

HEADLINES (continued)

Possible Acquisition - Vacant Land - Barrington and Artz Streets	179
Daylight Saving Time	179
Construction of Kearney Lake Beach	180
Establishment of Community Relations Division - Police Department	180
Traffic Violations and Fine Structure	180
Amendment - Ordinance Number 138, respecting "The Fee to be Paid for a Tax Certificate" - Second Reading	181
Resubdivision (Lot Consolidation) McFatridge Road - William McFatridge Subdivision	182
Application for Rezoning - 5821 (Lot #7) Lady Hammond Road to C-1 Local Business from R-2 General Resi- dential - Date for Hearing	182
Subdivision Approval - Cowie Hill Housing Project	182
Extension to a Non-conforming Building and Modification of Lot Frontage - 1271 South Park Street	182
Rezoning from R-3 Residential to C-1 Local Business 2632 Windsor Street - Date for Hearing	183
Application for Approval of Lots 300A, 301A, 302A and 311 - Lands of John C. Risley, Joyce Avenue	183
Extension to a Non-conforming Building - 6271 Summit Street	183
Subdivision Approval for Convoy Place	183
Application for Rezoning of Property Known as 132 Purcell's Cove Road from R-1 Single Family Dwelling to R-2 Two-family dwelling zone	183
Final Approval of Lot K-9, Stoneybrook Court, Clayton Park	184
Rezoning from R-2 Residential Zone to C-2 General Business Zone - 2176-80 Robie Street	184
Non-encroaching - Illuminated Sign - 6015 Lady Hammond Road	184
Application for Subdivision - Purcell's Cove Road - Lands of Herman Newman	184
Application for Resubdivision (Consolidation) Young and Sullivan Streets - Lands of Provincetown Trading Corporation Ltd.	185
Rezoning Lot "Z" Dutch Village Road and Alma Crescent from R-3 Residential to C-2 General Business - Lands of Fort Massey Realty Ltd. - Date for Hearing	185
Motion - Alderman Stapells Re: Introduction of Ordinance No. 158, respecting "The Use of Lakes"	185
Approval - Kline Heights Contract No. 4	186
Insurance Claim - City Prison Fire	186
Proposed Bond Issue	186
Resolution re Funding Police Station and Kline Heights Projects	187
Tenders - Police Vehicles	187
Question Alderman Meagher Re: Closing Out of Classes at Chebucto School	187
Question Alderman Moir Re: Resignation of Mr. Forhan Halifax Athletic Commission	187
Question Alderman MacKeen Re: Conflict of Interest - Halicon	188

HEADLINES (continued)

Question Alderman Sullivan Re: Transfer of Royal Nova Scotia Yacht Squadron Property to Point Pleasant Park	188
Question Alderman Stanbury Re: Vandalism - Bus Shelters	188
Question Alderman Wentzell Re: Potholes - Leiblin Drive	189
Question Alderman Meagher Re: Extension of Parking Ban for Street Cleaning Purposes	189
Question Alderman Moir Re: Loading Zone - Bedford Row	189
Notice of Motion - Alderman MacKeen - Amendments to Ordinance No. 151 - Automatic Amusement Machines - License Fees	190
Expropriation Claim - S. Cunard & Co. Ltd. - Appeal to Supreme Court of Canada	190
Agreement with Volvo Canada Ltd.	190
Board of Trade - Uneda Discount	190
Possible Extension of Overnight Parking Ban	191

WALTER R. FITZGERALD
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD
CITY CLERK

17(c)

TO: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council,
 FROM: C. McC. Henderson, City Manager,
 DATE: 11th April, 1973,
 SUBJECT: Proposed Bond Issue.

It is proposed that a bond issue in the amount of \$ 2,000,000 be made with an issue date of May 15, 1973, at a coupon rate to be determined close to the date of issue.

The amount of \$ 2,000,000 is for the following purposes and expenditures on these projects for 1973 are estimated to be \$ 2,617,982.

	<u>AUTHORIZED</u>	<u>ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>AMOUNT FOR BOND ISSUE</u>
Aerial Platform Truck	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000
Fire Alarm Systems	60,000	60,000	60,000
Pavements	1,209,652	134,254	134,000
Paving Renewals	1,584,445	125,863	126,000
Street Widening	1,853,108	224,758	225,000
Traffic Improvements	4,436,552	154,329	155,000
Greenhouse Wanderers Grounds	31,000	31,000	31,000
Sewer Rehabilitation	30,493	29,818	30,000
City's Share Oversize Sewers	750,000	150,000	150,000
Spryfield-Herring Cove Sewer	1,250,000	150,000	150,000
Recreation Facilities	781,144	276,692	196,000
Design Branch Library	50,000	50,000	50,000
Air Conditioning North End			
Branch Library	50,000	50,000	50,000
Rehabilitation Program Schools	1,156,000	163,268	163,000
Cowie Hill School	1,985,000	938,000	400,000
		<u>\$ 2,617,982</u>	<u>\$ 2,000,000</u>

It is recommended that the proposed issue of \$ 2,000,000 be approved.

Respectfully submitted,


 C. McC. HENDERSON
 CITY MANAGER

DEL/db

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARINGS
MINUTES

Council Chamber
City Hall
Halifax, N. S.
April 18, 1973
8:00 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 Sullivan, Meagher, Hogan, Stanbury, Stapells, Moir, Connolly, Bell, Wentzell, and Deputy Mayor MacKeen.

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

The City Clerk advised that the meeting was called as a Public Hearing to consider:

1. Public Hearing Re: to alter and confirm the north and south street lines for Kempt Road and Kempt Road Diversion from five hundred feet more or less (500') northwest of Hood Street to the western street line of Young Street; and
2. Public Hearing Re: Rezoning of land at Civic Nos. 5680-5690 Duffus Street to be rezoned from C-1 Local Business Zone to C-2 General Business Zone.

Public Hearing Re: To alter and confirm the north and south street lines from Kempt Road and Kempt Road Diversion from five hundred feet more or less (500') northwest of Hood Street to the western street line of Young Street

A Public Hearing was held at this time into the above noted matter.

The matter was duly advertised and no letters in support or of objection were received.

Mr. Dodge of the Development Department, with the aid of maps, explained the proposal and answered questions raised by members of Council.

His Worship then called for those persons wishing to speak in favour of altering and confirming the street lines as indicated.

There being no persons wishing to speak in favour, His Worship then called for those persons wishing to speak against the proposal.

There being no persons wishing to speak against the matter, His Worship declared the matter before Council.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Sullivan that the matter be sent to the next regular meeting of City Council to be held on April 26, 1973, without recommendation.

