

The National Building Code is published by the National Research Council as an advisory document for use throughout Canada. It is advisory only and has no legal standing until and unless adopted for specific use by a provincial government or municipal administration. The Code is essentially a set of minimum regulations respecting the safety of buildings with reference to public health, fire protection and structural efficiency. It is not and is not intended to be a textbook of building design, advice upon which should be sought from professional sources. The Code relates to buildings and simple structures but it is not intended for use with specialized civil engineering structures. Its essential purpose is the promotion of public safety through the use of desirable building standards throughout Canada.

1963
Limore
592
593
593
593
594
594
594
594
595
595
595
596
597
598
599
600
600
600
600
601
601
601
602
602
602
603
603

The National Building Code and the various parts or sections as well as other supplements may be obtained by writing to:

The Secretary,
Associate Committee on the National Building Code,
National Research Council,
Ottawa, Canada

Printed in Canada

ALAN O'BRIEN
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODARD,
CITY CLERK

Record

SPECIAL COUNCIL
MINUTES

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
Halifax, N.S.
June 19, 1969
8:30 p.m.

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

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

Present were: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; and Aldermen Abbott, Connolly, Ivany, LeBlanc, McGuire, Meagher, and Sullivan.

Also present: City Manager, Acting City Solicitor, City Clerk, and other staff members.

The City Clerk advised that the meeting had been called to consider the "Halifax Waterfront Historic Buildings - Engineering Study and Report". Council also agreed to add the following items to the Order of Business:

2. Narrows Bridge Approaches - Stage I - Additional Capital Borrowing Authorization (Combined Sewers).
3. \$70,000 Performance Deposit - Provinces and Central Properties Limited.

NARROWS BRIDGE APPROACHES - STAGE I - ADDITIONAL CAPITAL BORROWING AUTHORIZATION (COMBINED SEWERS)

The following report was submitted by staff:

"At the City Council meeting of May 28, 1969, it was recommended that the above report regarding the relocation and construction of new sewers in the Narrows Bridge area be approved, and that the City of Halifax accept responsibility for the cost and construction of a sewer from the first manhole north of the new bridge structure to the shores of Bedford Basin.

"Due to the lateness in receiving the above related plans

Special Council,
June 19, 1969

"for Stage I, and the fact that the 1969 Capital Budget has since been approved (March 26, 1969), it is now necessary for staff to seek City Council's approval in order to request an additional Capital Borrowing in the amount of \$75,000.00 necessitated with the above construction."

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Meagher, that approval be given to an additional Capital Borrowing in the amount of \$75,000.00 to cover the cost and construction of a sewer from the first manhole north of the new Narrows Bridge structure to the shores of Bedford Basin and to the formal borrowing resolution submitted. Motion passed.

\$70,000 PERFORMANCE DEPOSIT - PROVINCES AND CENTRAL PROPERTIES LTD.

A report was submitted by staff requesting authority to proceed with the Appeal to set aside the Order of Judge Green, acting as Arbitrator, for the return of the \$70,000 Performance Deposit to Provinces and Central Properties Limited by the Partnership, and that the necessary funds to make the required payment into Court for costs of such an action, be approved.

It was agreed by the Council that this matter be deferred until members had had an opportunity to discuss the matter in private with the City Solicitor.

8:35 P.M. - Council adjourned to meet as Committee of the Whole.

HALIFAX WATERFRONT HISTORIC BUILDINGS - ENGINEERING STUDY AND REPORT

The following report was submitted by Staff:

"The Paul Wendt Report was submitted to the Committee of the Whole Council on Wednesday, June 11, 1969. The Committee referred the report to City Staff for comments on the engineering feasibility of the proposals.

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

"On Monday, June 16, 1969 the large scale drawings of proposals 1 to 4 were made available to staff by Mr. Wendt. On June 16, 1969 staff met with Mr. Wendt for approximately three-quarters of an hour to discuss the drawings. It was the impression of staff following this meeting that Mr. Wendt was going to make some minor adjustments in the drawings. Staff have not, as yet, seen the revised drawings.

