerald said that for some time a problem has existed at the rear of some houses on Connaught Avenue, between Chisholm Ave. and Windsor St. He said the problem at first concerned a swamp in the area which caused the residents much discomfort, but that this matter was being rectified. However, he continued, the previous week he had received several calls from residents in the area complaining that there was water seeping into their basements, this in

Council,
September 26, 1968

the dryest summer experienced in many years. Alderman Fitzgerald added that the water was contaminated and could therefore be considered as causing a health hazard. He said the Sewer Department had been called and they did what they could to rectify the situation, but the flooding kept recurring. The Public Service Commission had also investigated the district for a broken water main, but had reported back they were satisfied that a broken main was not the source of the trouble. Alderman Fitzgerald said he had referred the matter to staff and the City Manager, but that staff had not been able to locate the trouble, and the matter seemed to have come to a dead end; but in the meantime, he said, water was still seeping into the basements. He said several of the persons whose homes were experiencing the trouble had come down to City Hall tonight to be assured that some positive action would be taken the next day. He said that the effect of the water on the high retaining walls on the north side of the dwellings presented a safety factor, in addition to the health hazard already mentioned.

The City Engineer confirmed that Alderman Fitzgerald had called him at his home concerning the problem of the flooding basements and in turn had discussed the matter with the Commissioner of Works.

The Commissioner of Works stated that the obvious reason for the trouble was a broken main, but with the Public Service Commission unable to find a broken main in the district, he had to admit that staff were mystified as to the cause of the trouble.

Alderman Fitzgerald said he wanted to establish at this point whose responsibility it was to locate the trouble.

Council,
September 26, 1968

After further discussion it was agreed, on a suggestion from His Worship the Mayor, that the City Manager be asked to bring together the Commissioner of Works, the City Engineer, and a representative from the Public Service Commission the following morning to try and determine the exact cause of the trouble and see that the necessary action is taken to rectify the situation.

11:45 p.m. - Meeting adjourned until 8:00 p.m.

Wednesday, October 2, 1968 to transact the remaining items on the Order of Business.

HEADLINES

Congratulations to Staff Sergeant E. Moignard	793
Minutes	794
Approval of Order of Business, Additions & Deletions.....	794
Public Hearing Re: Rezoning Land on the Southwestern Side of Kencrest Ave. between Gottingen St. and Newberry St. from R-2 to R-3 Zone	796
Request - Halifax Police Association.....	798
Auctioneers' Licenses	798
Fire Department - Annexation Requirements and Request for Additional Funds under Section 316C	798
Provinces and central Properties Limited vs The City of Halifax and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation - Performance Deposit - \$70,000.00	799
Annaxation - Street Lights	799
Remuneration - Non-Union Police & Fire Dept. Personnel ..	799
Court House Site	800
Harbour Drive - Northbound	801
Specifications - Police Cars	802
Amendments - Ordinance #55 - Re. Tag Days, etc. Second Reading	805
Ordinance #130, Respecting Electric Wiring and the use of Electrical Energy - Second Reading	805
Amendments to Ordinance #106, Respecting the Election Ordinance - Second Reading	805
Ordinance #131, Respecting the Building Code - Second Reading	805
Report - Transit System	805
Tenders for Bond Issue	827
Bond Resolution	828
Terms of Reference for Feasibility Study - Brunswick St. "West House" to Cornwallis St. - Rehabilitation	828
Safety and Health Hazard on Connaught Avenue	828

ALLAN O'BRIEN
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R.H. STODDARD
CITY CLERK

Council Sept 26th

City Council
September 26, 1968

TO: His Worship the Mayor and
Members of City Council

FROM: S. A. Ward, City Manager

DATE: September 26, 1968

SUBJECT: Terms of Reference for Feasibility Study - Brunswick Street
"West House" to Cornwallis Street - Rehabilitation

Attached are the proposed Terms of Reference for the Feasibility Study pertaining to the above properties. These have been agreed to by the Civic Advisory Committee on the Preservation of Historic Buildings.

The proposed cost of the Study is \$5,800.00 and the Province has indicated its willingness to participate to the extent of 25 per cent of this cost. If Council approve the Terms of Reference, formal representation will be made to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for participation in the cost-sharing of the Feasibility Study.

IT IS RECOMMENDED, therefore, that the Terms of Reference for the Feasibility Study - Brunswick Street "West House" to Cornwallis Street - Rehabilitation be approved.

Respectfully submitted,



S. A. Ward
City Manager

SJL/RWD/gcp
Attachments

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Objective - A Study to establish whether or not practical ways and means are available to rehabilitate part of the "streetscape" as part of a complete restoration program for this section of Brunswick Street.