Motion passed.

Public Hearing Re: Rezoning of land at Civic Nos. 5680-5690
Duffus Street to be rezoned from C-1 Local Business Zone
to C-2 General Business Zone

A Public Hearing was held at this time into the above noted rezoning application.

The matter was duly advertised and no letters in favour of the application or in objection to the application were received.

Mr. Dave Keefe of the Development Department, with the aid of maps, outlined the rezoning application and answered questions raised by members of Council on the matter.

His Worship then called for those persons wishing to speak in favour of the application.

Mr. G. Vaughan of Petrofina Canada Limited, the applicant, addressed Council in favour of the application and circulated photographs of the proposed new building showing its location on the lot. Mr. Vaughan answered questions from members of Council and advised that a completely new building will be erected to replace the present service station and advised that the area will be repaved. In reply to a question, Mr. Vaughan also advised that the new building will be better situated on the lot and said there will not be a car-wash facility located in the service station.

There being no further persons wishing to speak in favour of the application, His Worship called for those persons wishing to oppose the rezoning.

Mr. R. MacKeigan representing Mr. & Mrs. James Ferguson, the residents of the property next door to the property being considered for rezoning, addressed Council opposing the rezoning. Mr. MacKeigan said his clients reasons for objecting to the rezoning are much the same as those expressed approximately one year ago when a similar application was refused by Council. Mr. MacKeigan suggested that Council should consider the way in which the facility has been maintained in the past and said the fencing which once separated the two properties has gradually deteriorated and said it has never been replaced. He said this has greatly concerned the Fergusons who live next door.

Mr. MacKeigan also referred to an additional lot which was purchased by Petrofina and said this is not well kept and is used as a catch-all. Mr. MacKeigan also referred to the traffic problems which result from the operation of the service station.

Mr. MacKeigan also advised that when the Fergusons purchased their property, the service station was not operating and the pumps were removed and said that since that time, the station has been permitted to re-open.

Alderman Connolly said it was his understanding that once a use lies vacant for 6 months, it could not be re-opened unless it was properly zoned, and questioned how it was that this particular station was permitted to re-open.

The City Manager advised he would investigate this point before the next regular meeting of City Council.

Mr. MacKeigan was then further questioned by members of Council on the matter.

There being no further persons wishing to speak against the proposed rezoning, His Worship declared the matter to be before Council.

MOVED by Alderman Hogan, seconded by Alderman Connolly that the matter be sent to the next regular meeting of Council to be held on April 26, 1973, without recommendation.

Motion passed.

9:15 p. m. - Meeting adjourned.

HEADLINES

- Public Hearing Re: To alter and confirm the north and south Street lines from Kempt Road and Kempt Road Diversion from five hundred feet more or less (500') northwest of Hood Street to the Western Street line of Young Street 194
- Public Hearing Re: Rezoning of Land at Civic Nos. 5680-5690 Duffus Street to be rezoned from C-1 Local Business Zone to C-2 General Business Zone 195

MAYOR WALTER R. FITZGERALD
CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD
CITY CLERK

PUBLIC HEARING - CITY COUNCIL
AMENDMENTS TO ZONING BY-LAW
RE: VIEWS FROM CITADEL HILL
MINUTES

Gymnasium,
Westmount School,
Edward Arab Avenue,
Halifax, N. S.
April 25, 1973
8:12 p.m.

A Public Hearing was held at this time with respect to the proposed Amendments to the Zoning By-law relating to Views from Citadel Hill.

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

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

His Worship the Mayor suggested that the Director of Planning first explain the proposed amendments followed by a question period for clarification. He requested that the questions be asked for clarification only and that comments and opinions be reserved for later in the meeting.

The Director of Planning spoke of the decisions which had been taken, the studies done by Staff in order that the proposed amendments could be drawn up for consideration. He said that it was necessary to make certain decisions in order that the legislation would be simple and understandable to all. He outlined and described, with the aid of diagrams, the three view planes from a point 5 feet above the wall of the Citadel.

His Worship the Mayor said that Council has discussed this matter at great length and he spoke of the tremendous amount of work done by Staff in order that, as a first step, something could be put on paper in an attempt to preserve the remaining views from the Citadel. He said that Council had requested that this work be done as quickly as possible.

8:30 p.m. Alderman Stanbury arrives.

His Worship the Mayor then asked if any members of the audience wished to ask questions for clarification purposes only.

Mr. Lou Collins asked for confirmation that the photographs displayed by City Staff, purported to be of the three views proposed, actually showed a larger area than that which was to be preserved.

The Director of Planning confirmed the statement of Mr. Collins.

Mrs. Bell asked what restrictions are presently placed on heights of buildings on the other sides of the Citadel.

The Director of Planning said that only the present provisions of the Zoning By-law prevail and that other views are still to be studied further.

Mr. Terry Stanford asked why other views such as that of the Narrows Bridge are not proposed to be protected at this time. He also asked why the view planes are so narrow.

The Director of Planning said that this is a first step and there are many things to consider in drafting legislation of this type. He said that Staff will proceed with work on other views.

Mr. Stanford made some disparaging remarks with respect to the work of Staff and the presentation made.

His Worship the Mayor expressed the view that the remarks made were in bad taste and members of Staff should not be attacked in this manner when they are unable to defend themselves. He said that the work has been done upon the instructions of Council over many months. He said that presently, other than the general zoning provisions as contained in the By-law, there are no restrictions on the height of buildings in the downtown area. He felt that the amendment proposed is at least a step in the right direction and gives an indication that Council is concerned about the preservation of views, although he agreed that, at this time, it perhaps does not go quite far enough.

Mrs. Thibodeau referred to the fact that the views to be preserved are taken from one specific point and she asked if it was the intention to limit the viewers, or viewing time from the particular spot.

The Director of Planning said that this is a point well taken but he considered that up to twenty people could stand on the wall and obtain approximately the same view.

Mrs. Thibodeau asked what can be done for those persons who are unable to climb up on the wall.

His Worship the Mayor said that this is a decision which Council has to take, whether to accept the recommendations of Staff or not, and the purpose of this meeting was to hear the views of interested persons to assist in the decision making process.

Mr. Jeff Braybrook felt that the views should be taken from the roadway and asked why a point was picked above the wall.

The Director of Planning said that, in his opinion, the views from the wall were superior to those from the

roadway and are presently unobstructed. He said that one point only was picked instead of more to facilitate the drafting of legislation which can be easily administered.

Alderman Stanbury asked whether the view from the roadway was the same as that from the wall.