"In reviewing the engineering study, staff have been somewhat concerned about two specific limitations imposed by the consultant within the body of his report. The specific limitations are:

1. 'We would, therefore, like to restrict our remarks on traffic minimum radii, design speeds, and grades to the eastern traffic lane only.'
2. 'Proposals 1 to 4 as shown on the attached drawings and discussed later should be considered as possible solutions rather than designs.'

"The significance of the restrictions are as follows:

1. It has been the experience of staff that many initial proposals are substantially altered between the proposal stage and the final design stage.
2. While the report indicates that remarks pertain to the eastern traffic lane only, the technical information provided in respect to grades, etc., relate only to the eastern curb line.

"The plans approved by Council for Harbour Drive in the area under discussion were prepared after very careful consideration of all the implications in the immediate area. The intention was that the roadway, when constructed, would be capable of logically and efficiently servicing the development and the development potential in the area. Undoubtedly, if any of the Wendt proposals are accepted by Council, the same considerations would have to be given in the final designs.

"Staff have examined the proposals made by the consultant within the limited area to which they are applicable. It is the opinion of staff that none of the proposals could be recommended by staff on engineering grounds. The reasons can be detailed in discussion if Council so desires.

"If Council decides to accept one or the other of the Wendt proposals, it is recommended that Council appoint a consultant to convert the approved proposal into a final design. This will ensure that due consideration is given to all of the factors involved for the complete area involved. It is the opinion of the engineering staff that this design should be completed before a Call for Proposals on the Historic Buildings is made."

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

It was agreed by the Council to restrict the meeting to engineering considerations such as grade, drainage, and traffic in front of the historic buildings.

His Worship the Mayor suggested that Council consider the four proposals contained in the Wendt report, one at a time, until one of them was found acceptable, or all were discarded.

Mr. Wendt then came forward to address the Council, and said that since the previous meeting when his report was submitted, he had met with members of staff and had discussed two items in particular, one relating to the elevation in front of the Pickford and Black building, and the other in front of the entrance to the Court House. He then outlined for the Council, the means by which he proposed to overcome any problem to these two points, and said he felt it should answer the questions raised by staff.

His Worship the Mayor questioned Mr. Wendt about the statement in the staff report that the Wendt report restricted its remarks on grades, etc. to the eastern traffic lane only.

Mr. Wendt replied that was a true statement, but in his opinion the difference between the eastern and western traffic lanes was insignificant, due to the fact both sides would be approximately on the same level, although on curves there might have to be some super-elevation. He illustrated his statements with drawings on the blackboard, stating that for the purposes of illustration he was exaggerating the curves, etc. of his lines.

Mr. Wendt was questioned about drainage under his Proposal No. 1, and replied that this would be covered by the installation of catch basins. He was then asked if the catch basins agreed with the plans of the City, and replied that the drawings he had been shown did not show catch basins, and presumed that this was because the City plans had not been completed as yet.

The City Engineer confirmed that the City's plans were not completed for the road, but stated that normally catch basins would be located every 250 feet, and that they would be at all low points. With regard to Mr. Wendt's remark that super-elevation might be necessary, Mr. Dodge stated that this was not done on City streets.

Mr. Dodge commented on some of the grade figures quoted by Mr. Wendt in connection with the Court House, in which he had said that the Court House architects had set the optimum grade at 110.75.

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. Dodge if Mr. Fowler set the optimum grade for the Court House at 110.75 and the eastern street line were moved as shown in the Wendt Proposal No. 1, could 110 be considered a reasonable grade, taking into account the street line and the distance to it from the building line. Mr. Dodge replied "no", stating that in this instance Council was only dealing with one curve line, one low point, and this could not be done.

His Worship the Mayor asked the City Engineer if he felt a slope involving 9" from the proposed eastern curve line to the building were unmanageable, and Mr. Dodge replied "yes". The City Engineer repeated his previous statement that there would be at least four low points to contend with.

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. Dodge if it would not be possible to examine this whole question of grades, etc. in the area in front of the Court House alone, without relating it to other sections of the road.