The section of the street forming the subject of the Study has recently formed the basis of a voluntary survey and report by the Civic Advisory Committee on the Preservation of Historic Buildings. The Advisory Committee's Report relates to fifteen existing buildings on Brunswick Street which form part of the Uniacke Square Redevelopment Area. The buildings, with the exception of three, have been designated for demolition and the object of the Advisory Committee's survey was to determine, in relation to the buildings scheduled for demolition, the physical condition, the historical content and, in the event they are not demolished, their value upon the new urban fabric being developed in the area.

The Report indicates the buildings are of generally sound condition, and identified the buildings which it suggests should be retained as examples of generally fine "streetscape" which would add vitality to and compliment a new redevelopment project as well as preserving an area in the City of unique character. The Report recognizes the need to rehabilitate or convert the buildings for a functional use and a need to determine specific costs related to accepted standards, the intent being to rehabilitate the buildings and identify future uses allied to future ownerships.

The Report refers to the possible reuses for residential purposes, perhaps public housing, as well as possible institutional uses. The Feasibility Study is to attempt to indicate alternative uses either for residential purposes or for institutional uses and make specific recommendations.

The Feasibility Study is, therefore, to determine the costs and feasibility of rehabilitating the existing buildings on Brunswick Street and to make specific recommendations leading to decisions by the Partners, as appropriate, regarding their future.

It is to be noted that, while the primary objective of the Study is to promote rehabilitation, i.e., a standard to comply with recommended use requirements, the Study should also indicate general recommendations and broad implementation proposals for the complete restoration, i.e., refurbishment of at least the exterior of the buildings appropriate to their historic, architectural character. Indications should also be made for long-term control procedures to insure that the goals of the Advisory Committee are maintained for posterity, i.e., appropriate legal covenants allied to appropriate planning control ordinances for buildings of historic and architectural merit.

In connection with the proposal to establish an area of special historic or architectural merit, proposals for insuring complete harmony of the area should also be indicated, i.e., appropriate landscaping and street furnishings. Such proposals should also, it is suggested, refer to any conflicting adjoining uses which may not be in harmony with the proposed atmosphere of the historical and architectural precinct.

The buildings to form the specific subject of the Feasibility Study are Civic No's 2213-17, 2219, 2223, 2229, 2237, 2239, 2253, 2263-7, 2275, 2277, 2281, 2287, 2293-5-7, 2309 and 2319-23 Brunswick Street. Civic No's 2213-17, 2229, 2239, 2253, 2263-7, 2277, 2281 and 2287 Brunswick Street are presently in private ownership and, in addition to other recommendations relating to these buildings, it will be necessary to include specific recommendations regarding agreements with the owners. It is suggested that the agreements would indicate how the objectives of the Study are to be achieved in relation to these buildings. These buildings include three properties owned by the Church, i.e., St. Patrick's Church, St. Patrick's Rectory and St. Patrick's Convent, and the agreements mentioned will, it is presumed, also deal with the future proposals for these buildings. The "West House", Civic No's 2319-23 Brunswick Street, which forms part of the general study is presently under consideration to investigate the feasibility of converting the building to permanent accommodation for the Halifax Housing Authority offices. Detailed layout plans of the interior of these buildings are to be provided by the City together with proposed layout plans for the proposed office use. The appropriate costing for this work is to form part of the Study.

In view of the special circumstances relating to the "West House", this portion of the Study is to be proceeded with first with a view to appropriate recommendations being brought forward as soon as possible in order to enable appropriate works to be put in hand in the near future.

The Feasibility Study will involve additional survey and analysis of each property to determine the following:

1. Present condition of each property both structurally and architecturally. Note: The present Advisory Committee Report is to form the basis of this assessment.
2. The Market Value of each property in an "as is" condition. A qualified appraiser or appraisers will undertake this analysis (if necessary) and will include Market Values of the properties presently in private ownership.
3. A recommendation for the appropriate reuse (including specific details of future owners/tenants and details of provisional agreements, if any) of each of the buildings for residential or institutional use or both. Note: It is considered preferable to bring forward recommendations on both bases in the event that the residential uses prove on balance to be unfeasible.
4. The preparation of drawings and specifications indicating work necessary to rehabilitate each property, having regard for Municipal, Provincial and Federal laws including National Housing Act minimum property standards for existing residential buildings (standard to comply with appropriate recommended use requirements) or any other specific requirements which may be involved. The drawings and specifications should be in sufficient detail to enable the objectives of the Study to be achieved in the event that a decision to proceed is made.
5. Detailed estimated costs of rehabilitation for each property (Alternative costs for public housing or other residential use and institutional uses to be provided).

6. The Market Value of each property when restored. A qualified appraiser or appraisers (if necessary) will undertake this analysis.
7. Consultants' opinions and recommendations of the economic viability in whole or in part for the restoration and the long-term preservation for the use intended.