The Director of Planning said that the view from the roadway would not be the same and he reiterated that the view from the wall was superior.

Mr. Bev Grineault asked what the difference in stories would be of buildings if the views were taken from the roadway rather than the ramparts.

The Director of Planning said that he did not have that information at hand but that there would not be too much difference.

Mr. Frank Kempster asked if any consideration has been given to the effect twenty-storey buildings would have on the whole vista from the Citadel if they were constructed on Brunswick Street between the two central view planes, as proposed. He contended that they would destroy the whole effect.

The Director of Planning said that Mr. Kempster is correct and consideration has been given to this aspect.

There apparently being no further questions for clarification, His Worship the Mayor asked for comments or submissions.

Mr. Greg Murray and Mr. David Lachapelle made a lengthy joint presentation on behalf of the Downtown Committee with diagrams, pictures and elevations. Copies of both submissions are attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting.

Mrs. Elizabeth Pacey expressed her concern about the preservation of views from Citadel Hill and illustrated her concern with statistical charts about assessments, tourist revenue, city revenue, employment as a direct result of the tourist trade and annual growth in tourist dollars.

Mrs. G. Hutton read a brief on behalf of the Heritage Trust and a copy of the submission is attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Thompson, a member of the Princess Louise Fuseliers who stand up on the Citadel every summer, in their uniforms, addressed the meeting and said that he looks at the views of the harbour from the ramparts for three solid hours at a stretch. He said that most visitors to the Citadel are either inside visiting the various museums or are on the roadway. He said that very few tourists climb up on the ramparts to view the harbour. He felt that some stringent regulations must be enacted and he suggested that

members of City Council listen carefully to the citizens tonight so that they do not get out of touch with what people want.

Mr. Geoffrey Marshall spoke of the number of visitors to the Citadel each year and questioned whether all or even half of them climb the ramparts to look at the view. He felt that a simple regulation could be drawn up that would prohibit the construction of any building which would obscure any part of the view of the water from the roadway around Citadel Hill.

Mr. Charles Campbell addressed the meeting and spoke of the beautiful views that can be seen from Fort Needham in the North End of the City. He suggested that perhaps the tourists should visit that location and that the tourist dollars be spent improving that facility rather than the Citadel and thus obviating the necessity of enacting legislation to protect the views from the Citadel.

Mr. Alan Ruffman exhibited a photograph in a book of Notman pictures of the view from the Citadel in the year 1900. He also referred to the Stephenson Report and exhibited a picture showing that footpaths had been worn across the grass to the Citadel from all directions, indicating that the residents of the City visit the Citadel just as much as tourists. He endorsed the presentation made by Mr. Murray and Mr. Lachapelle and suggested that Council instruct Staff to prepare a By-law which would preserve the views from points B and C on the roadway around the Citadel.

Mr. Fletcher Smith spoke of the enormous problem facing Council who will be required to make a decision on this matter. He questioned how the downtown area can be redeveloped and the views preserved at the same time. He contended that there might be many people who favour the retention of the views but that there are equally as many who would much prefer redevelopment to take place and their taxes reduced.

Mr. Hugh Porter submitted and read a brief on behalf of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. A copy of this brief is attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting.

Mrs. Ruth Doleman was disturbed over the fact that the viewing point selected was up on the ramparts. She noted that many persons are unable to climb up there and thus are unable to enjoy the view. She said that she looks out upon acres of open land which for years has never been walked on. She referred to Windsor Park which she contended should be taken over by the City.

Donna Spicer submitted and read a brief on behalf of the Environmental Study Group of the Halifax University Women's Club. A copy of this brief is attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Lou Collins, Chairman of the Halifax Landmarks Commission addressed the meeting and spoke in favour of preserving the views from the Citadel and he urged Council to think seriously about the proposal that the views be taken from two separate points on the roadway. He said that haste is required to enact the necessary legislation. He was appreciative of the presentations that have been made at the meeting.

A lady executive from the Halifax County Consumer Association, Lindy Duncan and Graham Hicks all spoke in favour of preserving the views from the Citadel and preferred locations B and C on the roadway rather than a point up on the ramparts. They endorsed the proposal of Mr. Murray and Mr. Lachapelle

Mr. John E. Lloyd addressed the meeting as an interested citizen and favoured the preservation of the views from the Citadel but felt that the economics of the preservation and the effect on development of the legislation must be seriously considered. He felt that the important thing to do is to adopt the By-law as Council sees fit as a start to preserving the City's beauty.

Mr. Eugene Mattatall submitted and read a brief on behalf of the Urban Development Institute. A copy of this brief is attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting.

Mr. John Pike Grady addressed the meeting as a visitor from Eastport, Maine. He said that Eastport is a small port City with many of the same problems as Halifax. He said that there are many similar places who are looking with great interest at Halifax and the efforts being made to protect the heritage. He said that it could be that other towns and cities will follow Halifax' lead in the future.

His Worship the Mayor concluded the meeting by thanking all those who had participated and those who showed their interest by attending. He said that Council will think very hard about the presentations that were made and he informed the meeting that the matter will be debated in Council at the meeting to be held on May 17th at 8:00 p.m.

10:57 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

WALTER R. FITZGERALD
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD
CITY CLERK

^{Mrs Pacey}
Mrs. Stoddart

Presentation to Halifax City Council
April 25, 1973

by

Elizabeth Pacey

Charts, Sources and Rebuttal

CHART I

TAXES from

View-Blockers
(1972)

\$ 1,729,000

VS.

TOTAL city
revenues
(1972)

\$ 54,800,000

% of revenue

from view-Blockers

3.1 %

Notes and Sources for Chart I

1972 tax revenues from view-blockers:

	ASSESSMENT	TAX RATE	TAXES
<u>Residential</u>			
Scotia Square Apts.	\$2,000,000		
Brunswick Towers	\$1,726,200		
Fenwick Towers	\$3,267,400		
	\$6,993,600	X 2.4756%	\$173,000
<u>Business Realty</u>			
Bank of Montreal	\$3,500,000		
Royal Bank	\$3,237,000		
2 Scotia Square Towers	\$6,562,000		
Richardson Building	\$2,384,000		
Centennial Building	\$1,748,000		
Citadel Inn Addition	\$ 855,000		
Sackville Place (7 storeys)	\$ 827,900		
	\$19,113,900	X 5.428%	\$1,037,000
Business occupancy (estimated at 50% of Business Realty on advice of City tax collector)			\$519,000
TOTAL			\$1,729,000

Total city revenues = \$54,800,000

Per cent of revenue from view-blockers = $\frac{1,729,000 \times 100\%}{54,800,000} = 3.1\%$

I have used the above Ecology Action Centre table. I am in agreement with (and have personally verified) every figure. It should be noted that if services were included the tax gain could be reduced to nil or a deficit. A Borough of York ratepayers' study showed that increased tax gains from high-rise buildings were exactly cancelled out by increased services for the high-rise buildings. In San Francisco taxes from the central high-rise district were lower than costs of services.