The City Engineer replied that the grades were established, and they just could not be put in one area - that they were established right along.

His Worship the Mayor asked the City Engineer if the grade provided for the Court House had been on the assumption that the buildings in the block to the west would be demolished. The City Engineer replied "no" - that the original proposal put forward by A. D. Margison, showed the road missing these buildings. His Worship the Mayor said that in the light of the grade now provided for the Court House, there would be a slope in the road unless the buildings came down across the street, in which case was this slope "livable", and how soon would these buildings have to come down to meet the grade for the Court House.

The City Engineer said that the problem was that there are five lanes of traffic going into one, and the only solution was to build a road which would destroy the block that Morse's Teas was in.

His Worship the Mayor asked if there was anything in the next block to the south that would have to come down, and Mr. Dodge replied "a small portion through Harris & Roome Ltd. His Worship the Mayor asked if the City Engineer was saying those buildings would have to come down when the Interchange opened, and Mr. Dodge replied "September 1". His Worship the Mayor then asked if there was any Council decision which

said these buildings would have to come down, and Mr. Dodge replied "no".

His Worship the Mayor asked if the grades after the Interchange opens are established, which allow the continued use of the historic buildings, and at a later date these buildings came down, would it be possible to redevelop the bit of land left and revise the roadway at the same level.

The City Engineer said that as far as trying to answer that question, he had mentioned one night in Council what staff would hope to do by 1970 as far as the Court House site was concerned - that was one-way north traffic. In any event, he said, lowering the grade down to 110.75 would still leave a major problem.

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. Dodge if he recognized the statement made by Mr. Fowler that he could tolerate a difference in grade of one foot up or down in his plans for the Court House. He asked if that offer still stood, or had it changed in the passage of time.

Mr. Dodge repeated his statement that Council had already established that grade for the Court House.

Alderman McGuire said if the line and grade had been established - what was there left to decide, and Mr. Dodge replied "that is it".

Alderman Abbott said it would appear the matter was not progressing very far this evening. He said the City had paid Margison a lot of money to prepare plans for the road, and in view of the fact that it had been a long time since someone from that firm had appeared at Council, he felt possibly it was time to hear from them, because he personally was not

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

prepared to go against Mr. Dodge's recommendations.

Mr. Dodge said he had sent a copy of the Wendt Report to A.D. Margison & Associates, in view of the fact that they had been the consultants used by the City. However, Mr. Stewart had called him several days later and stated that he did not wish to comment officially on the report, unless asked officially by the City to do so, but personally he was in complete agreement with the City staff report.

His Worship the Mayor said that Mr. Stewart had telephoned him and stated that he did not think there should be any change in the plans and his views were much the same as those in the staff report. Therefore, His Worship the Mayor said, he felt sure in saying it was obvious what Margison's answer would be to any question involving a change in the grades, etc. as laid down at present.

Mr. Collins spoke next, and asked the Council if it were prepared to accept something less than the ideal engineering situation, something workable, in order to keep the buildings, and he felt that Mr. Wendt's proposals were acceptable on these grounds.

It was agreed that the engineers involved might be handicapped by a public discussion, and it was MOVED by Alderman McGuire, seconded by Alderman Meagher, that the Committee meet in the Mayor's office to discuss the matter in private for a period of not more than one half-hour.

A discussion followed on whether or not the matter should be discussed in private, until it was MOVED by Alderman McGuire, seconded by Alderman Meagher, that the question be put. The motion was passed, four voting for the same and three against it as follows:

For - Aldermen Ivany, LeBlanc, McGuire,
and Meagher 4

Against - Aldermen Abbott, Connolly, and
Sullivan 3

The motion that the Committee meet in private was then put and lost, three voting for the same and four against it as follows:

For - Aldermen Ivany, McGuire, and
Meagher 3

Against - Aldermen Abbott, Connolly,
LeBlanc, and Sullivan 4

His Worship the Mayor then asked Mr. Wendt if he wished to make any further comments regarding his proposals, especially in view of any statements made by Mr. Dodge concerning the workability of the proposals.