The architectural work is to be carried out by the firm of MacFawn and Rogers within ninety days from the date that all necessary approvals to proceed with the Study are available. It is understood that Mr. G. W. Rogers, one of the joint principals of the firm, will be the partner in charge of the assignment.

The estimated cost of the Study is:

1. Consultants' fee is to be a per diem rate of \$125.00 subject to a maximum \$5,800.00.
2. An additional provisional item for appraisers' fees (if necessary) of \$1,500.00. Note: This sum is included for budget purposes only and, in the event that appraisers are to be used, prior concurrence with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the City will be obtained.

been called to consider the recommendations of the Council Committee from their meeting held earlier in the year and various matters pertaining to the operation of a transit service. The meeting was held as follows:

1. With respect to the recommendation of the Council Committee that the City should consider the possibility of establishing a transit service in the City, the Council Committee has agreed to refer the matter to the City Council for their consideration.
2. That, in the event the City Council decides to establish a transit service in the City, the City Council should consider the possibility of establishing a transit service in the City, the Council Committee has agreed to refer the matter to the City Council for their consideration.
3. That, in the event of establishment of the City Council of a subsidiary to provide a transit service in the City of Halifax, the City Council should consider the possibility of establishing a transit service in the City, the Council Committee has agreed to refer the matter to the City Council for their consideration.

His Worship the Mayor was present and presided.

Committee recognized the need for further study and...

P R I V A T E & CONFIDENTIAL
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL
M I N U T E S

Committee of the Whole,
October 2, 1968

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
October 2, 1968
10:30 p.m.

A private meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council was held on the above date:

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

Also present: City Manager, City Solicitor, Acting City Clerk, and Committee Clerk.

His Worship the Mayor said the meeting had been called to consider the recommendations of the Transit Committee from their meeting held earlier in the day, on various matters pertaining to the operation of a transit service. The recommendations read as follows:

1. With respect to the application of Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Ltd. to the Board of Public Utilities Commissioners for permission to abandon its transit service in the City of Halifax, the City inform the Board that it opposes such abandonment at any date, prior to July 1, 1970;
2. That, in the event such permission is denied, the City inform the Board that it opposes also the imposition on users of electrical service in the City any surcharge in support of deficits of the Company's Transit Division as proposed by the Company in the application referred to;
3. That, in the event of establishment by the Company of a subsidiary to provide a transit service in the City of Halifax, deficits of which the City in future agrees to underwrite in whole or in part, the City will support the purchase by such subsidiary, at book value, of diesel coaches purchased in the interim by the parent Company.

His Worship the Mayor said that the Transit Committee recognized the need for lengthy negotiations on

on some aspects of the subsidiary proposal, and felt the Board should allow time for these negotiations, and that the Company should maintain operation of the transit system at its present level until all details of the subsidiary had been worked out. He said Mr. Harrington had asked him if the City were ready to offer a guarantee on the purchase of new equipment, and he had replied that if the City did that there would be nothing else left to negotiate.

Alderman Moir questioned the date mentioned in Item 1, of July 1, 1970.

His Worship the Mayor said the Transit Committee envisaged the subsidiary coming up with a new service comparable to what would have been formed under a Commission, and felt it would require that long to get it into operation. Also, he said, it was felt there might be some compromise in changing it to an earlier date, say, April 1, 1970, in which case it could be a point for bargaining.

Alderman Moir said he felt it might be stretching things too far if the City asked the Board for an unreasonable delay in starting the subsidiary, and at the same time were not anxious to pick up the full deficit during that interim period.

The City Solicitor said the City was taking the view that because of present annexation problems, and the problems which would be inherent in starting a new transit system, including the necessary studies and investigation, the City should be allowed until July 1, 1970 to work these things out. He said that although the Company made much of

Committee of the Whole,
October 2, 1968

the fact that they had a \$300,000 deficit on the transit system, they neglected to mention their 3½-Million profit on their electric utility. He said it was a case of one company which operated two utilities, but the Company had presented their case to the Board as though the transit division were an entirely different entity. He stated the City's main position was (i) it was against abandonment of the service by the Company, (ii) there must be a transit service functioning in the City, and (iii) the City was not in a position to assume responsibility for the service at this time.

Alderman Matheson said he wanted to make sure that Committee of the Whole members understood the recommendations of the Transit Committee, and he was not sure that the draft report properly reflected them. He stated that he also shared Alderman Moir's doubts about the use of the date July 1, 1970 in Item 1, in view of the fact that the Transit Committee had already set April 1, 1970 as an appropriate date for the City to take over.