CHART II

Economic Impact

Construction
of View-Blockers
(1972) \$2,581,200

VS.

Tourism
(1972) \$15,500,000⁺

Notes and Sources for Chart II

- (a) View-blockers constructed in 1972 were the addition to the Citadel Inn and the Brunswick Towers.
- (b) I have used the assessments for these buildings as the assessments would equal construction costs very nearly.
- (c) 1972 was a typical year. The average value of view-blocker construction for 1963-1972 was \$ 2,610,750 per annum.
- (d) \$ 15,500,000 was spent by tourists in Halifax in 1972 — a conservative estimate according to the Halifax Visitors and Convention Bureau and the Provincial Dept. of Tourism.

CHART III

JOB

at a rate of 1 job

per \$ 14,000

tourists spend

→ 1,100⁺ direct jobs

in Halifax

Notes and Sources for Chart III

The formula (1 job per 14,000 tourist dollars) is used by the Provincial Tourism Dept. to determine the number of jobs tourism creates in N.S. Both the Provincial Dept. of Tourism and the Prov. Dept. of Development (where input & output from Statistics Canada are handled) agreed that this formula could be applied to Halifax but said the 1,100 would be unusually low as jobs created by tourism would be more concentrated in Halifax.

1,100 refers to direct jobs only (i.e. a \$7,000 - \$8,000 salary job) and does not include indirect or induced jobs.

CHART IV

Tourism

a Growth Industry

\$ 15,500,000⁺ in 1972

10% ANNUAL GROWTH

\$ 40,400,000 by 1982

Notes and Sources for Chart IV

Unlike the armed forces (frozen budget) and the universities (at a standstill on hiring and expansion) tourism is a growth industry". A 10% annual growth is a conservative expectation according to the Halifax Visitors and Convention Bureau. Tourism represents a very great potential. We can't afford a serious decline (16.4% drop in 3 yrs.) like San Francisco.

The tax gain from view-blockers is only a pittance and will not help to reduce a homeowner's taxes. Future tax gains from view-blockers (even ^{using} an absolute maximum number of high-rises) will constitute only a minor percentage of total city revenues.

The citadel and its views, our prime tourist attraction, should be protected from further devaluation. The citadel is our investment for the future.

Rebuttal

After I left the microphone, Mayor Fitzgerald commented about the number of people who work in Scotia Square. This is not relevant because:

1) Scotia Square is not a primary employer (the armed forces, the port and tourism are)

2) the people who work in Scotia Square could equally well work in 4-8 storey buildings (permitted under a views by-law)

View from Citadel Hill

San Francisco a bad example for Halifax

By ELIZABETH PACEY

Halifax City Council will soon decide the fate of the views from Citadel Hill. The importance of the views to the city's economy and tax base are underlined by recent experience in San Francisco.

San Francisco, pop. 750,000, is larger than Halifax, but the cities have striking similarities. Both are historic: San Francisco was founded in 1775, 26 years later than Halifax. Both cities stand on peninsulas, guarding fine, land-locked harbors.

Like Halifax, San Francisco has superb views from its hills, of the harbor, the Oakland and Golden Gate Bridges and the islands of Yerba Buena and Alcatraz.

During the 1960s however, San Francisco was seduced by the highrise boom that promised to create a new Manhattan of the West.

Thirty-one new highrise buildings sprouted in downtown San Francisco

of Holiday Magazine called "the remorseless brutalization of the uniquely delicate skyline and the obliteration of everyone's view."

Backlash against the skyscraper boom grew. Residents in the North Waterfront area organized and won a 40-foot height limit, barring more view-blockers along their portion of the waterfront. Yet, such groups, though winning skirmishes, decisively lost the war.

One significant result was the sharp slump in tourism, an industry highly dependent on the views. In 1969, 1970 and 1971, the San Francisco Visitors and Convention Bureau reported the number of visitors to San Francisco fell by eight per cent, 4.6 per cent and 4.7 per cent, respectively, with the loss of 9,000 tourist-related jobs. Figures for 1972 are not available yet, but a spokesman indicated that San Francisco is now finding it harder to compete with other North American cities.

There is a direct relationship between

the highrise boom and the drop in tourism, says Herb Caen of the San Francisco Chronicle. "Tourists go to San Francisco for 'exhilarating vistas, a way of life that is different, parks, not parking lots,'" he says.

Clearly, San Francisco's number one industry has been dealt a heavy blow. It will take years to recoup the 16.4 per cent overall drop in tourism of the 1969-1971 period, in terms of jobs and tourist dollars.

Ironically, those who favor highrise development without height restrictions, argue that the view-blockers would bring taxes to the city coffers. But in San Francisco, the increased taxes from the downturn, generated by the highrise boom, were less than the increased services needed as a result of that highrise boom.

The San Francisco Bay Guardian survey, based on city records for 1970, showed that the central highrise district contributed 25.2 per cent of all city revenues, but services for the central highrise district

cost even more, 27.9 per cent of all city expenditures, a net drain on city coffers.

Halifax is at the turning point. Highrise buildings are shooting up at a frightening rate. In 1970 alone, building permits were issued for 12 new highrise buildings, five of which were potential view-blockers. Already, a considerable amount of the sweeping panorama from the old stronghold is obscured.

Last year, an estimated 700,000 people visited Citadel Hill and visitors spent \$15.5 million in the city.

For Halifax, tourism is still a growing industry. But we must control highrise development to guarantee that the Citadel continues to hold a vantage point from the hill. We must ensure that the Citadel remains Canada's most-visited historic site.

A public hearing on this issue will be held on Wednesday, April 25 at 8 p.m. in the West Hill School 6700 Edward Arab

Greg Murray

PRESENTATION - VIEWS POLICY

The Mayor's Committee on the Downtown - Public Hearing -
Westmount School, Halifax, Nova Scotia, April 25, 1973

The reason that we are all here this evening is that in this City, like many others elsewhere, we have a continuing confrontation with the forces of economic development on the one hand, and the interests of those who, on the other hand, are more concerned with preservation of human, social and "quality of life" values. In many cities, this confrontation cannot be avoided. In Halifax, it is the firm belief of the members of the Mayor's Committee on the Downtown that this confrontation is both unnecessary and avoidable.