Mr. Wendt expressed some confusion over Mr. Dodge's statement that the buildings would have to come down in the fall in order to accommodate the plan on the left, but on the other hand he had also mentioned that the plan on the right was what would be used for the time being - for a number of years probably. He said he noted that the Margison plans did show that their grades and alignments came down to meet the present Water and Hollis street alignments, by providing a temporary turn-around around the Morse's Teas. Mr. Wendt said he had drawn up his proposals, keeping those facts in mind, and that he had endeavoured to meet present Margison grades - not future ones.

With regard to the overall picture, Mr. Wendt said his assignment was for the historic buildings only, although he did line up both ends on the plan.

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

Mr. Wendt repeated his statement that he was satisfied his Proposal No. 1 solved the immediate problem when the Interchange opened, and he had not been contradicted in this regard by Mr. Dodge, either in his report or in discussions they had had with each other. Mr. Wendt said he had been guided by the Canadian and American standards for road design in making his proposals, provided the road was not intended as a speedway but as an urban collector street, and if there was not a collector street, there would be no access to the buildings on either side of the street.

His Worship the Mayor then asked Mr. Wendt the same question he had put to Mr. Dodge, namely, assuming that Council decided to adopt Mr. Wendt's proposal which involved a dip in the road, as shown on the plan at the right, and at a later date wanted to widen the roadway, would it be possible to continue the dip in the road and could the grades be worked out? Mr. Wendt replied "yes". He said he had not concerned himself with western traffic - that it was feasible to separate the grades with a dip in the eastern lane.

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. Wendt if he felt the dip in the road would pose any problem for 130 ft. trailer trucks.

Mr. Dodge said the figure of 130 ft. which had been quoted was incorrect, that 65 ft. was more the length of such trucks, and in any event he did not believe there would be any problem over the dip due to the size of trucks. He said it was the volume of traffic that was of concern, not the size of the individual vehicles.

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

There was some discussion on what the volume of traffic would be after the Interchange opened, and Mr. Wendt said that at the moment nobody could say for sure what this was likely to be. He said it would be traffic generated locally, that there was no way to evaluate it like in a case where the bulk of the traffic was "through traffic".

His Worship the Mayor asked Mr. Wendt how his Proposal No. 1 differed from the map on the right, and Mr. Wendt replied the road came closer to the Court House.

Alderman Abbott asked Mr. Wendt if he was willing to say that any one of his proposals was workable, and upon Mr. Wendt confirming they all were, he asked him if he were willing to guarantee it. Mr. Wendt said he was putting his professional reputation on the proposals by putting them down in the report he had submitted.

Alderman McGuire asked Mr. Wendt supposing that one of his proposals was adopted, what would he recommend for development from thereon in.

Mr. Wendt said he would draw up a proposal for phasing in the development. Right now, he said, there was the problem of meeting traffic requirements once the Interchange opened. The next step, he said, would be to wait for the results of a traffic study which would indicate the volume of traffic that could be expected. The standards would then be consulted to classify this particular roadway, and after classification it would be developed in two to three phases. In connection with classifying the road, Mr. Wendt explained that there were, for instance, more than one type of "collector" road. His proposal was on the basis of a 40 m.p.h. collector road.

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

Alderman Ivany said that no one had asked Mr. Wendt about the financial implications of his proposals.

Mr. Wendt said that his proposals would involve considerable saving.

His Worship the Mayor said it was obvious that Mr. Wendt's No. 1 Proposal which was similar to the plan on the right and involved a narrower roadway than the plan on the left, would not cost as much and there was also the matter of filling in the space if the historic buildings were demolished, which would involve an expense not necessary under the Wendt Proposals.

After further questions were put forward regarding the financial implications, His Worship the Mayor pointed out that the Committee had agreed to discuss only the engineering problems initially, and to clear them up before proceeding with the other aspects of the matter.

Alderman Connolly said that in view of the people in the City in trouble because of lack of housing, he was not prepared to support any expenditures by the City for the preservation of these buildings, as he felt such money would be better used to alleviate the critical housing shortage, and he was prepared to move that the Pickford and Black building should be demolished.