After further discussion on what date should be used, it was agreed that the City Solicitor in his submission to the Board and subsequent negotiations would have a six-month leeway in finally determining the date prior to which the City opposed abandonment of the transit service by the Company.

There was a short discussion on the City's position regarding the imposition on users of electrical service of a surcharge to cover the transit deficit, and it was noted amongst other things that this would tend to

discourage industrial development.

Alderman Matheson said he did not like the use of the word "subsidiary", but still felt the proposal contained in the Company's letter of April 25 was in the best interests of the City, so that he felt it should read (Item 3) "subsidiary or other arrangement".

Alderman Moir felt that if the City Solicitor were going to use the 3½-Million profit argument, he would have to relate it to the capital investment and the interest on common and preferred shares, since it could be said, for instance, that on a 100,000,000 investment, 3,500,000 was not such a profit.

Alderman A.M. Butler suggested that when on the subject of the deficit the Company has incurred, the City Solicitor should mention that there has been a lightening of the Company's burden during the last two or three years because they discounted their income tax.

Alderman Matheson felt that the words "in the event such permission is denied" should be deleted from Item 2.

Alderman A.M. Butler referred to the wording of Item 3 which stated that in the event of a subsidiary "the City will support the purchase by such subsidiary, at book value, of diesel coaches purchased in the interim by the parent company", and asked if no mention was going to be made of depreciation. His Worship the Mayor replied that "book value" for income tax purposes included depreciation, so that the intent of Item 3 was that the City would only pay depreciated value of the buses.

Committee of the Whole,
October 2, 1968

At this point, the Committee of the Whole agreed with Recommendation No. 1 of the Transit Committee, with the exception that the City Solicitor was to be allowed flexibility in determining the date at which the City opposed the Company abandoning the service, but such date not to be earlier than January 1, 1970.

The Committee of the Whole agreed with Recommendation No. 2 of the Transit Committee, after the deletion of the words "in the event such permission is denied".

In connection with Item #3, the question was asked what was required in view of the October 1 deadline which the Company had set for ordering 16 new diesel coaches which were required for service on the interchange. The City Manager said that when the October 1 deadline was set, the Interchange was scheduled for completion in the spring, but that date had been set forward to August, so that the deadline for ordering new equipment was also advanced.

His Worship the Mayor said he felt there was some question as to whether it was absolutely necessary for buses to use the Interchange. Also, he said, he expected the City would have the Board's decision in time to see if it actually had to guarantee the purchase of new equipment. He said he felt the reason the Company was pushing for a guarantee was to get a commitment from the City at this time, but if the City won Item 1 of the Transit Committee's recommendations, the Company would be obligated to maintain the present service until a specified date, in which case the City would not have to guarantee the purchase of new equip-

Committee of the Whole,
October 2, 1968

ment at this time. He therefore felt the City should avoid any commitment on buses until the Board renders a decision on the Company's application.

Alderman Matheson said it was important that the City act in good faith, and that it had made a decision in public and was not doing anything to implement it.

His Worship the Mayor said he felt the Transit Committee should meet next week to discuss the question of negotiations with the Company.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Ivany, that subject to advice from the City Solicitor, the Transit Committee be authorized to approach the Company when it feels it is ready, to negotiate matters in accordance with the motion passed at Council on September 26, 1968. Motion passed.

It was agreed that for the moment Recommendations 1 and 2 were all the City Solicitor needed for the base of his submission. In connection with Recommendation 3, Alderman Matheson again said he felt the emphasis should not be on a subsidiary, but rather a subsidiary or some other arrangement. His Worship the Mayor said there would be no one to purchase the buses at any price if there were no subsidiary.

The City Manager said he was concerned at this point about the lack of expert knowledge of staff on the transit operation, and with the work load caused by annexation and other pressing matters at the moment, staff was not, he said, in a position to spend the time preparing financial statements, etc. that would be required in carrying

out negotiations with the Company. He said the City should be prepared to employ Consultants.

After further discussion on the matter it was agreed that an amount of \$5,000 be made available, under the authority of Section 316C of the City Charter, to cover the costs to the end of the year of engaging professional consultants to assist the City of Halifax in formulating its position with respect to financial and other aspects of the transit service in any negotiations that will be entered into with the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company.

The City Manager had recommended hiring the firm of Urwick, Currie Limited, but there was some objection to that because Urwick, Currie Limited had carried out surveys on behalf of the Company and it was felt there might be a division of interests on their part. It was therefore recommended that the City Manager investigate other firms of equal merit, such as Kates, Peat Marwick, & Company.

11:20 p.m. - Meeting adjourned.

ALLAN O'BRIEN
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

J. LAMB
ACTING CITY CLERK

REPORT - TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Council considered the report of the Town Planning Board from its meeting held on September 17, 1968 with respect to the following matters:

Modification of Lot Area & Front Yard Requirements - 3620 Albert St.