This conclusion based on several studies of the existing and future requirements for economic development in Halifax, particularly in the downtown area. This point, as it relates to the views question, is the chief point that we wish to make tonight.

Our second point, and it is important, is that the Downtown Committee feels most strongly that the proposed legislation on views, as it has been outlined to us here tonight, is an extremely feeble attempt at a solution. In many ways we think that it is a very limited effort and we strongly recommend that it not be adopted by City Council at this time or any time. Better solutions are available and better solutions should be used.

The Downtown Committee has already indicated to Council the faults it finds with the proposed legislation. I will mention them only briefly here tonight, for the record:

1. The reference point chosen on the ramparts ignores the realities of public use of the Citadel Hill as a viewing point.
2. All of the view planes proposed, those that we have seen here tonight and the other three that have been deleted, permit building to too great a height in the restricted areas. The difference between what the proposed legislation permits and what the Downtown Committee would like to see permitted is not large in economic terms, but in its impact upon the view as available to the average citizen the difference is a most serious one. At the same time, the view planes are unnecessarily wide in some instances, while in the case of the Harbour Mouth plane in particular, height has been restricted in some areas where new high buildings would make no difference at all to the existing view. This is typical of the clumsy approach that has been taken to this problem.

3. We object to the whole idea of putting in restrictions in only three of the six possible planes with a view to seeing "how things work out". The original premise of City Staff in this matter was that they could not discuss the proposed legislation with the Downtown Committee before it went to Council because they did not want to give an opportunity to developers, of which many are represented on the Downtown Committee, to rush out and get building permits before Views legislation was enacted. Now we have a complete about-face, with only half of the important areas to be protected and the rest left to take their chances until somebody gets around to devising legislation for them.

So much for the existing proposals.

In looking at what we would prefer, the Downtown Committee's very strong feeling is that at a very minimum the reference points from which arcs of view are established should be points B & C of the Watson report. These, of course, are the roadway at the south end of the Citadel and the saluting base near the main entrance to the fort. These positions are accessible to all citizens of Halifax and to all visitors 365 days a year, at all times of the day or night. The same can certainly not be said for the reference point used in the draft legislation.

The second point of the Downtown Committee is that we feel that the View Planes as proposed can be narrowed in some instances, while in other instances substantial segments of unrestricted area can be permitted, particularly within the larger planes.

I would now like to call on Mr. David Lachapelle, another member of the Mayor's Committee on the Downtown who will briefly go over the graphical material that we have used in our analysis. This material will illustrate the effects of what the Downtown Committee would like to see legislated in contrast with what has been proposed tonight.

All this leads back to the point on which I started out, which is that based on the analyses done by City Staff, MAPC, consultants working for a variety of government bodies, and members of the Downtown Committee itself, we strongly believe that there is room in downtown Halifax, and indeed in all of the areas affected by the views legislation, to provide for all of the new construction that we are ever likely to need, of whatever height, without the necessity of destroying the view or many of the other things of value in downtown Halifax, particularly our delightful older buildings and our scarce and irreplaceable open areas.

It is very easy to get lost in a maze of numbers on this subject, so I am going to attempt to be very concise. Council has already been exposed to our detailed calculations, and they can be made available to anyone else who is interested for the asking.

What we have tried to do is look at demand on the one hand and capacity on the other. Demand ultimately translates into the number of apartments and the amount of square feet of commercial and retail space that is going to be needed from now until 1991. Capacity, as measured by the Downtown Committee, consists of the amount of square footage that could be built, in both restricted and unrestricted areas, to the height limits that we have proposed, while simultaneously preserving open spaces and historic structures.

Looking first at demand, and specifically at housing, it has been calculated that this City will have to provide for about 20,000 additional persons on the Halifax peninsula between now and 1991. It has further been estimated that the existing R3 zones, the apartment building zones, on the peninsula could be developed to provide for an additional 50,000 people or 2 1/2 times the population growth expected. If the regulations that we would like to see put into force were applied on the R 3 zones in the Harbour Mouth and McNab's Island view planes, the reduction would be 2500 persons. In a word, with view plane regulations based on roadway reference points, we would be able to build apartments to house an additional 47,000 people in This City, although by 1991, we expect only an additional 20,000 people.

Turning to office space demand, we had a bit of a problem because firm projections are not available for the large area to the south of Salter Street, the southern border of the downtown proper. However, using the view planes that we propose, there is development capacity in this southern area, in existing commercial zones, for 11 million square feet of new office space. 11 million square feet is the equivalent of 45 Royal Bank buildings. 11 million square is nearly twice the total office space projected for the downtown area proper in 1991. We don't think that anyone is likely to build the equivalent of 45 Royal Bank buildings in this City south of Salter Street over the next 20 years, or over the next 50 years, but if they want to they can and still not change the view as we have it from the Citadel today.

The critical area, where all the action is, or it is supposed to be, is the downtown. Here, with the aid of City Staff projections, the Downtown Committee was able to go into more detail. Looking at demand for more hotel space and residential space and office space and retail space, there appears to be a requirement for new capacity, additional capacity, in the downtown by 1991 of approximately 5.4 million square feet. Against that demand of 5.4 million additional square feet, we

have a City Staff analysis which indicates that if all of the downtown was developed to only 80 feet in height, over 9 million additional square feet could be provided, or twice what we are projected to need.

That's one approach and a very simple one. Looking at it a little differently, let's consider the areas on this drawing which can be totally free of height restrictions, even if both reference points suggested are used. If we subtract from these areas illustrated buildings recently built, and if we also subtract all the historic structures, and if we assume that nobody is going to build any higher than 15 stories, then such new buildings could produce at least 4 million additional square feet in the downtown, and that figure could be considerably higher as our estimates were conservative. Remember that we need less than 5 1/2 million new square feet in all of the Downtown over the next 20 years. These areas alone can provide about 80% of that requirement, or another 16 Royal Bank buildings. The rest of the Downtown, the so-called restricted areas, can still provide a great amount of additional square footage, so that surely no one can seriously believe that even with the restrictions that we have proposed there is the slightest possibility of the City not having the space for all of the new construction that it is going to need.

If this City can provide space for the equivalent of more than 60 Royal Bank buildings in the space between the Citadel and the Harbour, while still enforcing legislation to preserve our various Citadel views for today's citizens and tomorrow's citizens, then anyone who says that development is unduly restricted needs his head read.

To close, let me repeat on behalf of the Downtown Committee our request to Council originally made on March 7th:

- a) Please do not approve the draft legislation that has been proposed. It doesn't do enough and what it does do, it does badly.
- b) Please request that Staff prepare new legislation based on view planes emanating at least from reference points B & C on the Citadel roadway.
- c) Finally, please endorse view legislation which protects all of the views that we have left to us, not just those in the three view planes proposed.

* * * * *

TO SEE OR NOT TO SEE?
IS THAT THE QUESTION?

This Wednesday evening City Council will hold a public hearing to listen to the thoughts and ideas of Haligonians on protecting the view from Citadel Hill. Judging from previous remarks made by the aldermen, the paramount question in their minds will be whether or not to establish legislation to safeguard the view, or more correctly, part of the view, as this is what the proposed by-law calls for at this time. In addition to the above, they must also reconsider which method should be used for setting up the view planes by-law. Three different ones have been presented to council and, while the choice of method is admittedly the second step in the procedure, it is of no less importance than the first, for the value of having a views by-law depends on the quality and effectiveness of the legislation. Most Haligonians will not be aware that the basis of this legislation will be discussed at the hearing, or that the City Staff proposal will be contested by several citizens and groups including the Downtown Committee.

The basis for the contention is as follows. The City Staff, in their analysis, selected what they thought was the best vantage point on Citadel Hill and chose that location for a reference point. That point, which is five feet above the top of the ramparts at the telescope stand, can be attained only from inside the fort. From this point in space the view planes extend toward the harbour, and within these, building height restrictions become automatically imposed. Unfortunately, what would at first seem to be a logical method of approaching the view problem actually turns out to be just the opposite. The realities of the situation, regarding people and environmental quality, are overlooked in a search for a simple geometrical basis as well as a politically more expedient process. While these two characteristics are undoubtedly desirable, they are by no means the most important. Therefore they should not have become the goal, and should remain only as possible means to an end.

How then should the problem be tackled? Two years ago a former member of City Staff, Alex Watson, began working on this task. Two reports which were produced (the second was not published, possibly because of some errors contained in it) indicate that his well thought out analysis was revealing a problem, which although it contained certain technical intricacies, was basically simple. They also stressed that it was a most important problem, one which required bold decisions to be made in a very near future. The analysis led to the choice of three points on the roadway around the Citadel, because it recognized that:

- 1) Haligonians as well as tourists should be considered in establishing the view planes.
- 2) Haligonians, who frequently want to relax and enjoy the view, neither have the time nor the physical energy to climb the ramparts.
- 3) The Citadel is not open 24 hours a day, whereas the roadway vantage points are accessible and provide spectacular sights both at sunrise and at night.
- 4) The assets of Halifax, and Canada, for that matter, should be made more accessible to the citizens to encourage their use.
- 5) 700,000 people a year visit the Hill and 325,000 of them visit within the fort, from which it can be concluded that the majority of the remainder tour the summit to take in the view.
- 6) The view from the Citadel is a dynamic or moving experience and can be enjoyed from several points.
- 7) Basing height controls on a one-point system ignores these realities.

It should be further noted that if view plane legislation were based on the point above the ramparts, then significant views could be entirely blocked from the roadway, even by future buildings which conform with the height regulations of the proposed by-law. Among these would be the view of George's Island, which is considered one of the two most important views. The City's proposal would allow a seven storey building to be constructed on Brunswick Street which would obscure the view of the Island from the two most popular vantage points on Citadel Hill. On the other hand, if the legislation was based upon at least two of these points which the Watson study established, then such unfortunate consequences could be prevented.

The implications of establishing a Views By-Law are far-reaching. Halifax could benefit socially, environmentally, and economically from such legislation. However, a far more mature approach to urban development than is being taken now is required, in order that the city realize the potential benefits. Short term costs of such a venture would not be great; in fact, it has yet to be proven by the skeptics that such legislation will cost the city a cent. Undoubtedly, the growth-minded people are worried, because such measures definitely challenge the practice of encouraging unlimited, uncontrolled growth. It is about time, however, that we looked at the direction in which we are heading. It is about

time we began to examine the development of the area and search for the logical and rational solutions, rather than plug in the conventional or traditional ones. It is time that we look for quality as well as quantity, and try to evaluate the intangible and difficult to quantify benefits which can be found in ventures such as this. It is about time we capitalized on the natural potential of our region, our community, our land, instead of beating them into submission to make them yield something they aren't suited for. And isn't it time that we stop defining progress as a cluster of new buildings?

David Lachapelle
Views Legislation Subcommittee of the Downtown Committee
Student, Nova Scotia Technical College

6267 Duncan Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
455-5454 (9-5)

J. E. Hutton.

When tall buildings began to eliminate the view from the Citadel, assurances were given to the public that legislation would be enacted to protect these views for the citizens to enjoy.

In considering the proposed legislation, there are evidently two classes of citizen in Halifax: The first class of citizen - the ones who qualify to be provided with a view from the Citadel, are those people old enough or young enough, agile enough or tall enough or warm blooded enough to climb the Citadel walls to look at the harbour - and these only in the summer months. The second class of citizens - the rest of us - older or younger - not that warm blooded who go to see the view from the roadway - are evidently not as important as the first class - at least according to the proposed legislation.

On the roadway is where many people go to see the views in daytime. As well, many cars go up to circle the Hill in the evening - and one of the main reasons is to look at the lights of the two cities and the harbour. The roadway is used winter and summer, in daylight and evening by young and old. We feel that it is these views that should be protected.

Moreover - using the higher vantage point of the proposed legislation means that higher construction would be allowed close to the Citadel in the view planes - not obscuring the view from the top of the ramparts - but will be able to block some views completely from the roadway.

Therefore, the Heritage Trust supports the contention of the Downtown Committee that at least two vantage points on the roadway should be the basis for any views legislation and that such legislation be adopted quickly to protect what remains.

On the subject of complexity - any plan - any number of view points and any number of views produces in the end a simple map of Halifax with zones marked with different building heights allowed. The application is simple - and the Staff is certainly capable of working out this map. The Heritage Trust considers the Citadel one of the landmarks of the City of Halifax and an important element of the Citadel is its views to and from the harbour and downtown. We have proposed to Council on another occasion, the establishment of a Historic Precinct to protect the historic architecture in the downtown. The Citadel with its views is part of this inheritance.

Can we afford to provide for both views and the historic precinct? I wish to give again the figures used by the Downtown Committee. The need, from Staff studies for the Downtown Core, was found to be 5.4 million square feet additional floor space. Taking the high rise sectors - and subtracting the historic buildings from the high rise sectors and supposing development to a height of 15 storeys, the additional square feet provided would be 74 million square feet. The figure for the need is a projection, the figure for the possible high rise development is actual - so there is a margin of safety if you consider the additional development possible at lesser height in the view planes.

I would like to comment on the question of high rise development in general.

High rise, with its increased assessment has been proposed as a help to the City's financial difficulties. But high-rise also means increased traffic, sewers and water, police and fire protection- which cost the City money. As well, there are the social costs to the entire fabric

of the City.

If high rise development cured City's financial problems then New York City should be the most affluent of all North American cities - we all know this is not the case.

Does Council really want 100% high rise downtown? If they don't, then at some point they will have to say about certain pieces of land - "You may not build high rise here". We ask that this be done now - to save our architectural assets and our views.

In closing, we ask that at least two vantage points on the roadway and the 6 views - where the people are at to see the view - be the basis for any views legislation. We feel that there is adequate development potential in Downtown without destroying our landmarks or the view. We ask that Council act swiftly to adopt new legislation to adequately protect the views and our landmarks before more are destroyed.

Hugh Parker.

BRIEF ON
PROPOSED VIEWS BY-LAW
PUBLIC HEARING
CITY OF HALIFAX

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs
Parks Canada
Atlantic Region

April 25, 1973

Your Worship

Members of Council

The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Parks Canada, Atlantic Region, wishes to identify certain values and implications, both in a qualitative and quantitative sense, which are related to the preservation of views from the Citadel. This Department is charged with the direct responsibility for the operation, maintenance and restoration of the Citadel, for the benefit, education and enjoyment of all Canadians.

As related to the qualitative values associated with the Citadel and the views therefrom, it is essential to identify three aspects. The first is the historical significance of the Halifax defence complex and its importance on a global scale. By 1815 the defense system at Halifax, centered around the Citadel, became one of the major worldwide defense systems for ensuring British sovereignty.

The status of the Citadel in more recent times is perhaps best expressed in the manuscripts of the late Harry Piers in 1928 as follows:

"But the lesson of the past is still with us as we survey the Halifax Fortress. Since 1749, it has never been invested or even attacked. While the city may not have the glorious associations, romantic atmosphere, and stirring traditions so abundantly connected with venerable places like Louisbourg or Annapolis Royal, we can only be most heartily thankful for our safety. We must never forget, however, that our nearly two centuries of peace has been due in large measure to our military strength".

Within an historical interpretive context the views to and from the Citadel relate more strongly to Georges Island and the Harbour Mouth Views.

In a more contemporary sense the views from the Citadel still offer a major aesthetic quality and value to the citizens of this City and countless visitors. Having made this statement the question immediately arises as to views of what? The views include elements of water as related to the protected confines of the Harbour, the openness of the Harbour Mouth and in turn the broad expanse of the Atlantic. The views also include land features directly associated with the water such as the islands, headlands and sandbars. The views also encompass man created features such as the general townscape, individual historic buildings, ships of commerce, sailing boats, the ferry and even refineries and smoke stacks. It is this combination of natural and man-made features which together provide an avenue for spiritual refreshment and peace of mind. What other city in North America has the opportunity at its very centre to associate visually with such magnificent seascapes and associated landforms? The Citadel also represents one of the few locations in the Metropolitan area where strong panoramic views exist. Halifax Harbour in both an historical and contemporary sense has served as a major avenue for waterborne traffic related to commerce and defence. The opportunity to view the movement of ships is rare as pedestrian access to the waterfront is extremely limited, unattractive and confined at any given point. The Citadel presents one of the few opportunities to appreciate actual ship movement at the harbour mouth. Such vessels vary from the small fishing or sailboats to the modern day container vessels. It is within this context that the McNabs Island and Harbour Mouth views provide the greatest opportunity.

Finally a pure economic argument can be put forward in terms of the Citadel and its role as a prime tourist attraction. Visitation to the Park exceeded 700,000 visitors last year with about one half this number entering the Fortress. It is of interest to note the origin of these visitors. Since

visitor information is largely taken from the registration book the figures are subject to some unknown bias. However, it is reasonable to estimate that 85 to 90% of these visitors are from outside Nova Scotia and of the Nova Scotians who visit the Fortress at least one half are from outside the Halifax-Dartmouth area. The significance of the Citadel as a tourist attraction and its contribution to tourist dollars in the local economy is evident. In fact the Park has the highest visitation of any historic site or park in Canada.

In summary, the views from the Citadel are important because of the mixture of manmade and natural features in an historical and contemporary sense entailing old fortifications and defence systems, seascapes, cityscapes, landforms, shipping and other boating activities. It is the total blending of sky, water, land and buildings which create the overall effect. Eight generations of Haligonians have repaired to the slopes of the Citadel for a spacious outlook, to check what is moving in the harbour and to attempt to see things in proper perspective. The economic importance is also readily apparent.

Undoubtedly the majority of citizens would agree that some portion of the views from the Citadel should be preserved for a variety of reasons. However, the essential question also exists as to what type of development controls are necessary and in an economic sense what controls can the City of Halifax afford? The By-law under review primarily proposes view retention through the creation of zones (between the Citadel and Halifax Harbour) wherein no development would be allowed to exceed a particular height. The approach taken calls for the definition of a triangular view plane - which would have its apex on Citadel Hill and with its base defined by two points at the water surface level in Halifax Harbour. Six triangular view planes have been identified based upon view values and the lack of existing or impending obstructions. General acceptance of these

six view planes appears relatively widespread. However, agreement as to how many of the view planes can be retained and the number and location of viewing stations from the apex of the triangle on Citadel Hill is not so well confirmed.

In the assessment of view values our priorities are listed in order of importance as follows:

1. Georges Island View Plane
2. Harbour Mouth View Plane
3. McNabs Island View Plane

These views have been selected on the basis of historical significance, representations of the port activity of Halifax in historical and contemporary senses and environmental quality such as the land and seascapes. The intent is not to deny the significance of the other views, namely, Centre Harbour, Duke Harbour and Bridge Harbour, but rather to emphasize the special qualities of the other views. In fact it is a series of views comprising all of the view planes that contribute to the total panorama and its visual experience.

It is important to recognize the significance of the single viewpoint from the ramparts of the Citadel near the noon day gun as proposed by City staff. At this elevation, largely unobstructed views are still available within the six defined planes. The selection of additional points along the ramparts changes the prime views in a subtle manner only, or orients the views toward less significant ones. The optimum views are obtained at this location. A viewpoint from the ramparts will unquestionably be well utilized. Additionally it is surmised that of the remaining 350,000 visitors who do not enter the Fort, the majority are Halifax-Dartmouth residents and other Nova Scotians. For these visitors the views from the roadway around the Citadel are of greater significance as related to pedestrian or vehicular traffic. That portion of the roadway along

the south-westerly side of the Citadel affords an opportunity to experience the Harbour Mouth, McNabs Island and Georges Island views with only slightly reduced quality relative to the ramparts location. The roadway at this location represents an important experience and opportunity for local people who do not enter the fortress, let alone climb the ramparts. It is also interesting to note that the difference in potential buildable floor space under the two viewpoints, that is, ramparts and roadway, is less than eleven percent (11%) within the Harbour Mouth, McNabs Island and Georges Island view planes.

The claim of potential loss in new residential and commercial floor space, consequent tax revenue reduction to the City, and in turn monetary loss to the individual property owner, should be carefully examined. It is worthy of note that projections contained in recent City Planning Reports indicate that for a Metropolitan population of 350,000 persons, the Halifax Peninsula would have to accommodate an additional 20,000 persons with the majority of the increase being accommodated in higher density development. Under existing high density residential zoning for the Halifax Peninsula, that is, 3rd density outer and central (150 and 250 persons per acre respectively), there appears to be a theoretical capacity for new high density residential development exceeding some 50,000 persons. This does not take into account land which is currently or in the future will be changed to high density residential use through natural ~~attribution~~ ^{attrition} and other factors. The development of the former prison lands is one example of a relatively recent conversion to high density use. A detailed assessment of potential buildable floor space under existing zoning regulations and the proposed height regulations was undertaken for the Harbour Mouth, McNabs Island and Georges Island view planes. Height restrictions to be imposed on presently zoned high density residential land by the three view planes from the ramparts and/or roadway will reduce development potential by some 2500 persons

or less than five percent (5%) overall on the Halifax Peninsula.

For commercial land within the above view planes the potential loss in total floor space is somewhat greater in magnitude. A cursory look at the reduction in the general business zone (C2) under the ramparts and roadway viewplanes infringing on the Downtown area indicates losses in potential buildable space but a potential overall capacity well in excess of the most optimistic demand projections. As one example, the Halifax Waterfront Development Planning Study prepared by MAPC indicates a potential within the waterfront area alone for some 8,000,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor space. The "best guess" target figures for 1991 indicate a need for some 8 to 11,000,000 square feet of floor space for the Downtown and peripheral areas.

There is strong evidence to support the belief that the imposition of height regulations within selected view planes will not deprive the City of Halifax of development potential or tax revenue. There are generally sufficient options open for good urban development. In the end, the City of Halifax will be a place to invest because of an attractive environment and concomitant security of this investment.

Finally view preservation entails retention of the historical, aesthetic and economic values associated with the Citadel. The views of highest priority are those associated with Georges Island, Harbour Mouth and McNabs Island. The views from the Citadel can be retained without serious encroachment and/or economic loss to the City of Halifax.

CITADEL VIEWS

Your Worship, Aldermen, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Environmental Study Group of the Halifax University Women's Club is of the opinion that a views' bylaw would be of benefit to the tourist industry and to the developers and private citizens of Halifax. Those citizens whose livelihood is not directly dependent on further industrial development, those whose livelihood is directly dependent on the tourist industry, and those of us who remember with joy a less obstructed view would ideally like to preserve an arc of at least one hundred eighty (180) degrees beginning with the Harbour Mouth. Reality forces us to concede that several triangular view-planes interspersed with triangles of unrestricted growth would be more judicious and more practical because of our tax structure.

THREE VIEW-PLANES MUST HAVE FIRST PRIORITY: (A) THE HARBOUR MOUTH, (B) MacNABS ISLAND AND (C) GEORGE'S ISLAND. SEVERAL REASONS FOR THIS ARE OBVIOUS:

1. Visitors and citizens alike have an endless fascination for the sea and her commerce. Halifax is first and foremost a port city.
2. Georges Island is a national and historic site and where the first settlers of Halifax landed.
3. MacNabs Island was originally part of the Cornwallis estate and was called Cornwallis Island after the founder of Halifax. As such it is of Historical importance.
4. MacNabs and Georges Islands are part of the topography which gives Halifax Harbour its singular identity.
5. These three viewpoints taken together give one a panorama of low buildings, sea, sky and island that sweeps for almost sixty (60) degrees. This puts a sense of spaciousness and widening horizons within a few minutes walk of any inner city dwelling.

CITIZENSHIP

... of the ... and ...

The Government ... of the ...

... (A) ...

... and ...

... of the ...

... and ...

6. The sailing community and sea-going tourists and workers would like to have an unobstructed view of the citadel from the harbour and islands.

We ask that the formula for height control in the viewing planes designated by Halifax City Council be added to the proposed amendments of the zoning law as outlined on page 4 and 5 of paper addressed to the Mayor and City Planning Committee of December 20, 1972 and presented January 3, 1973. A diagram of this procedure is also included in Mr. Henderson's report and is entitled "Section Illustrating Possible Impact of Imposition of Views Bylaw on Two Hypothetical Developments".

However, we have some reservations regarding specifics. Why is the focal point selected for calculating height restrictions and describing arcs of view at two hundred forty one (241) feet above sea level, on five (5) feet above the ramparts? We can see from the developers point of view that this might add as much or more than three stories to a proposed building, but from the standpoint of those wishing to view the harbour and environs from Citadel Hill, three problems arise:

1. Many people are too old, too infirm or too handicapped to scale the ramparts.
2. Very young children who would generally be only too happy to scramble up the walls usually don't stand five (5) feet high and cannot see over.
3. Some people, particularly Halifaxians who visit the citadel often, sometimes prefer to just drive or walk around the roadway a couple of times to see the view from there. Snow and ice are problems encountered in the wintertime if the only view is from the top of the ramparts.

Therefore, we strongly recommend that not one but two or three points on the ROADWAY be chosen as viewing points from which to describe view-planes.

We are opposed to a general height restriction of ninety-six (96) feet (as mentioned on page eight (8) of Mr. Henderson's paper) and we are for varying height restrictions calculated according to a view-plane

profile and using a measure of height above sea-level.

We are of the opinion that the revenue expected from projected hypothetical development in the viewing-planes is over-estimated while existing and projected tourist revenue is under estimated, and that there is ample room for high rise buildings in other parts of the city.

The Halifax Citadel is the most visited historic site in Canada. The views from the Citadel provide more than the economic value in tourist dollars and contribute greatly to the indefinable but instantly recognizable quality of life in Halifax.

Donna Spicer 6327 Edinburgh Street, Halifax, N. S.

Diane Baggs 200 Willett Street, Halifax, N. S.