

- (c) That the apartment buildings be re-oriented and the apartment buildings at the rear of the site be substantially reduced in height.

Alderman Sullivan seconded the motion and urged that members of Council support it.

Alderman Meagher expressed the view that he would like to have included in the conditions that the apartment buildings be no higher than 20 storeys and he spoke of the concern expressed by the residents of Yale, Yukon and Harvard Streets about the possible traffic conditions in that area. He felt that these matters should be decided and if necessary negotiated in the Development Agreement.

The City Manager advised that if Council passes the motion, as made, it would be tying Staff's hands entirely and preclude any possibility of negotiation with respect to traffic patterns, etc. He was of the opinion that Staff should continue with their studies of the scheme and present some guidelines for Council to consider and he said that these could be presented to the next regular Council meeting or, if preferable, could be discussed at some length at this time.

Alderman Moir spoke against the motion and felt that Council should have the benefit of the Staff study before making any decision. He said that he favoured a density of no more than 125 persons per acre rather than the 250 proposed. It was then MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Hogan that the matter be referred to Staff, as recommended by the City Manager, and Staff report back to the Committee of the Whole Council their findings.

Alderman Hogan began to speak to the motion but Alderman Sullivan rose to a Point of Order. He contended that a motion to refer is not debatable except as to time or the place of reference.

His Worship the Mayor conferred with the City Solicitor and ruled that since this motion is to refer the matter to Staff, it can be debated.

Alderman Hogan continued by saying that this Council has often been accused of acting in haste and not weighing the advantages and disadvantages of certain actions. He was of the opinion that the City could be put into a position where considerable monies would need to be spent to improve the sewers, traffic patterns, etc. as the project was constructed and he felt that a thorough study should be made before a decision taken.

The City Manager cautioned Council by saying that a firm approval should not be given at this time, without much more discussion and study of those items which must be negotiated in any Development Agreement.

Alderman Connolly said that it was not his intention to give a carte blanche to the developer in making his motion, consequently he included some conditions. He spoke of his concern that the Council not dilly dally on this matter for fear that the developer might withdraw his proposal. He stated that he was not averse to amending his motion to include any specific conditions which the City Manager might consider necessary.

Alderman Stanbury felt that a decision must be made quickly on the matter and said that there was very little opposition to the scheme when presented at the public meetings. She contended that such a development would be a shot in the arm for the City of Halifax.

Alderman MacKeen spoke of the need to receive more information on the project and its possible effects on the surrounding areas of the City. He said that he would support the motion to refer so that a decision can be made with full knowledge of the effects of the scheme.

Considerable discussion ensued as to the best method of proceeding with the matter, whether to defeat the motion to refer and approve the project in principle to assist the developer in his approaches to financial houses or to indicate the City's interest and listing certain areas which would be subject to negotiation in any Development Agreement.

The motion to refer was put and lost, three voting for the same and seven against it as follows:

For:	Aldermen Hogan, MacKeen and Moir	3
Against:	Aldermen Bell, Connolly, Meagher, Stanbury, Stapells, Sullivan and Wentzell	7

Discussion took place on the motion of Alderman Connolly and possible amendments which could be made and it was suggested that perhaps the motion should be withdrawn and another motion made.

The City Manager suggested that perhaps Council could instruct Staff to prepare a framework of guidelines within which to negotiate a Development Agreement with the Developer, such framework to include those areas of concern which have been mentioned in the discussions this evening.

Various suggestions were made as to how Council should proceed with this matter and alternatives put forward as to the re-wording of the motion presently on the floor.

The City Manager suggested that Council adjourn

to meet in private to discuss the motion and its possible implications before putting it to a vote.

The City Solicitor also indicated that he would wish to advise Council in private before the motion is put.

9:20 p.m. Council adjourned to meet in private and discuss the motion.

10:15 p.m. Council reconvened, the same members being present.

At this time, Alderman Connolly, with the approval of his seconder, withdrew his motion.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that Council indicate its intention to issue a development permit for a multi-use development of the Quinpool Road lands along the lines outlined in the submission made by the developer subject to the following conditions:

- a) That the residential density shall not exceed 250 persons per acre, exclusive of the acreage covered by the unlandscaped commercial areas.
- b) That the floor space of the proposed office tower be reduced by at least 50,000 square feet to a maximum of 166,000 square feet.
- c) That the start on the superstructure of the proposed hotel be deferred for a period of three years from the date of the issue of a development permit.
- d) That the developer undertake, at no cost to the City, to provide such lands from the site as may be necessary, in the opinion of the Traffic Engineer, and to make such traffic improvements as may be called for by the Traffic Engineer to accommodate the external traffic generated by this facility and to protect the use of roads within 1,000 feet of the development.
- e) That adequate provision, in the opinion of Council, be made for communal facilities to serve future tenants of the residential area as decided by Council.
- f) That Staff be instructed to negotiate a development agreement along lines outlined herein.
- g) That the foregoing is subject to such further terms as are normally found in a development permit.

Alderman Moir said that there are a number of things in the motion that he objects to and he advised that he could not support it.

Alderman MacKeen spoke in favour of the motion and indicated his support.

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

For: Aldermen Bell, Connolly, MacKeen,  
Meagher, Stanbury, Stapells, Sullivan  
and Wentzell 8

Against: Aldermen Hogan and Moir 2

Rezoning - Lands in the Area Bounded by Keating Road,  
Crown Drive, St. Margaret's Bay Road and Balcome  
Drive, from C-1 Local Business Zone to R-1 and R-2  
Zones

Alderman Moir spoke on this matter and said that there are three alternatives open to Council, to rezone the lands as has been requested, to refuse the rezoning request or to amend the areas to be rezoned by eliminating a strip of land on the north side and possibly the strip on the south side. In any event, he suggested that the matter needs further discussion and it was MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Meagher that the matter be referred to the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council.

Alderman Stapells said that as representative for the area, he would concur with the motion.

The motion was then put and passed.

Rezoning - Civic Nos. 2176-2180 Robie Street from R-2  
Multiple Dwelling Zone to C-2 General Business Zone

MOVED by Alderman Hogan that the request for  
rezoning be denied.

The motion was not seconded.

MOVED by Alderman Stapells, seconded by  
Alderman Wentzell that the matter be referred to the  
next meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council to  
permit the solicitor for the applicant to make a  
presentation. Motion passed.

Zoning - Former portions of Windsor Street, Kempt Road  
and Lady Hammond Road from C-2 General Business Zone  
to C-3 Industrial Zone

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by  
Alderman Stanbury that the former portions of Windsor  
Street, Kempt Road and Lady Hammond Road be rezoned  
from C-2 General Business Zone to C-3 Industrial Zone.  
Motion passed. Alderman Moir abstained since he was  
not present when the Public Hearing was held on this  
item.