MOVED by Alderman J.W. Butler, seconded by Alderman Abbott that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board,

Record

CITY COUNCIL
ADJOURNED MEETING
MINUTES

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
Halifax, N.S.
October 2, 1968
8:00 p.m.

An adjourned meeting of the City Council was held on the above date.

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

Also present: City Manager, City Solicitor, Acting City Clerk, and Committee Clerk.

The Acting City Clerk advised the meeting had been called to transact the unfinished business from the September 26, 1968 Council meeting.

ADDED ITEM

It was agreed to add the item "Canada Games Tennis Centre" to the agenda as 20 (c).

REPORT - TRANSIT COMMITTEE

At the request of His Worship the Mayor, members of Council agreed to meet in private in Committee of the Whole following adjournment of Council, to discuss the Transit Committee's report on its meeting held earlier in the day.

REPORT - TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Council considered the report of the Town Planning Board from its meeting held on September 17, 1968 with respect to the following matters:

Modification of Lot Area & Front Yard Requirements - 3620 Albert St.

MOVED by Alderman H.W. Butler, seconded by Alderman Abbott that, as recommended by the Town Planning Board,

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

the application for modification of lot area and front yard requirements at 3620 Albert Street, as shown on Drawing No. P200/2491, to permit the conversion of an existing single family dwelling into a duplex by internal alterations, be approved. Motion passed.

Approval of Plans by Development Department for Public or Private Buildings

The recommendation of the Town Planning Board was that the plans for all building construction, whether of a private or public nature, be passed through the Planning Department for City Architect's examination.

Alderman Ivany said he thought it only right that a City architect examine the preliminary plans of all buildings, whether private or public, to be constructed in the City of Halifax. He mentioned the Queen Elizabeth High School extension, and said he had never been able to confirm that the plans for that building had been examined by the Planning Department. He also mentioned the Mental Hospital building, and said he felt it would be a serious mistake if the plans for this building were not scrutinized by City architects.

Alderman A.M. Butler said that he felt the Architect engaged for the Mental Hospital, or any other public building, were qualified to do the job without coming down to City Hall for approval of their work.

Alderman Ivany said there were angle controls and other such matters that should be very carefully checked, especially on school buildings, on preliminary plans, before they are progressed further.

Alderman Abbott said preliminary plans for school buildings are approved by the School Board, and he asked

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

where the responsibility would rest for any mistakes if plans were approved by a City architect.

His Worship the Mayor asked Alderman Ivany if the intent of his recommendation was to have City Planning staff examine preliminary plans for public buildings in the same manner in which they examine plans for private buildings, to see that they fit within the broad plans for the City of Halifax. Alderman Ivany confirmed that this was the intent of his recommendation.

Alderman Moir said that the recommendation should make it clear that the examination by City Planning staff of preliminary plans for public buildings, would be in the same manner as they examine plans for private buildings, and not a detailed examination of every item.

Alderman Matheson felt that City staff should examine plans for public buildings from the point of view of owners, and as holders of the public purse be certain that further economies could not be achieved. He cited the Queen Elizabeth High School extension as a case where if a private developer had suggested such a monstrosity at a busy intersection, the City most certainly would have turned him down.

Alderman Moir rose on a point of order concerning the reference to Queen Elizabeth High School, stating it was a matter already resolved.

His Worship the Mayor ruled the Alderman in order since he was using it as an example of the kind of control he thought the City should have in the construction of public buildings.

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

Alderman Matheson maintained that public buildings should be judged by the same standards as private construction. He said as it was, there seemed to be one set of rules for private construction and another for public buildings, and he said Queen Elizabeth High School was a perfect example of what Alderman Ivany was trying to avoid through his motion.

Alderman Ivany said he would like to have staff confirm whether or not plans for the Queen Elizabeth High School ever went through the proper channels, because he had never had a reply from the School Board to a letter he wrote asking this question.

After further discussion, it was agreed that the resolution go back to the Town Planning Board and the intent of the motion made more specific.

MOTIONS

Amendment to Ordinance #119, Respecting the Levying & Collection of Poll Tax

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Sullivan, that the following amendment to Ordinance No. 119, respecting the levying and collection of poll tax, be read and passed a First Time.

"AMENDMENT

ORDINANCE NO. 119

Respecting

THE LEVYING AND COLLECTION OF POLL TAX

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

"1. Ordinance No. 119, the Poll Tax Ordinance is amended by adding thereto the following Section:

"11. A person who becomes the owner of real property in the City in any tax year, and who has paid the Poll Tax to the City in respect

October 2, 1968

"of such year, shall be entitled to a rebate of such poll tax paid by him in the manner following:

"Property Registered between January 1 and March 31 incl. Rebate 75%.