His Worship the Mayor said that since they had agreed to stick to the engineering problems at this meeting, he felt the first motion should indicate that Council either accepted the grade and lines of the Margison proposal or those of one of Mr. Wendt's proposals.

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

His Worship the Mayor MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the grade and line of the Margison Plan be confirmed from the Court House to the Cogswell Street Interchange.

Mayor's Question Alderman McGuire asked Mr. Wendt about the relationship of the four proposals in his report, and Mr. Wendt replied that there would be a phasing in of the proposals, for instance, No. 3 proposal took care of 2 lanes of traffic, while proposals 2 and 4 provided three lanes. Proposal 4 was the ultimate one, and very close to City staff's recommendation, with the exception he had moved the lanes nearer the historic buildings to the west and made a dip in the grade.

City Engineer In reply to a question from Alderman McGuire, Mr. Wendt confirmed his opinion that the design of the road section, Chainage 76 to 82, should be part of the Call for Proposals, or run in conjunction with the Call in order to save time, and also because they could not be separated.

His Worship the Mayor asked if there was need for the final design work on the roadway in front of the historic buildings before a Call for Proposals could be issued, and Mr. Wendt replied the only deadline was taking the traffic off the Interchange.

City Engineer: The following is a verbatim report of questions and answers by His Worship the Mayor and the City Engineer:

His Worship the Mayor: Mr. Dodge, is the plan on the right workable? That is, with regard to traffic, grades, and so on?

City Engineer: Yes, but I would clarify that by the same question that I said, the Armdale Rotary is workable.

His Worship the Mayor: What is the difference between Mr. Wendt's No. 1 proposal, and that plan on the right?

City Engineer: The only difference is we have sidewalk next to Morse's Teas remains the same - they have a 24 ft. roadway at the same grade we would have to have - they have a 5'4" sidewalk on that side - all I am saying - their's would be a 1.5 - what we refer to as a devil-walk on that side next to Morse's Teas - with a guard rail - a 24-foot roadway a 5.4 sidewalk, and we have a 10-foot sidewalk.

His Worship the Mayor: Is the No. 1 Proposal of Mr. Wendt less workable than that plan on the right?

City Engineer: As far as I am concerned - yes - because that plan on the right - that is with the fronts of the buildings removed.

His Worship the Mayor: In terms of grade, drainage and number of traffic lanes is it less workable?

City Engineer: Same on grade and same on drainage, Your Worship - and the same number of lanes of traffic - one being one-foot smaller - one 24-feet and one 25-feet.

His Worship the Mayor: Now would it be possible to work your right-hand plan into the wider traffic artery after the buildings to the west of Water Street come down, without changing the grade?

City Engineer: This goes right back to the same question again Your Worship, all proposals proposed by Mr. Wendt are one and the same grade - the grade doesn't change in any of them - it is one and the same grade throughout the four proposals - he has mentioned this.

His Worship the Mayor: Well is it workable - It is workable on that plan to have the grades that Mr. Wendt has -- ?

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

His Worship the Mayor: If it is workable on that one, and I have no conclusion yet in my mind on this matter - and with seven Aldermen I expect I won't even have to vote on it - but I would like to understand it fully, and I would like to make sure that all the Aldermen understand it when it comes to a vote. If it is possible to have the dip in the road for the plan on the right over there -

City Engineer: The dip is not in the road your Worship when this opens in September - it is the existing Lower Water Street - the dip doesn't occur in the road until such time as the Court House opens - or prior to the Court House opening where we would propose to put this curve across.

His Worship the Mayor: At the point when the Court House does open - if the City has been unable to afford to take over the buildings and have them demolished on the west side of Water Street - will we then have the plan on the right over there with the dip in the road?

City Engineer: Yes, we would.

His Worship the Mayor: If that is workable and later on it is necessary because of traffic volume to widen - is it not possible to continue to have a dip in the road with a wider roadway as on your left hand plan?