A Formal Resolution was submitted giving effect to the foregoing motion of Council.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that the Formal Resolution, as submitted, be approved. Motion passed. Alderman Moir abstained since he was not present when the Public Hearing was held on this item.

Zoning - Former portions of Acadia Street and Dartmouth Avenue to "P" Zone, Park and Institutional

MOVED by Alderman Bell, seconded by Alderman Connolly that the former portions of Acadia Street and Dartmouth Avenue be zoned to "P" Zone, Park and Institutional. Motion passed. Alderman Sullivan voted against.

A Formal Resolution was submitted giving effect to the foregoing motion of Council.

MOVED by Alderman Bell, seconded by Alderman Connolly that the Formal Resolution, as submitted, be approved. Motion passed with Alderman Sullivan voting against.

Housing Authority Budget - 1973

Alderman MacKeen spoke of a meeting of His Worship the Mayor, some members of the Housing Authority and himself held recently and he said that he hoped as a result of that meeting much greater co-operation will be achieved between City Council and the Authority. MOVED by Alderman MacKeen, seconded by Alderman Moir that the Housing Authority Budget for 1973, as submitted, be approved. Motion passed.

REPORT - FINANCE AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Council considered the report of the Finance and Executive Committee from its meeting held on January 17, 1973, with respect to the following matters:

Freshwater Brook Sewer Interceptor

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman Bell that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the City notify the National Harbours Board to the effect that the City will defray the cost of any dredging of the Halifax Harbour that may be required in the future as a result of the build up of solid effluent from the proposed Freshwater Brook Sewer Interceptor outfall. Motion passed.

Sale of Former Fawson Street Lands

This matter was forwarded to Council without recommendation with a request for a specific recommendation from the City Manager.

A report was submitted from Staff dated January 24th, 1973, containing a recommendation.

The City Manager advised that since the report was prepared the City has received a letter from the C.N.R. confirming the fact that the developer who was proposing the development on this property has withdrawn his proposal. He said that he would now recommend that Section 6) of the recommendation contained in the Staff Report be amended to allow six months for submission of offers rather than three months.

MOVED by Alderman Hogan that the City offer for sale the former Fawson Street lands on the following terms:

- 1) offers to be on the basis that the land is free and clear of encumbrances, the existing water line to be removed at the expense of the City following acceptance of an offer;\*
- 2) the lands to be developed in accordance with the laws of the City within twenty-four months of acceptance by the City of an offer;
- 3) offers will be considered on the basis of
  - a) the price tendered for the land, and
  - b) the value and general acceptability of the development proposed either on the City land or in combination with the land of others;
- 4) in the event that the offer involves the combining of City land and the land of others, the City will join with the proponent as necessary in any applications for permits, etc., required by the laws of the City;
- 5) the proponent to take possession of the land on execution of an Agreement to Convey and be responsible for normal taxes and rates from that time, actual conveyance of the land to be effected by warranty deed on substantial completion of the approved development;
- 6) bidders to be allowed six months for submission of offers.

\* estimated cost \$6,000.

There was no seconder to this motion.

After a short discussion, it was MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Meagher that the matter be referred back to the Committee of the Whole Council for further consideration.

Alderman Stapells expressed his dissatisfaction with the entire procedure and he regretted the fact that McCulloch and Company have cancelled their plans for the proposed Port Centre.

Alderman MacKeen was of the opinion that if there was any blame in this matter, it rests on the shoulders of Council who neglected to make an early and quick decision.

The motion to refer was then put and passed.

Recommendations - Tax Concessions and Grants Committee

MOVED by Alderman Hogan, seconded by Alderman Connolly that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the following be approved:

1. Granville Co-operative Workshop

That the request for partial tax exemption from the Granville Co-operative Workshop, 1869 Granville Street, be refused for the year 1972, on the grounds that the operation is Federally funded and that Federally and Provincially funded programs must take into account in their budget and operational expenses, the payment of municipal taxes.

2. Holy Heart Seminary, 6137-6155 Quinpool Road

That the request of the Holy Heart Seminary, 6137-6155 Quinpool Road, for a reduction or elimination of taxes, be refused.

3. Junior Achievement of Halifax

That the request of the Junior Achievement of Halifax for a grant in the amount of \$388.00, which is the amount of the organization's business tax for 1972, be refused.

4. Teled Video Services Association

That the application from Teled Video Services Association, 2158 Upper Water Street, for a grant in the amount of \$320.74 which represents 1972 business occupancy taxes, be refused.

5. The Halifax Committee of Oxfam-Canada

That the request of the Halifax Committee of Oxfam-Canada for a grant in lieu of taxes for 5 months of 1972 in the amount of \$246.93 for premises occupied at 1719 Barrington Street, be refused.

Motion passed.

Possible Acquisition - Civic No. 5187 Gerrish Street

MOVED by Alderman Bell, seconded by Alderman Wentzell that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive

Committee, the property of Mr. Joseph F. Mercer, known as Civic No. 5187 Gerrish Street, be purchased for \$5,300 as settlement in full for all claims, and that the money be paid to his Solicitor to be held in trust until such time as the City receives a warranty deed to the property; funds to be made available from Account No. 850-726. Motion passed with Alderman Connolly voting against.

Settlement - Sun Construction Company Limited v City of Halifax

MOVED by Alderman Hogan, seconded by Alderman Moir that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, the City not defend the Action of Sun Construction Co. Ltd., and that the amount of the Company's tender deposit plus \$100 for all legal costs incurred, be returned. Motion passed with Alderman Bell, Connolly and Sullivan voting against.

REPORT - COMMITTEE ON WORKS

Council considered the report of the Committee on Works from its meeting held on January 17, 1973, with respect to the following matters:

Removal of Existing Truck Restrictions - Various Streets

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Bell that, as recommended by the Committee on Works, City Council pass a resolution removing the truck restriction signing "Trucks Prohibited -  $\frac{1}{2}$  ton or over - Except for Local Delivery", from the following streets upon implementation of the new Truck Route scheme:

1. Point Pleasant Drive
2. Queen Street: south of Spring Garden Road
3. Waegwoltic Avenue: West of Oxford Street
4. Jubilee Road: West of Oxford Street
5. Norwood Street: West of Oxford Street
6. Rosebank Avenue: South of Quinpool Road
7. Connaught Avenue: South of Quinpool Road
8. Bloomingdale Terrace: South of Quinpool Road
9. Prince Arthur Road: South of Quinpool Road
10. Armview Avenue: South of Quinpool Road
11. William Hunt Avenue: North of Chebucto Road
12. Leppert Avenue: West of William Hunt Avenue
13. Romans Avenue: West of Federal Avenue
14. St. Andrews Avenue: South of Chisholm Avenue
15. Pennington Avenue: North of Mumford Road
16. Ralston Avenue: North of Mumford Road
17. Mayfield Avenue: North of Mumford Road
18. Hemlock Avenue: North of Mumford Road
19. Ashburn Avenue: North of Mumford Road
20. Stanford Avenue: North of Mumford Road
21. Spruce Street: East from Howe Avenue
22. Almon Street: West of Connaught Avenue
23. Beech Street: West of Quinpool Road



24. Pepperell Street: West of Oxford Street
25. Abbott Street: East of Dutch Village Road
26. Hood Street: East of Windsor Street
27. Leiblin Drive: West of Rockingstone Road
28. Mabou Avenue: West of Purcell's Cove Road
29. Collingdale Avenue: West of Purcell's Cove Road
30. Kearney Lake Road: East of the Bicentennial Highway.