"Property Registered between April 1 and June 30 incl. Rebate 50%.

"Property Registered between July 1 and September 30, incl. Rebate 25%."

Motion passed.

Amendment to the Anti-noise Ordinance #113

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Ahern, that the following amendment to Ordinance #113, respecting the Control of Noise, be read and passed a First Time:

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

"1. Ordinance Number 113, the Noise Ordinance, is amended by inserting immediately following Section 7 of the said Ordinance the following Section:

"Blowing of Train Whistles "8. Any sounding of any engine whistle, horn or bell in accordance with the provision of Section 311 subsection (1) of the Railway Act, in respect of the following highway crossings in the City of Halifax, is hereby prohibited:

Bayers Road at Howe Avenue;
Howe Avenue (opposite G.E.);
Dutch Village Road (opposite Abbott Drive);
Barrington Street (north end - Glebe St. etc.);
Lady Hammond Road (opposite old Standard Paving property);
Young Street (Kempt Road to Windsor Street);
Almon Street (west of Acadian Bus Company);
Kempt Road (Livingstone Street);
Upper Water Street (Dockyard Area)
Commission Street (P.S.C. siding)
Robie Street (north end at Africville);
Gottingen Street (north end at Africville);
Terminal Road area (opposite Hotel Nova Scotian);
Springvale Avenue (off Dutch Village Road);
Palmer Hill Road (off St. Margaret's Bay Rd.);

"2. Sections 8,9, 10 and 11 of Ordinance 113 are renumbered Sections 9, 10, 11 and 12."

Motion passed.

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Accounts Over \$5,000:

There were no accounts over \$5,000 for approval.

Report - Housing Committee:

The following items were submitted for Council's consideration:

Student Housing

Alderman Matheson stated the Housing Committee had talked with representatives of local Universities and the Technical College, and although the Housing Committee had no recommendation to make regarding action to be taken by Council, they had been made aware through the discussion that the general housing shortage was going to be increasingly aggravated by a shortage of accommodation for students attending local educational institutions. As an indication of the magnitude of the problem, he stated that Dalhousie University, for instance, had estimated that for the 1970-71 term, 1111 additional units would be required to house students.

Housing Project - Old Sambro and Rockingstone Roads

The following report was submitted:

"At a meeting of the Housing Committee held on September 25, 1968, Mr. John MacKinnon, Assistant Manager of the Nova Scotia Housing Commission, advised that the Provincial Government is the owner of land situated on the Old Sambro and Rockingstone Roads in Spryfield and that the Commission has plans and specifications prepared for a housing project to contain 65 units.

"After hearing from Mr. MacKinnon on this subject, it is recommended:

'THAT the City of Halifax request its Senior Partners to investigate the feasibility of proceeding with such a project which will contain a combination of town houses and maisonettes, and

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

and he said "THAT it be financed under the provisions of
Section 35A of the National Housing Act."

Alderman Matheson said this was a test case
in having such a project approved under Section 35A, but there
was no legal reason why it could not be done. He stated
that the Housing Committee did not have much additional
information to that contained in the above report, and that
recommendation for the City to initiate renewed action in the
project had come from the Assistant Manager of the Nova Scotia
Housing Commission.

His Worship the Mayor asked if staff had
examined the plans for the project, and Alderman Matheson
replied that the intent of the motion was that City staff
and the Partners would consider the feasibility of the
project together.

The Senior Planner said he had seen the plans,
but when the project first came up it was outside the City's
jurisdiction, so that Staff have only recently become
involved in the project.

His Worship the Mayor said that even though
he realized the housing shortage demanded fast action, he
did not think it was a good idea for the City to commit itself
to a project for which they had not even studied the plans.

Alderman Matheson said the land was owned
by the Housing Commission and if they saw fit they could proceed
without the City's participation. He said he felt the suggestion
had been put forward that in a spirit of cooperation it should
be a municipal effort.

His Worship the Mayor felt that they probably
had a more specific reason for asking the City to participate,

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

and he said that reason might rest with why the project bogged down in the first place.

Alderman Matheson said he agreed with the statement that the City should be fully satisfied of the suitability of the project before committing itself, but he asked if possibly at this time Council could agree to the recommendation in principle.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that all the parties concerned, including City Staff, should meet to discuss the project, after which staff could report back to Council.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Meagher, that City Council request the Partnership of the City, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the Nova Scotia Housing Commission, to report on the feasibility of proceeding with a housing project which will contain a combination of town houses and maisonettes on land on the Old Sambro and Rockingstone Roads in Spryfield. Motion passed.