City Engineer: With a wider roadway - yes - I see what you mean. All I am saying is that as you go up, this hill goes up, and if you are going to carry the same slope across - can you imagine how far you would be cutting in to the rest of these properties across here. The streets go up - therefore you must go in - you are cutting into it. On that grade there, as far as here is concerned, the grade from Hollis at this point is a very flat grade, and it

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

is something that does help the proposed traffic lights which are to be installed at that intersection, so I am saying the grades have been figured out up-dale, down and all the rest of it - and I maintain that this has not been done in the Paul Wendt report, and in all fairness to Mr. Wendt, I feel he certainly has not had the time to do this type of thing - within the time available.

His Worship the Mayor: You said that the grade was rather flat between - on Duke between Water and Hollis Streets - is it flat on both of those two maps?

City Engineer: It would not be flat here --

His Worship the Mayor: You are going to take that slope out when you widen the traffic artery.

City Engineer: Right --

His Worship the Mayor: So the problem -- really what you are saying on an engineering basis, if we are going to live with that dip because we can't afford to do otherwise -

City Engineer: Not one dip Your Worship - as I have said, you are building in four of them -

His Worship the Mayor: We anticipate we will have to live with the dip when the Court House opens for some period of time until we can afford to widen the roadway and take down buildings - and you are saying at that point in time we have an additional problem because of widening of the roadway and the fact that there is now a slope on Duke Street -

City Engineer: True - plus the fact your Worship - what if someone wishes to build within this block - what do we tell them as far as grades are concerned. That in a few years time you might take it out of there and put it up here again - you have to be firm as far as the grade as given - and this is why we have the

same problem next door.

His Worship the Mayor: You are saying that Mr. Wendt's No. 4 Proposal is unworkable - you have, in effect, said that his No. 1 Proposal is workable - perhaps with some minor modifications - and we are going to have it in existence a year from now.

City Engineer: They are all the same as far as grades are concerned.

His Worship the Mayor: No. 1 proposal of Mr. Wendt is workable at the time the Court House opens, and No. 4, which is the wider one, you are saying is not workable because of some grade situation at the foot of Duke Street.

City Engineer: Your Worship - you are using words as far as I am concerned.

His Worship the Mayor: Well that is all I have - there is nothing else I can use.

City Engineer: You have still to come back to the point where you say that is what was intended and that is what should be built - and that is what we gave the lines for the Court House for, and if you don't build that - you people change it - not staff - that is the line what we propose - the line we got from Margison, and the line that was designed to those standards within this area - if you wish to move it out eight feet here - you lose eight feet of property up there - you can't change eight feet without changing radii - and if you change radii - they have changed many next door and we have moved exactly fifty feet in the other direction.

His Worship the Mayor: I have only one question left Mr. Dodge, and then maybe the Aldermen have some - and that is this - in what way will the plan be unworkable on the assumption that we

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

have accepted the dip while the road is narrow but later need to widen it because of more traffic - in what ways will it be unworkable from the City's point of view?

City Engineer: Would you repeat that again Your Worship?

His Worship the Mayor: All right - we have a situation a year from now - the Court House is open - we have the narrower road - we keep the buildings, the historic buildings and access to Morse's Teas, and we have a narrow road at present grade level and we have a dip in it because we have raised it in front of the Court House - and that is workable because that is likely what will happen --

City Engineer: Right --

His Worship the Mayor: Now at a later date because of traffic volume it is found necessary to widen this to some additional lanes, and supposing we try when widening it to keep the dip in the road so that the historic buildings could continue to exist - what then would be the unworkable aspect of it - where would we get into trouble that would make it actually unworkable -- ?