Motion passed.

Amendment - City Charter Section 363 Re: Notice - Ice Control - Sidewalks

MOVED by Alderman Hogan, seconded by Alderman Connolly that, as recommended by the Committee on Works, the length of notice required with respect to snow and ice removal from sidewalks required by Section 363 of the City Charter, be reduced from 48 hours to 24 hours, and the necessary steps be taken to alter the City Charter accordingly.

Alderman Sullivan spoke against the motion and contended that such a change would cause undue hardship to the elderly citizens. He felt that no change should be made at this time.

Alderman Stanbury concurred with the remarks of Alderman Sullivan.

Alderman MacKeen also spoke against the motion and felt that the hardships that would be imposed would far outweigh the benefits achieved by this amendment to the City Charter.

The motion was put and resulted in a tie vote, five voting for the same and five against it as follows:

For:	Aldermen Bell, Connolly, Hogan, Moir and Wentzell	5
Against:	Aldermen MacKeen, Meagher, Stanbury, Stapells and Sullivan	5

His Worship the Mayor cast his vote in favour of the motion and declared the same passed.

Amendments to Garbage Regulations

Alderman Stapells referred to the amendments proposed to the Garbage Regulations which will permit garbage to be placed on the street for collection after 10:00 p.m. rather than 11:00 p.m. the previous day and he expressed his agreement. He asked that full scale advertising be given to this change so that all might be aware of it.

The City Manager said that there will be other

proposed amendments put forward to the next meeting of the Board of Health and he would prefer to publicize all the amendments at the one time after they have received the necessary approvals.

2095 Maitland Street

Alderman MacKeen asked if the City Manager has anything to report on the above mentioned property.

The City Clerk advised that further correspondence has been received with respect to this property and it will be necessary to call a meeting of the Board of Health as soon as possible to deal with the matter.

REPORT - CITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Council considered the report of the City Planning Committee from its meeting held on January 17, 1973 with respect to the following matters:

Rezoning - From R-2 Residential Zone to C-2 General Business Zone - Civic Nos. 2100-2102 Oxford Street

The above matter was forwarded to Council without recommendation and the City Solicitor was requested to look at the by-laws and the Planning Act to see if there is any way the shed can be replaced with another improved facility without the rezoning of the whole property.

The City Solicitor submitted a report which reads in part as follows:

"Under the existing law, therefore, the wooden structure at Civic Numbers 2100-2102 Oxford Street cannot be replaced by a new structure. The matter is regulated by Section 47(1) of the Planning Act, which provides:

47 (1) No structural alterations except as required by statute or by-law shall be made in a building or structure while a non-conforming use thereof is continued, but such use may be extended throughout the building."

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that a date be set for a public hearing into the rezoning from R-2 Residential to C-2 General Business of Civic Nos. 2100-2102 Oxford Street and the persons living within the designated area be notified of the date of the public hearing.

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

For: Aldermen Bell, Connolly, Meagher,  
Stanbury, Stapells and Sullivan 6

Against: Aldermen Hogan, Moir and Wentzell 3

Alderman MacKeen was not present in the Council Chamber when the vote was taken.

The City Clerk advised that the Public Hearing will be held on February 21, 1973.

Rezoning from R-3 and R-2 Residential to C-4 Professional Zone and Alteration to a Subdivision - Lot "X"  
Coburg Road and Civic No. 1531 Oxford Street

MOVED by Alderman Bell, seconded by Alderman Connolly that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, a date be set for a public hearing into the rezoning from R-3 and R-2 Residential to C-4 Professional zone of the property known as Lot "X" Coburg Road and 1531 Oxford Street and that the persons living in the designated area be notified of the date of the public hearing. Motion passed.

The City Clerk advised that the Public Hearing will be held on February 21, 1973.

Modification of the Lot Area Requirement - Lot 037  
Seaforth Street

MOVED by Alderman Stanbury, seconded by Alderman Meagher that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, the application for modification of the lot area requirement for Lot 037 Seaforth Street, to permit the applicant to convert the duplex building to be constructed on the lot to a triplex, as shown on Plan No. P200/5507 of Case No. 2805, be approved. Motion passed.

Application for Resubdivision - Lands of Rolph-Clark-  
Stone Eastern Limited, Robie Street and Kempt Road

MOVED by Alderman Stapells, seconded by Alderman Wentzell that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, the application for resubdivision approval to create Lot Y, as shown on Plan No. P200/5529 of Case No. 2809, be granted by City Council. Motion passed.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Spryfield Lions Rink - Drysdale Road

Alderman Wentzell advised that he had requested that this item be placed on the Order of Business due to the recent controversy over this section of Drysdale Road which was claimed by a Mrs. Brown who was threatening to barricade a portion of the street

Council,  
January 25, 1973

so that it could not be used as access to the Spryfield Rink. Alderman Wentzell referred to a letter he had received from Mr. John Buchanan which claimed that the City had been negligent in that it had not paved the street and suggesting that the City immediately expropriate the same.

Alderman Wentzell referred to the Staff Report which had been prepared and copies distributed which sets out the City's position in this matter.

He concluded by saying that he would ensure that Mrs. Brown and Mr. Buchanan receive a copy of the Staff Report and he hoped that the matter could now be considered closed.

Draft Agreement between The City of Halifax, Halifax Forum Commission and Centennial Management Associates Ltd.

---

A Draft Agreement between the City of Halifax, Halifax Forum Commission and Centennial Management Associates Ltd. was submitted for approval.

A Staff Report dated January 25, 1973 was submitted which recommended that a change be made in Section 10 of the Agreement and further that no action be taken on the draft agreement for at least 3 months.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Hogan that the Draft Agreement, that has been accepted unanimously by members of the Forum Commission, be accepted by City Council.

Alderman Moir felt that it is necessary to discuss this matter further in light of the City Manager's report.

Alderman Connolly briefly reviewed the background to this matter and said that the Agreement has been in preparation since October, 1971, with various draftshaving been prepared, amended and subsequently discarded. He stressed the fact that the scheme is being prepared at no cost to the City and City Council has the option of accepting or rejecting any proposal put forward. He could not see how the City could lose.

Alderman Meagher said that there has been some concern expressed by the general public that perhaps the race track will be done away with or professional hockey might transfer away from the City.

Alderman Connolly said that no one knows yet what facilities will be included and that if the plan presented by the consultants does not meet with Council's approval it can be rejected.

Council,  
January 25, 1973

Some concern was expressed by the City Manager and several members of Council that the very fact that the plan is being prepared at no cost to the City leads them to look upon it with some question.

Discussion took place on the procedure which was followed with respect to the proposed development of the Prison Lands by Convoy Projects Ltd.

The City Manager elaborated on the comments contained in the Staff Report and said that perhaps some information should be given to the Aldermen in private before a decision is made on this item.

Alderman Sullivan said that much discussion has taken place within the Forum Commission over the Agreement and he urged that it be approved by Council, as submitted.

After considerable discussion, it was MOVED by Alderman MacKeen, seconded by Alderman Stapells that the matter be referred to the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council for further discussion.

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

For:	Aldermen MacKeen, Meagher, Moir and Wentzell	4
Against:	Aldermen Bell, Connolly, Hogan, Stanbury, Stapells and Sullivan	6

Alderman Connolly, with the approval of his seconder agreed to amend his motion to read as follows:

That the Draft Agreement be accepted by City Council.

Alderman Stapells suggested that perhaps a clause be added to the motion stating that such agreement is subject to a brief meeting with the City Solicitor.

The City Manager said that there might be some merit in discussing this matter in camera, since there are some developments in the wind which he is not at liberty to talk about in open Forum at this time.

Alderman Connolly felt that if Council attempts to have Section 10 amended to read as recommended by the City Manager, it might just as well forget about the whole thing. He said that the consultants would not agree to the change.

In reply to a question, the City Solicitor advised that the change represents a different basic approach to that of the developer.

His Worship the Mayor pointed out that any plans that are prepared must be presented to Council for approval or rejection and he stated that the City Manager, in his recommendation, is just trying to include make it a little easier for Council to make a decision.

Alderman Meagher asked if an amendment could be made to the motion to approve the document with the change made in accordance with the City Manager's recommendation.

Alderman Connolly reiterated that Council might just as well forget about proceeding with the matter because he was sure that the consultants would not agree to the change.

After further discussion, it was MOVED by Alderman Hogan, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that the matter be referred to the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council for further consideration.

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

For:	Aldermen Hogan, MacKeen, Meagher, Moir, Stanbury, Stapells and Wentzell	7
Against:	Aldermen Bell, Connolly and Sullivan	3

Stipends - School Board Commission

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Bell that legislation be prepared that will permit the City to decide what the stipend for the School Board Members will be. Motion passed.

QUESTIONS

No questions were asked at this time.

NOTICES OF MOTION

No Notices of Motion were given at this time.

ADDED ITEMS

Capital Borrowing Resolutions

Formal Capital Borrowing Resolutions were submitted as follows:

1.	Aerial Platform Truck	\$	80,000.00
2.	New Fire Station North End		260,000.00
3.	New Fire Alarm System		60,000.00
4.	Traffic Light Improvements		122,000.00

5.	Sidewalk Renewals	\$ 275,000.00
6.	Paving Renewals	298,000.00
7.	Street Widening	1,263,000.00
8.	Traffic Improvements	3,330,000.00
9.	Land Acquisition	200,000.00
10.	Greenhouse, Wanderers Grounds	31,000.00
11.	Storm & Sanitary Sewers Collector (Lacewood Drive & Vimy Avenue)	10,000.00
12.	Trunk Storm & Trunk Sanitary Sewer South Armdale Area	88,000.00
13.	Fresh Water Brook Sewer Diversion	250,000.00
14.	Storm & Sanitary Sewers Spryfield - Herring Cove Road Area	250,000.00
15.	Sewers General	598,000.00
16.	Storm & Sanitary trunk Interceptor (Fairview Cove at Bedford Basin to Duffus Street)	600,000.00
17.	Trunk Sewer Interceptor (Duffus Street to Inglis Street)	10,500,000.00
18.	Trunk Sewer Interceptor (Inglis Street to Pollution Control Centre)	3,700,000.00
19.	Pollution Control Plan - Design	1,550,000.00
20.	Land Aquisition - Pollution Control Plant	2,900,000.00
21.	Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall - Design	50,000.00
22.	Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall - Con- struction	1,350,000.00
23.	Pollution Control Plan - Construction	15,200,000.00
24.	Trunk Sewer Interceptor Design Bedford Highway	150,000.00
25.	Trunk Sewer Interceptor Construction Bedford Highway	2,700,000.00
26.	North West Arm Interceptor	8,700,000.00
27.	Waterfront Land Redevelopment	1,500,000.00
28.	Recreational Facilities Upgrading	140,000.00
29.	Alterations Main Branch Library	550,000.00
30.	North End Branch Library - Air Con- ditioning	50,000.00
31.	Addition Halifax West High School	386,000.00
32.	New Fairview Junior High School	260,000.00
33.	New Cowie Hill School	285,000.00
34.	New Schools Spryfield Area	2,000,000.00
35.	School Rehabilitation Programme	651,000.00
36.	Carson Street School	410,000.00
		\$ 60,747,000.00

MOVED by Alderman MacKeen, seconded by Alderman Bell that the Formal Capital Borrowing Resolutions, as submitted, be approved. Motion passed.

A Formal Resolution was also submitted to transfer \$624,000 from the overfunding of the Lane Memorial Hospital for the following purposes:

Land Africville	\$ 16,336.55
New Police Station	<u>607,663.45</u>
	<u>\$624,000.00</u>

Council,  
January 25, 1973

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman MacKeen that the Formal Resolution, as submitted, be approved. Motion passed.

Tender Specification 72-151 - 1973 Truck Chassis Complete with Combination Salt Dump Body, One Way Plow and Automatic Transmission

A report was submitted from Staff relating to the above matter.

MOVED by Alderman Hogan, seconded by Alderman Stapells that City Council approve the purchase by the City of ~~three~~ 1973 Truck Chassis Complete with Combination Salt Dump Body, One Way Plow and Automatic Transmission from Haldart International Limited, being the only tender received, for the price of \$54,837.00. Motion passed.

Pockwock Water Supply

Alderman Sullivan referred to the above matter and to a newspaper report which indicated that a New Brunswick Member of Parliament spoke out in the House of Commons for the development of the Pockwock Water Supply. He expressed some surprise and could not understand that the local members could not do as much. He suggested that His Worship the Mayor write to the Member thanking him for his interest. He could not understand the delays which are taking place in this matter especially in light of the warnings which have been given by the Public Service Commission.

His Worship the Mayor said that he and the City Manager had raised the matter only last week with both Federal and Provincial Governments.

Alderman Sullivan asked what can be done now if approaches have been made both to the Provincial and Federal Governments to push the issue which is getting desperate.

Alderman Moir said that the feasibility reports have just been received and require some study which might take two or three months.

His Worship the Mayor advised that in the consultants reports, no matter which way the water situation was looked at, Pockwock came out as the cheapest and best possible source.

Alderman Sullivan again urged that every effort be made to push for an early start to the development of Pockwock.

11:40 p.m. Council adjourned.



HEADLINES

Minutes	44
Approval of Order of Business	44
Proposed Major Development - Quinpool Road	44
Rezoning - Lands in the Area Bounded by Keating Road, Crown Drive, St. Margaret's Bay Road and Balcome Drive, from C-1 Local Business Zone to R-1 and R-2 Zones	49
Rezoning - Civic Nos. 2176-2180 Robie Street from R-2 Multiple Dwelling Zone to C-2 General Business Zone	49
Zoning - Former portions of Windsor Street, Kempt Road and Lady Hammond Road from C-2 General Business Zone to C-3 Industrial Zone	49
Zoning - Former portions of Acadia Street and Dartmouth Avenue to "P" Zone, Park and Institutional	50
Housing Authority Budget - 1973	50
Freshwater Brook Sewer Interceptor	50
Sale of Former Fawson Street Lands	50
Recommendations - Tax Concessions and Grants Committee	52
Settlement - Sun Construction Company Limited v City of Halifax	53
Removal of Existing Truck Restrictions - Various Streets	53
Amendment - City Charter Section 363 Re: Notice Ice Control - Sidewalks	54
Amendments to Garbage Regulations	54
2095 Maitland Street	55
Rezoning - From R-2 Residential Zone to C-2 General Business Zone - Civic Nos. 2100-2102 Oxford Street	55
Rezoning from R-3 and R-2 Residential to C-4 Professional Zone and Alteration to a Sub-division - Lot "X" Coburg Road and Civic No. 1531 Oxford Street	56
Modification of the Lot Area Requirement - Lot 037 Seaforth Street	56
Application for Resubdivision - Lands of Rolph-Clark-Stone Eastern Limited, Robie Street and Kempt Road	56
Spryfield Lions Rink - Drysdale Road	56
Draft Agreement between the City of Halifax, Halifax Forum Commission and Centennial Management Associates Limited	57
Stipends - School Board Commission	59
Capital Borrowing Resolutions	59
Tender Specification 72-151 - 1973 Truck Chassis Complete with Combination Salt Dump Body, One Way Plow and Automatic Transmission	61
Pockwock Water Supply	61

WALTER R. FITZGERALD  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD  
CITY CLERK

CITY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING  
CURRENT BUDGET  
MINUTES

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.,  
January 29, 1973  
11:15 a.m.

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

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

Present: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman, Aldermen Bell, Connolly, Hogan, MacKeen, Meagher, Moir, Stapells, Sullivan and Wentzell.

Also Present: City Manager, City Clerk, Acting Director of Finance and other Staff members.

The City Clerk advised that the meeting was called especially to consider the 1973 Current Budget.

At the request of His Worship the Mayor, the City Manager presented the 1973 Current Budget Estimates and elaborated on the contents of his letter of transmittal dated January 29th, 1973 contained therein.

Some discussion took place on the increase of the Joint Estimates over which, the City Manager stated, Staff has absolutely no control.

It was ascertained that the Joint Estimates relate to the Court House Commission and the Regional Jail.

Alderman Sullivan asked by what amount the revenue would need to be increased or the expenditures reduced to limit the residential tax increase to no more than 10¢.

The City Manager pointed out that to reduce the residential tax rate by 1¢ would necessitate an increase in revenue or a reduction in expenditures of approximately \$141,000.00. To limit the increase to no more than 10¢ would require an increase in revenue or reduction in expenditures of approximately \$1,260,000.

Alderman Sullivan questioned the fact that to reduce the taxes by 1¢ would necessitate finding \$141,000. He felt sure that some years ago it was estimated that \$55,000.00 would reduce the residential tax rate by 1¢.

The City Manager felt that the Alderman was

a little mixed up with the figures on the business rate which could be reduced by 1¢ with increased revenue or reduced expenditures of \$63,000.00. He agreed to check it further and see what the amount was in years previous to his joining the City.

In reply to a question, the City Manager explained how the \$700,000 surplus was arrived at last year. 60% of it being an unanticipated grant from the Provincial Government in connection with the Abbie J. Lane Memorial Hospital.

The City Manager went on to elaborate on certain matters which could be explored this year by Council, certain directives issued and policies laid down relative to Police and Fire Departments and in the field of Education, which would no doubt have a considerable effect on next year's Budget Estimates. He suggested the possible use of non-uniformed personnel in both Fire and Police Departments. In the Fire Department in the field of communications and despatch and in the Police Department in the field of parking violations other than Parking Meters. He referred to the proposals which have been put forward by the School Board in respect to the possible consolidation of some of the schools on the peninsula and he said that any decision which might be made could have considerable effect on next year's expenditures.

Further discussion took place on the following items:

1. Transitional Grants;
2. Tax rates and property costs in Dartmouth and the County;
3. Possibility of reducing budget estimates by 2%;
4. Possible renegotiation of Agreement with Public Service Commission at the time of the sale;
5. Need for development in the City to increase tax revenues;
6. School consolidation;

12:35 p.m. Aldermen Hogan and Stapells retire.

7. Effect of City's refusal to pay Joint Estimates;
8. Pupil teacher ratios in City of Halifax;
9. Possible redivision of Joint Estimates relating to Court House Commission presently under study;

Special Council,  
January 29, 1973

12:47 p.m. Alderman Meagher retires.

10. Limits to which the City can go to preserve historic buildings at the expense of tax paying development.

After further discussion, it was agreed that the first budget meeting should be held Tuesday, January 30, 1973 at 2:30 p.m. to last until 5:00 p.m. followed by one on Friday, February 2, 1973 at 1:30 p.m. to last until 5:30 p.m.

His Worship the Mayor said that he would present a schedule for the other meetings next week at a later meeting and it was decided that the Tuesday meeting should deal with General Government Expenditures.

1:10 p.m. Council adjourned.

WALTER R. FITZGERALD  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD  
CITY CLERK

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL  
MINUTES

Council Chamber  
City Hall  
Halifax, N. S.  
January 29, 1973  
8:10 P. M.

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

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

Present: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen Stanbury, Bell, Connolly, Moir, Sullivan, Stapells, Hogan, Moir, and Wentzell.

Also Present: City Manager, City Solicitor, City Clerk, Director of Planning, and other staff members.

The City Clerk advised that the meeting was called especially to consider the:

PROPOSED VIEW PLANE REGULATIONS

The City Manager advised that staff have the proposed view plane regulations in by-law form so that Council may act upon the matter when it so desires, and said it will result in an amendment to the Zoning by-law which will require the normal process of Public Hearings. The Manager suggested hearing from the Director of Planning and said there are two other groups who wish to comment on the proposal; one being the Downtown Committee and the other being the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design.

The City Manager said there are six proposed view planes but suggested Council may not wish to impose regulations on them all. He then suggested that those being of the highest priority would be the George's Island View, followed by the Harbour Mouth view, with the third falling somewhere in the central area such as the proposed Duke View.

At the suggestion of His Worship the Mayor, it was then MOVED by Alderman Sullivan, seconded by Alderman Connolly that City Council adjourn to meet as Committee of the Whole Council.

Motion passed.

8:20 p. m. - Council adjourned to meet as Committee of the Whole Council with the same members being present.

Mr. Babb, Director of Planning, then addressed the Committee and outlined the considerations given by staff in arriving at the proposed view planes. Mr. Babb also with the aid of maps, outlined the location of each and also reviewed the staff report of December 20, 1972, which was prepared on the matter a section of which gave some Detailed Cost-Income and Tax Revenue Implications of the proposed regulations.

8:30 p. m. - Deputy Mayor MacKeen arrives at meeting.

Mr. Babb said that staff, by using two hypothetical situations, did an analysis of the tax yield which indicated there would be a difference of approximately \$4,000,000 as a result of the restricted building height as imposed by the six view planes. Mr. Babb with the aid of maps, outlined the development potential of lands affected by the view planes in terms of historical areas, lands susceptible to further development, and those which would not be susceptible to further development.

Discussion then ensued with respect to the height restriction which would result from the proposed regulations in the area of the waterfront, and it was advised by Mr. Babb that a building of 8 storeys could be built at the waters edge within the George's Island View Plane. He advised that at Grafton and Argyle Streets, the height would be reduced to 7 storeys. In reply to a question, Mr. Babb advised that on the Barrington Street level within the Duke Harbour View Plane, a building of 12 storeys could be constructed.

The City Manager suggested that 12 storeys was an acceptable height but also noted it would be restrictive for a development such as the Bank of Montreal building.

In reply to a question as to the implications of imposing such regulations on persons who have assembled land in the Downtown area with the understanding that there were no height restrictions, the City Solicitor felt that Council would be in the same position as when it adopted the zoning by-law, and said that Council would not be decreasing values but redistributing them and said it is for the good of the entire city.

Alderman Hogan spoke in favour of such regulations saying that Halifax has a view which should be protected, and questioned how soon the regulations could be put into effect, to which His Worship suggested that a View Plane By-law could possibly become effective in a period of roughly two months.

Alderman Stanbury spoke opposing such regulations and felt the taxpayers of Halifax would not be willing to give up \$4,000,000 in tax revenues to preserve the suggested views. Alderman Stanbury suggested Council has to be realistic about the matter and consider the implications on the average Haligonian.

Alderman Sullivan said he was informed that if a spire were built on top of Citadel Hill, it would not be necessary to have the proposed regulations and suggested this would solve the problem presently before Council. Alderman Sullivan said the resulting height restriction would discourage developers from building in Halifax and suggested that such regulations should not be imposed unless other areas are doing the same thing. Alderman Sullivan then requested that he be informed of what developments are presently proposed for Downtown Halifax.

His Worship then advised that with the regulations as proposed, there is still adequate space for roughly \$250,000,000 worth of development in the Downtown which is adequate for a number of years to come.

The City Manager also advised that the establishment of View Planes does not prevent the redevelopment but only limits the height to a certain number of storeys depending on the location, and said the areas which are not affected, can be developed as high as the present Zoning by-law permits.

In reply to a question Mr. Babb advised that the Downtown Report as prepared by the Downtown Committee is more restrictive than that prepared by staff.

His Worship then advised that Mr. Murray of the Downtown Committee would like to address the Committee with respect to the matter, to which the Committee agreed.

Mr. Murray then addressed the Committee and advised that they have not had a chance to do the kind of analysis which they felt should be done before anything is resolved in the matter, and therefore, did not have an official presentation to make. He said he would like to comment with respect to the vantage points being used and the economic analysis.

In referring to the economic aspect, Mr. Murray said that according to the economic analysis which the Committee has had done, there is sufficient space in the restricted areas alone to serve the needs of future building requirements in Halifax for the next 20 years. He suggested that the staff report should have considered the matter in terms of what will be required in 20 years time and then look at what is available.

Alderman Connolly raised objection to this saying that you can not always take what you want, and said if a developer can not develop economically to his standards, he will move elsewhere.

A short discussion ensued on this point after which, Mr. Murray referred to the vantage points and suggested these points should be taken from the roadway around the Citadel as opposed to the rampart as suggested by the Staff report. He said the Downtown Plan is premised on a mix of building heights and does assume there will be low rise buildings of a residential nature on the first two or three buildings from the Citadel toward the waterfront. He suggested the view point could be lowered to the roadway which would still allow for high buildings at the waterfront. Mr. Murray also referred to the Waterfront Study which mentions the filling-in of waterfront sites to permit further development, and suggested there are a number of such sites.

Mr. Murray referred to the proposed arcs and said the Committee does agree that certain of the arcs could be smaller. In referring to the Harbour View and the McNabs Island View, he suggested these could be reduced or separated. Mr. Murray also referred to the complexity of the proposed by-law and felt it could have a complex base but that would not necessarily mean the by-law itself would have to be complex. He said that once the areas have been designated, a quick reference to the by-law would indicate whether a certain area can be built on or not.

Mr. Murray was then questioned by Members of the Committee with respect to the matter.

Mr. Saunders of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design then appeared before the Committee and advised that he, and a fellow student have not finalized their report on the matter as yet, but said it should be ready in approximately two weeks.

Mr. Saunders then outlined the work which his group has done to date and advised that they have used three different viewing points from the roadway which circles the Citadel. Mr. Saunders also displayed maps and corresponding photos which showed the present viewing obstructions as seen from the three different viewing points, and which outlined viewing obstructions which ranged from high density to low density shadows. Mr. Saunders said this information will be correlated from which conclusions and recommendations will be made.

His Worship advised that the Public Hearing on the matter would not be held until the month of March, and suggested the students continue their work and members of Council could review their report at a later date.

Discussion then ensued as to whether a Public Hearing should be held on the matter or whether it should again be considered by the Committee of the Whole for further review.

It was then MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Connolly that the Proposed View Plane Regulations be referred to the February 21st. meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council for discussion, following which, another special meeting be held before a Public Hearing is called.

The City Manager noted there are differences in the presentation made by staff from that made by the Downtown Committee and the students from the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, and suggested that staff's proposal was explainable, enforceable, and comprehensible, but suggested that when two or three viewing points are used, it becomes too complex. The Manager then suggested staff not do further work on the matter until Council has decided it would like answers with respect to specific boundaries to be used for the purpose of a public hearing.

Deputy Mayor MacKeen suggested that one of the questions Council will be faced with is the appropriate level of view, and questioned whether staff could do some work in terms of comparing the different proposals from which Council could make a decision. His Worship felt that at the next meeting, Council could compare the road level versus the rampart level by using the scale prepared by staff to determine the differences in terms of the number of storeys that would be lost.

The City Manager said that staff can answer general questions along these lines but did not think the details should be worked out until Council makes a decision on the matter.

The Motion was then put and passed.



10:25 p. m. - City Council reconvened with the same members being present.

His Worship the Mayor advised of an item which has been added to the agenda concerning Volvo Canada Limited.

OFFER - VOLVO CANADA LIMITED

The City Manager advised that Council is dealing with the matter of accepting the offer made by Volvo Canada Limited and applying it in the form as outlined in the City Manager's memorandum of December 20, 1972.

It was MOVED by Alderman Hogan, seconded by Alderman Stapells that the City accept the offer made by Volvo Canada Limited as outlined in the City Manager's memorandum of December 20, 1972.

The Motion was then put and resulted in a tie vote, five voting for the same and five voting against it as follows:

For:	Aldermen Hogan, Moir, Stanbury, Stapells and Wentzell	- 5
Against:	Aldermen Bell, Connolly, MacKeen, Meagher, and Sullivan	- 5

The Chairman cast his vote against the Motion and declared the same lost.

Alderman Stapells then gave notice of Reconsideration.

10:40 P. M. - Meeting adjourned.

HEADLINES

Proposed View Plane Regulations .....	66
Offer - Volvo Canada Limited .....	70

MAYOR WALTER R. FITZGERALD  
CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD  
CITY CLERK

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES

*Record*

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.  
January 30, 1973  
7:45 p.m.

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

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

Present: His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen Bell, MacKeen, Meagher, Moir, Stanbury, Sullivan and Wentzell.

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

The meeting was called to consider the Development Plan For the Granville Street Building Moratorium Area.

Moved by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Wentzell, that Council convene as Committee of the Whole. Motion passed.

Council convened as Committee of the Whole at 7:50 p.m. with the same members present.

His Worship suggested that members of staff be heard and, if Council wishes, individuals be heard who would like to comment on the Development Plan for the Granville Street area.

Aldermen Hogan and Stapells entered the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

The City Manager stated that in June 1972 Council imposed a moratorium on further demolition and construction within a given area and instructed staff to work out a plan for preservation and development within that area which, it was understood, would involve discussion with at least the principal land owners in the area. He stated that at the conclusion of staff discussions and the preparation of this report, there was not collective agreement to any particular course of action. He then called upon Mr. Babb to outline staff's considerations in preparing the plan.

Mr. Babb, Director of Planning, pointed out the boundaries of the seven-block area under discussion as the southern boundary being George Street, the western boundary being Barrington Street, and the eastern and northern boundaries being Water Street and the Cogswell Street Interchange.

Special Council,  
January 30, 1973

Mr. Babb stated that background inventories of Granville Street were made and an examination of the relationship of the Granville Street area, its planning and development, to already existing regional, city-wide and downtown plans was carried out. He advised that staff undertook to determine what was going on with property owners in the area and an analysis was made, on a preliminary basis, of the economic feasibility, from the private sector viewpoint, of rehabilitating properties.

Mr. Babb advised that three alternate proposals relative to Granville Street were developed, the best plan was selected, and staff proceeded to detail the selected plan. Property owners were interviewed who expressed interest in redeveloping their properties plus other property owners with significant land holdings in the area. Staff then made decisions and produced the plan presented for consideration. Mr. Babb stated that the subject is very complex and one plan will not solve all the problems in the area.

Mr. Bessim Sekim Hakim, Urban Designer, reviewed with Council the main aspects of the plan and explained the drawings and sketches presented to illustrate the plan and what it proposes.

Alderman Meagher asked if a wholesale business, presently located in Block 0929, will be permitted to carry on, to which Mr. Babb replied that the plan calls for retention of existing buildings in that block.

Alderman Moir stated that alternate designs were mentioned but do not seem to be available. Mr. Babb stated that alternate possibilities were looked at and a basic theme was selected from which the plan was drawn. He stated that alternatives could have been presented within a proposal but it was felt that it was best to present a basic proposal.

Alderman Moir asked what was planned with regard to the narrow passage way between Morse's Tea and the Waterfront Historic buildings. Mr. Babb replied that staff consider this to be a ten-year plan and it is the wish within the plan that the Morse's Tea building stay and that the traffic would have to be accommodated accordingly.

The City Manager expressed concern over any plan that consciously puts a constriction in with respect to the traffic into the heart of the City. He stated that the price of preserving the Waterfront Historic buildings was the eventual elimination of the Morse's Tea building, a decision made by Council when it was decided to preserve and make available the Waterfront Historic buildings.

Alderman Connolly entered the meeting at  
9:00 p.m.

His Worship asked if there were any persons in the gallery who wished to comment.

Mr. Leonard A. Kitz, Q.C., addressed Council on behalf of Halifax Developments Limited. He submitted a written brief which he read to Council, a copy of which is attached to the official copy of these minutes. In his brief, it was asked that the move not be taken that will sterilize the potential of the substantial building his client is considering.

Alderman Hogan asked if Halifax Developments Ltd. would back off completely or would they develop elsewhere in Halifax to supply the market. Mr. Kitz replied that Halifax Developments Limited have an investment in the land now which is lying with practically no return and his clients are entitled to think that they have created a desirable industrial neighbourhood and desire to profit by that neighbourhood which they have created. They would develop elsewhere in the City as well.

In reply to questions from Deputy Mayor MacKeen, Mr. Kitz stated that his clients had had consultations with Mr. Jack Diamond. He further stated that he would be reluctant to say exactly what would be done in Block 0926 although, in his view, he was sure a four-storey building would be deemed not to be economic but he did not think a twenty or thirty storey building is proposed, it would be something consistent with what has already been erected in the area.

Mr. Edward MacFarlane, while remaining in the gallery, commented on investment yield, and asked if the City is not looking for another form of investment.

Mr. J. Donald Simpson, Vice-President and Regional General Manager, Atlantic Region, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, addressed Council and stated he had submitted a letter to the members of City Council dated January 19, 1973, in which the views of the Bank were expressed, based on their interest in part of the area under discussion. Mr. Simpson stated that the latest revision of the plan provided that the tower of any building on that site would be set back 150 feet from Duke Street which would mean that a tower would be impossible on that particular site and the Bank would be limited to four stories.

Mr. Babb advised that the 150-foot setback does not mean an absolute building setback at ground level.

Mr. McCrae, representing Historic Properties Limited, stated that his firm and the College of Art have commissioned a study by Jack Diamond of Diamond & Byers, and there were three relatively independent studies within the one study. He stated that a part of the expression of interest of his firm was to see that the west side of Granville Street, or in fact the whole of Granville Street, could be preserved and it is toward that end that they have made the representations they have made to date.

Special Council,  
January 30, 1973

Mr. McCrae advised that his firm felt that the economic feasibility shown in their report would convince any developer, by the return on equity figures, that their project is worthwhile. The study proves, in their view, conclusively that the restoration of the buildings on the west side of Granville Street will work, is economically viable, at a construction cost of approximately \$1.4 million, with a total development of approximately \$13 million.

His Worship asked if anyone else present would like to make a significant contribution to the discussion.

Mr. G. Hutton addressed Council and stated that redevelopment and rehabilitation are forms of development and the kind of rehabilitation and restoration proposed in these selected blocks would represent a significant investment and is simply another kind of development which would result in a considerable rise in assessment.

Mr. A. Ruffman stated his experience in renting office space in the area under consideration.

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Stanbury, that Council reconvene. Motion passed.

Council reconvened at 10:25 p.m. with the same members in attendance.

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman MacKeen, that Council report progress and adjourn. Motion passed.

10:30 p.m. - Council adjourned.

#### HEADLINES

Development Plan for the Granville Street  
Building Moratorium Area.

71-74

WALTER R. FITZGERALD  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD  
CITY CLERK

SUBMISSION TO COUNCIL BY  
HALIFAX DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

KITZ, MATHESON, GREEN & MACISAAC

*Barristers & Solicitors*

SUITE 1300 DUKE STREET TOWER  
SCOTIA SQUARE, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA

SUBMISSION TO COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF HALIFAX ON BEHALF OF  
HALIFAX DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED  
REGARDING THE BARRINGTON/  
GRANVILLE BLOCK DEVELOPMENT

Halifax had a conventional municipal tax history until the Second World War with all properties assessed on the same principle and with one tax rate. Then a Federal Excess Profits Tax was imposed and with the City under heavy costs as a vital port it was deemed wise by the Council of the day to put an extra portion of the tax burden on business tax-payers and the two-tier system we now know was implemented.

It was to be a war-time measure only, the legislation empowering it limited it to the period of hostilities. But taxes come and seldom go and the small difference in 1942 of \$3.50 residential and \$4.25 business escalated in 1955 to \$3.50 residential and \$10.27 business. In 1972 just past as you know, the rates were \$2.47 and \$5.42. In 1955 the residential ratio to business was 1:2.42. In 1972 it was 1:2.15. I attach, as Schedule "A" a sheet of the City 1972 assessment report and you see that business realty, near enough, is \$200 million which carries the business occupancy charge as well and which is one-third of the residential realty, near enough, \$600 million, paid 51% of the tax dollars the City Collector received.

This ignores grants and miscellaneous income and for convenience approximately correct we



assume business occupancy is equal to 50% business realty.

It is dangerous to generalize about tax levies. There are so many reasonable exceptions and qualifications in doing an appraisal, but the chief advantages of our system is that residential owners get a break and despite the increase your 1973 rates indicate residential taxes in Halifax compare well with cities in Canada and indeed tax dollars paid per square foot for apartment buildings compare favourably.

The other side of the coin is tougher. A business rate of \$5.42 or \$8.13 with business occupancy is a high figure comparable to cities of corresponding size from coast to coast. Look about us; manufacturing plants, warehouses, distributing houses, large users of space trek steadily to Dartmouth and, to a lesser extent, the County; or put it negatively a wealth of abandoned plans for industrial construction have passed over the desks of the accountants, architects and bankers of this city and have not been built.

We used to put the blame for this dearth of industrial construction on lack of space in the peninsular of Halifax, but the enlargement of the city has removed that reason. The availability of expected upcoming Watershed lands may permit another review.

Many new industries locating here have special arrangements. This morning's Herald makes reference to chargeable City taxes to Volvo of \$100,000 plus, instead of \$17,000 which was apparently, according to the news story, the basis of their option. It is a good indicator and bespeaks of efforts to attract industry in a high tax area. And we all know the I.E.L. formula of a 1% tax levy.

Let no one lightly fault the Halifax tax structure. It is easy to criticize. It is another job to come up with acceptable alternatives. It has taken the Government of Canada a dozen years to prepare a new Income Tax for 1972 and the howls of dismay still resound throughout the land.

Well, this is our tax picture and for thirty years we have lived with it. A perusal of the figures shows that it is the business tax-payer who carries a large part of the load. It adversely affects the business that requires a large amount of space to carry on its business if the cost of carrying its real estate is a major factor. But the high rate is not a major factor for business where the cost of occupancy is not a significant percentage of total overhead. The tax collector, as a general rule, does not pinch too heavily on those who are

tenants of office buildings and their tax dollars contribute well to total City income.

Figures themselves may become dull and comparisons are easier to picture. For this purpose we have caused the tax rolls to be examined for five well-known streets in the City of Halifax and have shown the tax dollars for which each of these entire streets is liable. We have also taken the four latest main office buildings in the City of Halifax; the Bank of Montreal Tower, the Royal Bank Building, the Barrington Tower and the Duke Street Tower. We have ignored the relief given in the first five years of these commercial buildings which, as you know, is based on the 25%, 5% reducing year year formula. The results which we think are illustrative are shown in Schedule "B". Reference is also made to the block in question, a sketch individually shown as Schedule "C" with the data of Schedule "C" integrated in Schedule "B".

Persons wish to save the frontage of the west side of Granville Street and Halifax Developments Limited (H.D.L.) has devoted hours and days with the best designers and consultants to try out every suggestion made as well as projecting a host of other plans and sketches that would permit it on any feasible economic basis. It won't work. It just won't work.

It is obvious, too, the parties have suffered loss during the moratorium and if a four storey restriction were to be imposed the down-grading of permissible use will cause heavy loss.

It is impossible, particularly with 10ft. to come off Barrington Street for street widening to develop on any economic basis whatsoever. That is a flat fact and the efforts have been made with particularly heavy architectural costs as well as numerous other large expenses.

Among studies made has been one to try the idea of, in effect, moving back the rear walls of the buildings fronting on Granville. It is a reasonable study, done by two engineers, Messrs. John Harewood and John Doull and this report speaks for itself.

When you read it you will recognize that the idea, advanced by persons without too much knowledge of the design or condition of the buildings is not feasible. You cannot, of course, put a building on Barrington Street without windows on the east side for you would have no light for the first five storeys. The suggestion of cutting off the backs of the Granville Street properties to make a courtyard fails in the light of the Engineers' report. It is annexed as Schedule "D".