Acquisition of land in the annexed areas available for development:

The following report was submitted:

"A meeting of the Housing Committee was held on September 25, 1968 at which time City Staff reported there are several land sites in the annexed area which could be developed for housing projects.

"It is recommended that Staff be directed to investigate areas of land in the annexed areas suitable for land acquisition with a view to comprehensive development for housing, both public and private, and all related community services and facilities on a large scale"

Alderman Matheson said that to date nothing much had been done about acquiring land for development in the

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

annexed areas, as the City was awaiting results of a study by Canadian-British Engineering of the sewer system in the areas concerned. Also, he said, a certain amount of delay had resulted from the Hellyer investigation at this time, due to a tendency to await the results of that before taking any definite action. He said that the feeling at the last Housing Committee was that the selection of suitable lands and preliminary planning should proceed immediately; if the report on the sewers finds them inadequate, they will simply have to be replaced, and if the Hellyer investigation results prove favourable, so much the better - but in the meantime, he said, something should be done to provide more housing. He said the intent of the recommendation was for staff to begin immediately a search for suitable sites for comprehensive development on a large scale, in the same way the City was approaching the Prison Lands development, only on a larger scale.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Ivany, that Staff be directed to investigate areas of land in the annexed areas suitable for land acquisition with a view to comprehensive development for housing, both public and private, and all related community services and facilities, on a large scale. Motion passed.

Notice - Nova Scotia Light and Power Company Limited -Termination of Agreement, dated October 1, 1963, between the City of Halifax and the Company Re: Transit System

His Worship the Mayor said that no action was required of Council on this item.

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

Use of the Committee of the Whole Council:

A report dated September 18, 1968 was submitted by the City Manager recommending the substitution of meetings of Committee of the Whole Council for meetings of the standing Committees, with the exception of the Safety Committee, which would require an amendment to Ordinance No. 105. The report suggested that the Committee of the Whole meet on the afternoon of the Monday preceding the regular Council meeting.

His Worship the Mayor said that the reason for the suggested change was that the next Council would be smaller in size, and would therefore have to operate in a different manner.

Alderman LeBlanc said that while he might agree with much of the thinking behind the report, he felt it would be presumptuous of this Council, roughly three months before the new Council took over, to set down the procedure under which the latter would operate. Rather, he said, this should be left for the new Council to decide themselves.

His Worship the Mayor said he thought Council had already agreed in principle to use of the Committee of the Whole in place of Standing Committees, in which case it was only a question of legal complications which might arise and the date when the Committee would meet. However, he said, it depended on the exact wording of the motion, and he asked the Acting City Clerk to procure a copy of the minutes containing the motion.

While waiting for the Acting City Clerk to return, Council proceeded with Item 17(h) on the agenda:

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

Report - Halifax-Dartmouth & County Regional Planning Commission
Re: Rockingham and Spryfield Arterial

A letter dated September 19, 1968 from the Halifax-Dartmouth and County Regional Planning Commission to the City Clerk, Halifax was submitted.

His Worship the Mayor said that the letter did not require any action of Council, and was mainly for their information.

Letter - Board of Commissioners of the Public Utilities
Re: Fixing Term of Office - Mayor and Aldermen - Legislation

A letter dated September 17, 1968 from the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to the City, reading as follows, was submitted:

"The Board acknowledges receipt of the letter dated August 30, 1968 from the Acting City Clerk, informing the Board with respect to the resolution of City Council dated August 29, 1968 wherein Council requested the Board to fix the term of office of Aldermen forming the new Council after annexation. Since receipt of the letter the members of the Board held a conference with City Solicitor, D.F. Murphy and City Manager, S.A. Ward, and although the Board agrees that it is practical and desirable that the first term of office be defined so that subsequent elections will revert to the existing pattern of October elections, it has serious doubts that existing legislation confers upon the Board jurisdiction to fix the term of office.

"Accordingly, because of the serious consequences that might follow the upsetting of a Board Order fixing the term, the Board recommends that the City of Halifax seek appropriate legislation the next Session of the House to determine the terms of Mayor and Aldermen to coincide with a 1971 October Civic Election."

His Worship the Mayor said the question arose as to whether this Council should seek legislation to have the term of the next Council fixed, or whether it should be left for the next Council to decide.

After some discussion on the matter it was generally agreed that at the time the public is voting for

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

the next Council members, it should be aware for how long a period such members are being elected.

MOVED by Alderman LeBlanc, seconded by Alderman Fitzgerald, that legislation be sought to bring the term of office of the next Council to a conclusion on October 31, 1971. Motion passed.

Use of Committee of the Whole Council - Cont'd

Motion passed at Council meeting of August 29, 1968:

"MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Black, that the following resolution be approved:

THAT City Council agree in principle to the idea that no meetings of the Standing Committees be held except when and to the extent that the law requires action to be taken by one of the Standing Committees and that during this period the duties and functions of these Committees be undertaken and performed by the Committee of the Whole Council, which shall meet regularly twice monthly in the weeks preceding the regular meetings of City Council, and that the resolution take effect as soon as the City Solicitor had worked out the mechanics of the implementation of the proposal and advised City Council accordingly.

Motion passed unanimously."

His Worship the Mayor said he felt the wording of the motion bound Council to take some action in the matter, but Alderman A.M. Butler disagreed, because of the words "agree in principle".

Alderman A.M. Butler also agreed with Alderman LeBlanc, that it would be presumptuous for this Council to determine the manner in which the new one would function, since he felt it probably would have some ideas of its own on this subject, and could resolve them at its first meeting in January.

Alderman Matheson pointed out that the motion had been passed unanimously, but several Aldermen said they could not have been present.

At the request of His Worship the Mayor, the Acting

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

City Clerk read the roll call for the August 29, 1968 Council:

"His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen Ivany, Fitzgerald, Black, LeBlanc, Meagher, Ahern, Moir, Matheson, and Sullivan"

and confirmed that all were still present at the time the motion was put.

Alderman Matheson said he felt some of the Aldermen had forgotten the intent of the motion, which was not, he said, to bind the new Council to anything it did not agree with, but was to try and come up some manner in which the smaller Council could function efficiently, since, he said, it was obvious they would not be able to man all the Standing Committees presently operating. Alderman Matheson said the present system of using Standing Committees was ridiculous in any event, where seven Aldermen deal with a matter in the Committee, and the other seven receive only a smattering of information before they are asked to vote on the motion. He said most other cities in Canada which have the City Manager/Council form, did not have Standing Committees, but used the Committee of the Whole Council. He said the new system could be tried out for three or four weeks, and if it proved impractical there was nothing to stop them from going back to the old way, but in all fairness, he said, to the incoming Council, he thought some attempt should be made to set up a system under which the smaller Council could operate efficiently. Alderman Matheson felt the present Council also had a duty to review the Boards and Commissions of the City, since it would be absolutely impossible for a 10-man Council to have as many members on the Boards and Commissions as at present. He said the present Council, by means of practical experience, were in a

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

good position to advise the incoming Council on how it could best function.

Alderman LeBlanc said he could not go along with the line of reasoning Alderman Matheson was employing, and that he intended making a motion to rescind the motion passed at August 29, 1968 Council, even though he might have gone along with it at that time. He said he had since had second thoughts on the matter, and did not feel there was anything wrong in that. He said that the present Council should consider meeting more often, in an attempt to clean up all outstanding business, so that the incoming Council could start with as clean a slate as possible.

Alderman A.M. Butler asked what resolution was actually before Council at this time, and His Worship the Mayor said the City Manager's report of September 18, 1968 regarding "Use of the Committee of the Whole Council" was before Council, as a result of the motion passed at Council on August 29, 1968.

Alderman A.M. Butler said he did not like the idea of Council resolving important matters in an evening's session, since he felt members required time to reflect and even change their minds. Alderman Matheson replied that his resolution made provision for exactly that kind of consideration and second thoughts to be given, since the Committee of the Whole would meet one week prior to Council.

MOVED by Alderman Matheson, seconded by Alderman Moir that:

1. Council pass a resolution amending Ordinance No. 105 to provide that the Safety Committee shall be constituted

Adjourned Council,
October 2, 1968

by the Mayor and all the Aldermen;

2. Council pass a resolution making all members of the Council and the Mayor members of the Town Planning Board;
3. Council pass a resolution making all members of the Council and the Mayor members of the Committee on Health;
4. The Committee of the Whole meeting should be held eight days prior to the regular Council meeting on a Wednesday evening at 8:00 p.m.

Alderman Ivany said he did not like Alderman Matheson's approach of instituting the changes on a trial and error basis, at least before some research had been done.

Alderman Matheson repeated his statement that the present Council was better qualified than anyone else to recommend changes and, furthermore, he said, if the changes did not prove satisfactory they could simply be changed.

Alderman Fitzgerald said that with the present number of Aldermen, the Committee of the Whole tended to become unmanageable, especially where you have some Aldermen who speak three and four times in an evening, but he felt that with ten Aldermen it stood a better chance of working. He said the danger in this Council initiating the Committee of the Whole system during the few months left, was that if it proved unsuccessful the incoming Council would surely be influenced by the present Council's unfortunate experiment, whereas actually it might prove successful with a Council composed of only ten Aldermen. He said he would like to see the system given a trial under the proper conditions, and in any event did not see it essential that it be tried in the dying months of this Council.