City Engineer: Your Worship - if you are building something to certain classifications - you would like it to work to certain classifications - like I said about the door upstairs - if you continue over this - if you wish to continue - you are going - and you do not wish abrupt changes in grade and that would be the case at this point - which would have to be built in the Interchange - and we are not worrying about that abrupt change in the grade at the present time - because if you have to drive down between two buildings the psychological effect is that you slow down - this is why they try to keep things back from the edge of highways - the travel lanes are only 12 foot - but the book says that the curbs should be moved back at least

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

one to two feet, so that you have a wider roadway and lose that psychological effect - As far as through here is concerned, this is the same problem within this area - you will be coming down into this dip - the main problem is a grade problem - you just don't build this type of facility into a roadway - on the grades of that basis - and you know, you have taken so much urban development - we have to look ahead. They said it was foolish when we started on this lot - that we shouldn't do it. A large part of that block is already gone and I would be - you might say it is not fair to say it - someone said one night I shouldn't give away other people's property, but I made the statement and the property is gone now, and the City owns it, and we may plan to deed it to someone else - but we have to look at the proposals of development in the future for this area, and that is the basis on which we are looking at it, as far as the line and the grade, and we are trying wherever possible to make this road a limited access, so it will carry more volume according to what is laid out there, and it is just not good design standards to do so. I don't know how else I can answer your Worship.

Alderman Meagher asked what would happen to the buildings if the motion on the floor were passed.

His Worship the Mayor said that the Federal people would withdraw their support of a restoration scheme, and it would seem in order at that point to award a contract for demolition of the buildings and put in the fill from the D.N.D. to create land.

Alderman Ivany said the motion referred to the Margison Line, and asked where it stopped.

His Worship the Mayor said the area from the Court House to the Cogswell Street Interchange was involved.

Alderman McGuire asked if the mover of the motion would advise to what extent his motion was based on the financial implications of saving the historic buildings.

Alderman Connolly said that he would like to see the buildings saved, but was convinced that the Margison report was the one the City should follow. He felt the City should be spending more time and effort on providing housing for the ordinary citizen.

With regard to the financial implications, Alderman McGuire said he had understood that the Wendt proposals did not involve any additional expenditures by the City, and in any event that cost was only indirectly related to preserving the historic buildings. He therefore felt if the financial implications were the grounds for the motion on the floor, it was not well based. He then referred to the interest displayed by private groups in the restoration of the buildings. That, he said, together with the Federal Government's support would mean that the City would have very little financial burden to bear in the restoration of the buildings.

Alderman McGuire said the other question he would ask the Mover of the motion was, if he felt the steps mentioned by His Worship the Mayor were the logical outcome of his motion. Alderman Connolly replied: "Yes, I would feel that is the logical significance."

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969.

Alderman Sullivan asked if it was in order to vote on Alderman Connolly's motion, in view of the motion approved a while back to the effect that a Call for Proposals was to be prepared, and six months allowed for answers.

His Worship the Mayor said the matter had become complicated and there might be some risk in passing the present motion, but it was his view that Council had never rescinded the motion passed in July, 1967 that laid down the line as outlined in the Margison report. The implication at that time was that 12 feet would have to be removed from the fronts of the buildings, but the Federal Department had since confirmed that it would not participate in any scheme which removed any parts of the buildings. He therefore said he ruled that the motion was in order without the need of rescinding anything else. He said the whole matter was before the Committee of the Whole eight days previous, and this date had been set for a decision.

Alderman McGuire said he did not have in his mind a clear concept of what was intended for the Harbour Drive. He said the Wendt report had referred to traffic studies under way, and he asked if the results of such studies would not have an effect on any long range planning for the Drive, and thus also affect any immediate decisions relating to the Drive.

Alderman McGuire asked at this time to hear the Chief Planner's views on the retention of the historic buildings.

Mr. Lubka touched on the various problems involved but stated that "as long as there is a chance, and provided there are people willing to help, they (the buildings) should be saved".

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

The Development Officer spoke next and pointed out that the retaining walls on the eastern line of the street presently under construction, were aiming directly at the historic buildings. He said the basic concept of Harbour Drive and its relation to the various bridges was decided by Council as a matter of principle some four to five years ago, but that there had been discussion on the width of the road in the central part of the City. He said the reports submitted by staff were put together after lengthy discussion by members of the Development Department, and with one exception, represented a consensus of opinion of staff. The one exception was a minority report put in by the Chief Planner. Mr. Grant said that he fully supported the staff report submitted this evening regarding the engineering aspects of the problem.

Mr. Grant said that one point which he felt had some bearing on any decision, was that if Council decided to retain the historic buildings and subsequently found it was necessary to widen the road, it was his understanding from an engineering point of view that there would be two alternatives, (1) either to take down a portion of the retaining walls, or (2) to work backwards, and at the time it is wished to widen a portion of the Interchange is replaced. There was also a third alternative that the City live with facilities which did not conform to highway standards.

His Worship the Mayor said therefore that the Wendt proposal was workable, until such time as it was necessary to widen the road.

Committee of the Whole,
June 19, 1969

Alderman McGuire said he failed to see the validity of the argument for the moment on the possible widening of the road, and felt a solution to this could be found at the time widening was deemed necessary.

Alderman LeBlanc asked Mr. Grant if he fully endorsed the position of Mr. Dodge in this matter, and Mr. Grant said that with one exception, the recommendations of staff represented the opinion of himself and all the senior members of his staff who were involved in the discussions.

MOVED by Alderman Ivany, seconded by Alderman McGuire, that Mr. Renouf be heard from at this time, concerning private enterprise's participation in the restoration scheme. Motion passed.

Mr. Renouf commented on the financial implications to the City, stating he felt they would be small. He referred to an amount of Federal money which would be freed for expenditure on the project, and the rental the City would receive based on its financial involvement in the scheme.

Alderman Connolly asked Mr. Renouf when he would be able to make a firm commitment, or some kind of proposal, and Mr. Renouf replied this would be done once the City had accepted a proposal from a group of interest people. He then asked Mr. Renouf how soon he could work out a proposal, and Mr. Renouf replied it would take about two months. The Alderman referred to the time limit as far as the Federal people were concerned, and Mr. Renouf said he believed once the City actually submitted a Call for Proposals, this would be sufficient indication that they were going ahead with a scheme for the Federal Department to make allowance for funds in its budget.

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

For: Aldermen Abbott, Connolly, LeBlanc,
Meagher, and Sullivan 5

Against: Aldermen Ivany and McGuire 2

Mr. Collins, Chairman of the Civic Advisory Committee spoke briefly, indicating that he felt the months ahead would indicate how damaging to the City of Halifax the approved motion would be.

His Worship the Mayor questioned him about interest in restoring what portions of the buildings could still be saved, and Mr. Collins indicated that with the withdrawal of the Federal department this would be a difficult proposition, due to the lack of qualified personnel in the work.

It was then agreed that further decisions on the fill and demolition questions would be deferred until the following Committee of the Whole meeting.

Before the meeting adjourned, Alderman Ivany said he would like an expert opinion on the whole question of what was happening to the waterfront area.

12:10 a.m. Committee of the Whole adjourned and Council reconvened, the same members being present.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Abbott that, as recommended by the Committee of the Whole, the grade and line of the Margison Plan be confirmed from the Court House to the Cogswell Street Interchange. Motion passed with Aldermen Ivany and McGuire against.

Special Council,
June 20, 1969

\$70,000 PERFORMANCE DEPOSIT - PROVINCES AND CENTRAL PROPERTIES LTD.

The City Solicitor referred to the Staff report requesting approval of the recommendation that the Decision of the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada and that the funds necessary to make the required payment into Court for costs of the action in the amount of \$500.00 be provided.

This appeal concerns the \$70,000 Performance Deposit paid by Provinces and Central Properties Limited.

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Meagher that the recommendation be approved. The City Solicitor advised that he would take no action to proceed before June 25, 1969 until the Members of Council had had an opportunity to discuss the matter in private with him.

The motion was then put and passed.

12:12 a.m. meeting adjourned.

HEADLINES

Narrows Bridge Approaches - Stage 1 - Additional Capital Borrowing Authorization (Combined Sewers)	607
\$70,000 Performance Deposit - Provinces and Central Properties Ltd.	610, 608
Halifax Waterfront Historic Buildings - Engineering Study and Report	608

ALLAN O'BRIEN
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK