

Council
September 12, 1974

The City Manager said the Federal Government is interested, the Provincial Government appears to be interested but said she has nothing further in writing from the Minister on the matter.

Alderman Connolly noted that staff were to prepare additional information and asked if they had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. B. Davidson of the Development Department addressed Council advising that staff has not had an opportunity to complete a report that was to come to tonight's meeting and said staff is recommending the matter be forwarded to the next regular meeting of the Committee of the Whole. He said the information which staff felt was required for tonight was not available on time to ascertain the affects of the proposal but said on examining the material received today, the plan does meet the requirements as outlined in the survey plan requirements for the City of Halifax.

Discussion ensued on the matter and Alderman Sullivan referred to a staff report dated September 4, 1974 which he said indicates the problem centers around a 10' difference in depth. Alderman Sullivan said the application meets all the requirements in terms of zoning and noted the lots involved could be covered to a greater extent than is intended by the developer.

It was MOVED by Alderman Sullivan, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that the setback modifications relating to the proposed development of Centennial Properties Limited, Waterfront Lands at Water Street, be allowed.

Alderman Sullivan noted the developer has stated it will be three months before construction of the project can commence saying that if another level of government should decide to purchase these lands, three months should be sufficient time.

Mr. Davidson of the Development Department further spoke on the matter advising of the various recommendations which staff are working on with respect to the proposed development.

Alderman MacKeen referred to the three month time lapse as referred to by Alderman Sullivan and said Council must take into consideration the affect this may have on the value of the land saying that if in three months time, Council should wish to expropriate the lands, they may be considerably more valuable than at present.

Alderman MacKeen said he could go along with the Motion subject to certain qualifications and MOVED in amendment, seconded by Alderman Moir that the height setback modification and sideyard requirements regarding the proposed Development, Waterfront Lands at Water Street, be accepted on the condition that Centennial Properties' development can be related to and

Council
September 12, 1974

linked up with comprehensive development of the waterfront as conceived in the Downtown Committee Urban Design Plan and Policy Statement adopted by City Council on March 20, 1974.

In reply to a question, the City Manager said the Amendment presently before Council does not contain points as raised by Mr. Davidson such as lot consolidation and said the matter should be sent to the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council as there are more points which should be put in the Motion. The City Manager said that if conditions are to be put in the Resolution, then all the conditions have to be included.

Alderman Sullivan referred to a Motion from the Downtown Committee which appears later on the agenda which requests that Council give direction to the Director of Development and requesting Mr. R. Medjuck to review the proposal with the Downtown Committee so the Committee could compare the proposal with the Policy Statement and Recommendations Document. Alderman Sullivan said that in view of what is contained in the Resolution from the Downtown Committee, Council could ask the City Solicitor for an opinion as to whether a decision can be made or not.

9:12 P. M. - Alderman Meagher arrives.

Alderman Stapells said that the City is not in possession of a concrete set of plans for the building in question and questioned how one could make a comparison.

The City Solicitor advised that he could not make a comparison saying it is a planning matter which Planners are trained to answer rather than Solicitors. The City Solicitor said that Alderman Stapells makes a good point in that it would be a question at this time what it is one would be comparing to the policy adopted by Council in March.

Alderman MacKeen said the Resolution of the Downtown Committee as mentioned by Alderman Sullivan is a separate item on the agenda and said there is nothing in his amendment to refer anything to the Downtown Committee. He said the essence of his amendment is that the modification setback be granted according to policy adopted by Council and the Urban Design Plan.

The Amendment to the Motion was then put and lost.

The Acting City Clerk at this time read the main Motion following which it was MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman MacKeen that the matter be referred to the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council.

The Motion to refer was then put and passed, five voting for the same and four voting against it as follows:

For: Aldermen Bell, MacKeen, Meagher, Moir, & Wentzell - 5
Against: Aldermen Connolly, Stanbury, Stapells, & Sullivan - 4

Resubdivision - Convoy Place

MOVED by Alderman Bell, seconded by Alderman Connolly that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, Parcel A-3-1, Convoy Place, as shown on Plan No. P200/6646 of Case No. 2855, be approved. Motion passed.

Convoy Place - Agreement for Easement & Declaration for Encumbrance

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Sullivan that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, City Council authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to sign an Agreement for service easements and Declaration of easement encumbrance for Parcel A-3-1 of Convoy Place. Motion passed.

Block "J" - Cowie Hill

The above noted item was forwarded to City Council without recommendation.

Alderman Wentzell said that he has not heard anything as yet from the Developer or Condominium Group No. 2 and MOVED, seconded by Alderman Stapells that the matter be referred to the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole. Motion passed.

Rezoning - Maynard Street - Date for Hearing

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Connolly that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, the public hearing into the rezoning on Maynard Street be held in Joseph Howe School at 8:00 P. M., Tuesday, September 24, 1974. Motion passed.

Alderman Stapells leaves the meeting.
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Possible Playing Field Site - South Spryfield

A staff report dated September 4, 1974 was submitted relating to the above noted matter.

Alderman Wentzell noted the staff report states the preferred site is that in the Green Acres area which he felt should be the first priority as well as it could be developed with little expenditure for 1975. Alderman Wentzell then MOVED, seconded by Alderman Moir that staff be authorized to negotiate formally with the owners of the preferred site at Mansion Road and Woodcrest Avenue adjoining the Green Acres Subdivision.

It was noted the owners of the site in question are reluctant to negotiate and it was suggested that negotiations should also take place with owners of the other properties with staff to report back recommending the land with the most favourable price.

After further discussion, Alderman Wentzell with the agreement of the seconder, changed his Motion to read that negotiations commence and a report be submitted within two weeks advising of the best negotiations that have been arranged on the three properties involved.

The Motion as amended was then put and passed.

Resolution Downtown Committee Re: 2 Proposed Office Towers,
Salter Street

A report dated September 6, 1974 was submitted from the Downtown Committee containing the following Resolution for the consideration of Council:

"That a communication be made to City Council, directing the Director of Development and Requesting Mr. R. Medjuck to review the proposal for the two office towers on Salter Street with the Downtown Committee so that the Committee could compare the proposal with the Policy Statement and Recommendations document, which was adopted by City Council on March 20, 1974."

Alderman Moir noted that Council has referred the above noted application back to the Committee of the Whole and suggested that staff and the developer should take into consideration the Resolution of the Downtown Committee but said he would not suggest that Council designate a specific time.

It was MOVED by Alderman Moir that staff and the developer be requested to meet with the Downtown Committee at the time of negotiations, or between now and the next Committee of the Whole meeting, to discuss with staff and the developer the Downtown Committee's assessment of how these towers can or cannot blend themselves with the waterfront requirements of the Downtown Committee.

There was no seconder to the Motion.

With the agreement of Council, Mr. R. Medjuck addressed the meeting and with respect to the subject of his Company or any developer meeting with the Downtown Committee to review a specific proposal, appealed to Council not to consider this as a precedent for the review of development in the downtown area. Mr. Medjuck said there are already many difficulties for developers in meeting with the various City Departments regarding an application.

Mr. Medjuck further spoke on the matter and said the Company will review the brief that was submitted by the Downtown Committee but respectfully declined the opportunity to meet with the Downtown Committee to discuss their views.

MOVED by Alderman Sullivan, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that the report of the Downtown Committee dated September 6, 1974, be tabled by City Council.

Discussion ensued on the matter and it was MOVED in Amendment by Alderman MacKeen, seconded by Alderman Sullivan that the report of the Downtown Committee dated September 6, 1974, be tabled by City Council and that staff be directed to give the Downtown Committee access to the plans with respect to the two office towers proposed for Salter Street.

The Motion as amended was then put and passed.

Resolution Downtown Committee Re: Parking Facility Grafton
Street Site

A report dated September 6, 1974 was submitted from the Downtown Committee containing the following Resolution for consideration of Council:

"That the Downtown Committee endorse a proposal to construct a parking facility of three levels at the Grafton Street Site with the structure being designed and built to accommodate additional storeys for housing in the future."

Alderman Moir felt that Council should accept the endorsement of the Downtown Committee with respect to the parking facility in question and refer the matter to staff for processing and for a report on all facets of such a facility.

Alderman Connolly said there are a number of questions which should be answered with respect to this subject such as who is to pay for such a facility. He noted the area in question is City owned land and suggested that maybe Council should sell the land to the Downtown Business Association and let them build the garage. Alderman Connolly said it is his impression that the City is being asked to build the facility and questioned whether the City is in a position to do so or whether this is one of the priorities.

Alderman MacKeen said it is not the intention of the Downtown Committee that the City build the facility only that the land in question be used for the purpose as outlined in the Resolution and that it be designed to fit in with the rest of the Downtown Plan.

The City Manager suggested that such a facility would be constructed by way of a Call for Proposals if in fact this is what is recommended for the site.

Further discussion ensued and it was MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman MacKeen that the Resolution of the Downtown Committee as contained in the report of the Downtown Committee dated September 6, 1974 be referred to staff for a report to a meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council.

Motion passed.

QUESTIONS

Question Alderman Connolly Re: Religious Holidays

Alderman Connolly said it is his understanding that there are a number of religious holidays coming up next week which may interfere with the Centennial Properties proposed development which was previously considered at tonight's meeting and questioned whether some other arrangements could be made to deal with the matter.

The City Manager advised that what Alderman Connolly has said is true saying the developer has requested that a special meeting of Council be held to deal with the matter.

Alderman Moir suggested that such a meeting would be at the call of the Chair after His Worship and the City Manager have discussed the matter. He suggested that if such a meeting is desirable and the City Manager recommends it, then a meeting should be called whenever possible.

The Acting Mayor advised that he would consult with the City Manager on the subject.

Question Alderman Moir Re: Dilapidated and Semi-dilapidated Buildings

Alderman Moir said he has had considerable complaints regarding the above noted matter saying that he has reported two particular cases to City staff. Alderman Moir said he is not getting the appropriate response regarding these buildings and requested that staff respond and also find some means of resolving the destruction of a neighbourhood by dilapidated buildings.

Question Alderman Moir Re: Clean-Up Week

Alderman Moir noted the City is to have a Clean-up week this Fall saying he has been receiving complaints in his Ward that the problem does not just centre around the Streets. He said there are a number of sidewalks etc., which are dirty and referred particularly to the area of Spring Garden Road at Carlton Street on the south side. Alderman Moir questioned whether the Office of the Mayor could arrange to publicize the upcoming clean-up week and request the schools to get involved and to ask the citizens and businesses to clean up alleyways and the sidewalks fronting their properties.

Question Alderman Stanbury Re: Parking Lots on Robie Street at the rear of the Vocational School

Alderman Stanbury asked if she could be informed within the week whose responsibility it is for the construction of the parking lots at the above location. She said the construction which is taking place is badly cracking the plaster of the homes in the area.

The City Manager said it was her understanding that this was an extension to the school but said it would be investigated.

Question Alderman Sullivan Re: Caterpillar Blight

Alderman Sullivan questioned whether the Caterpillar blight which is affecting trees throughout the City is being looked at in order to bring the situation under control.

The City Solicitor advised that the City had a spraying program in an attempt to deal with the problem, but said the problem is that the caterpillars are nesting in back yards etc., as well as trees saying the problem has not been solved for this reason. He suggested that unless the citizens were to look after their own property, there is no way to deal with the matter.

Alderman Sullivan suggested that a public announcement should be made advising what can be done to bring the problem under control saying he was sure the citizens would be glad to help.

His Worship advised he would contact the Supervisor of Parks and Grounds regarding the matter.

Question Alderman Wentzell Re: Sewer & Water Connections

Alderman Wentzell questioned that if a street in the annexed area has sewer and water, whether it is required that the properties must connect to same.

It was advised that properties would be required to connect to the sewer.

The City Manager said that if it is a specific case, the Alderman should supply her with the details and it could be investigated saying it may be a matter of pumping.

Alderman Wentzell said his question refers to the item 20(a) on tonight's agenda saying he would like to know what the policy is.

Question Alderman Connolly Re: Location of Buildings on Lots

Alderman Connolly referred to a building on Oxford Street on land which was rezoned saying an addition is being put on the front of the building. He said that due to the Zoning, the building is now being extended to the lot line and questioned whether Council could control this in the future so that buildings cannot go beyond other buildings on the street.

The City Solicitor advised that this could be achieved by Building Lines saying that perhaps Council would have to define the situation where this is to be applied. He suggested Council would not want this to take place with all Commercial properties due to the cost of land etc.

Alderman Connolly suggested this is something which should be added to the agenda of a Committee of the Whole meeting in the future.

Question Alderman Connolly Re: Sidewalk Installation -
Young Avenue

Alderman Connolly referred to the sidewalk installation on Young Avenue where the double sidewalk was replaced with a single one. He said the residents felt a double sidewalk would be installed but that they would only have to pay for a normal one and questioned what the situation was with respect to this matter.

Mr. P. Calda of the Engineering and Works Department advised that the 8' sidewalk was replaced with a normal 5' one as after excavation was carried out in the area, it was found that the sidewalk was being affected by the tree roots in the area.

Alderman Connolly questioned whether it was the intention of staff to continue with the 5' sidewalk in the future, and it was suggested by Mr. Calda that this would seem appropriate.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Notice of Motion Alderman MacKeen Re: Speed Limit, Residential
Streets in Halifax

Alderman MacKeen gave notice that at the next regular meeting of City Council to be held on September 26, 1974, he will introduce a Motion that the City of Halifax approach the Provincial Authorities with a request that the speed limit of vehicular traffic on residential streets in the City be set at 20 miles per hour.

ADDED ITEMS

Dilapidated Buildings - Civic No. 34 Circle Drive

A staff report dated September 10, 1974 was submitted relating to the above noted matter.

Alderman Wentzell said he was glad to see that staff is recommending a date be set for a hearing to consider the demolition of the building in question saying he would like to see an earlier date than that recommended in the report if possible.

MOVED by Alderman Wentzell, seconded by Alderman Bell that the date of October 9, 1974, or earlier if possible, be set for a hearing of the assessed owner and others with the object of issuing an order that the building known as Civic No. 34 Circle Drive, be demolished and the site cleared.

Motion passed.

Transferral of Capital Budget Funds and Awarding of Tender 74-132 for the Dentith Road Traffic Improvement Project

A staff report dated September 10, 1974 was submitted on the matter.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Wentzell that:

1. The required City funding be made available by advancing \$156,619.05 (\$275,309. - \$118,689.95) from the 1975 Capital Budget Traffic Improvement block allocation account and that this project be made the prime priority project on the proposed 1975 Capital Budget construction program; and
2. Construction Tender #74-132 as outlined in Appendix "A" of the staff report dated September 10, 1974, for the construction of sewer and roadway work along Dentith Road be awarded to Steed & Evans (Maritime) Ltd., at \$229,424.00.

Motion passed.

C. N. Retaining Wall - Barrington Street

A staff report dated September 11, 1974 was submitted on the above noted matter.

Alderman Sullivan referred to a communication received from the Canadian National Railways in Moncton which in part stated "we consider the degree of urgency suggested in your letter is over emphasizing the matter", and said that the retaining wall is giving way due to the steady flow of heavy vehicles. Alderman Sullivan noted that two sections of the wall have collapsed to date and in view of this, said he hoped staff could further communicate with C.N.R. in hopes of getting something done at once.

The City Manager noted that C.N.R. has stated that work will commence in October of this year.

Alderman Connolly questioned whether there is anything in the City's By-laws regarding dangerous situations whereby the City can make the necessary repairs and bill the owners. He said that where this is a matter of public safety, staff should investigate to see if there is some avenue that can be explored along these lines.

Expropriation - Parcels A1, A3, and G - Lands of Park Projects Limited, Spryfield

A staff report dated September 12, 1974 was submitted relating to the above noted matter.

MOVED by Alderman Wentzell, seconded by Alderman Connolly that the formal Resolution with respect to the Expropriation of Parcels A1, A3, and G, Lands of Park Projects Limited Spryfield, be approved and the City Clerk be instructed to file the appropriate documents in the Registry of Deeds.
Motion passed.

Roadway Improvements & Resurfacing - St. Margaret's Bay Road

A staff report dated September 12, 1974, was submitted relating to the above noted matter.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Wentzell that Council concur with the revised project cost relating to roadway improvements and resurfacing for St. Margaret's Bay Road, and that the required (additional) 50% cost sharing by the City of \$37,850.00:

(\$308,700.00 = \$154,350.00 - \$116,500.00)

2

be funded in a similar manner, that is, from the special grants as received from the Province for roadway maintenance in 1975.

Motion passed.

Miscellaneous Trusts and Sinking Fund Statements

A report dated September 4, 1974 was submitted relating to the above noted matter.

Alderman Moir requested that the City Solicitor's Department should re-assess the various trust funds and look to the thought of having them diverted to something which would be more acceptable in this day and age. Alderman Moir said they are just accumulated funds each year and felt that under the terms of the trust, there is no way of spending the money.

The City Solicitor advised that this is already under way.

Council tabled the Miscellaneous Trusts and Sinking Fund Statements as attached to the report of September 4, 1974.

Sidewalk - Hoyts, Young Street

Alderman Stanbury referred to the sidewalk in front of Hoyts on Young Street saying there has been a great deal of justified discontent among the residents of this area as the sidewalk is not passable. She referred to a letter she received from the City to the effect that the sidewalk is privately owned and asked that this matter be investigated. Alderman Stanbury said it is a dangerous situation with children going to and from school saying it is impossible to use the sidewalk in this area.

The Acting Mayor said the City Manager will investigate the matter.

Report of Proceedings - Sydney Conference - Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities

Alderman Moir at this time gave a verbal report of the above noted conference. With respect to the matter of

the Graham Commission report which he said a great deal of time was spent on, Alderman Moir felt that Council should ask staff to investigate as soon as possible some means whereby Council and senior staff can sit down, preferably for an all day session, on the assessment of the report particularly as it relates to Volume #2 having to do with the role of municipal government as it relates to the Provincial Government.

Alderman Moir suggested that Council must familiarize itself with the report and felt there should be a study session of some sort led by a senior member of staff or by Council to try to come to some conclusions and where Council should move as an elected body. Alderman Moir expressed the hope that Council would agree that staff should report as soon as possible as to how they feel Council can come to grips with respect to this subject.

Report from the Downtown Committee

Alderman MacKeen referred to a report from the Downtown Committee dated September 6, 1974 which contains the following Resolution which he read:

"That the Arts Centre Node be Rezoned from C-2 entirely to P & I, which area is bounded by Spring Garden Road, Brunswick Street, Sackville Street, Argyle Street (Between Sackville and Blowers), and Blowers Street (Between Argyle and Barrington);

That the School Board Building Site be Zoned P & I;

That the Grafton Street Parking Lot Remain as C-2;

That the Remaining Five Blocks Bounded by Brunswick, Duke, Grafton, and Sackville Streets be Zoned R-3;

That Prince and George Streets (Between Brunswick and Grafton Streets) be zoned P & I."

Alderman MacKeen said he wished to refer the matter to the Committee of the Whole at which time a map could be presented and the item discussed.

The City Manager advised that as a result of the Agenda meeting this morning, the item is presently on the agenda of the Committee of the Whole meeting but said staff will not be able to have a report at that time.

MOVED by Alderman MacKeen, seconded by Alderman Sullivan that the matter be placed on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Committee of the Whole for the purposes of debate. Motion passed.

11:40 P. M. - Meeting adjourned.

HEADLINES

Minutes	360
Approval of Order of Business, Additions & Deletions ..	360

Letter of Thanks - Halifax Police Boys' Club	361
PUBLIC HEARINGS AND HEARINGS:	
Hearing - Appeal Against the Decision of the Development Officer in Granting Minor Variance - Case No. 2877 - 6231, 6233, and 6241 Summit Street	361
REPORT - FINANCE & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:	
Appointment of External Auditors 1974	361
Equipment Replacement Account	361
Tender Award - 7 Dump Trucks	362
One Soil Shed - Parks and Grounds Division	362
REPORT - COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL, BOARDS & COMMISSIONS:	
Tender - Reconstruction of St. Agnes School	363
REPORT - CITY PLANNING COMMITTEE:	
Rezoning - R-2 Residential to C-2 General Business - Civic Nos. 2519-21 Oxford Street - Date for Hearing .	364
Application for Modification of the Zoning By-law - Proposed Development - Centennial Properties Limited, Waterfront Lands at Water Street	364
Resubdivision - Convoy Place	367
Convoy Place - Agreement for Easement & Declaration for Encumbrance	367
Block "J" - Cowie Hill	367
Rezoning - Maynard Street - Date for Hearing	367
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:	
Possible Playing Field Site - South Spryfield	367
Resolution Downtown Committee Re: 2 Proposed Office Towers, Salter Street	368
Resolution Downtown Committee Re: Parking Facility Grafton Street Site	369
QUESTIONS:	
Question Alderman Connolly Re: Religious Holidays ...	370
Question Alderman Moir Re: Dilapidated and Semi- dilapidated Buildings	370
Question Alderman Moir Re: Clean-Up Week	370
Question Alderman Stanbury Re: Parking Lots on Robie Street at the rear of the Vocational School	370
Question Alderman Sullivan Re: Caterpillar Blight ...	371
Question Alderman Wentzell Re: Sewer and Water Connections	371
Question Alderman Connolly Re: Location of Buildings on Lots	371
Question Alderman Connolly Re: Sidewalk Installation - Young Avenue	372
NOTICE OF MOTION	
Notice of Motion Alderman MacKeen Re: Speed Limit, Residential Streets in Halifax	372
ADDED ITEMS:	
a Dilapidated Building - Civic No. 34 Circle Drive	372
b Transferal of Capital Budget Funds and Awarding of Tender 74-132 for the Dentith Road Traffic Improve- ment Project	373
c C. N. Retaining Wall - Barrington Street	373
d Expropriation - Parcels A1, A3, and G - Lands of Park Projects Limited, Spryfield	373

Council
September 12, 1974

e	Roadway Improvements & Resurfacing - St. Margaret's Bay Road	374
f	Miscellaneous Trusts and Sinking Fund Statements	374
g	Sidewalk - Hoyts, Young Street	374
h	Report of Proceedings - Sydney Conference - Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities	374
i	Report from the Downtown Committee	375

ACTING MAYOR L. C. HOGAN
CHAIRMAN

E. A. Kerr
Acting City Clerk

CITY COUNCIL - SPECIAL MEETING
PUBLIC HEARINGS
M I N U T E S

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.,
September 18, 1974
8:08 p.m.

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

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

Present: Acting Mayor Hogan, Chairman, Aldermen Bell, Connolly, Meagher, Moir, Stanbury, Stapells, Sullivan and Wentzell.

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

The City Clerk advised that the meeting has been called to consider the following Public Hearings:

1. Closure of a Portion of Birmingham St. from Clyde St. to approximately one hundred and fifty feet in a northerly direction;
2. Closure of a Portion of Dresden Row from Clyde St. to approximately one hundred and ninety feet in a northerly direction;
3. Permanent Closure of the median at Connaught Avenue and Young Street; and
4.
 - (a) To alter and confirm the east street line of Barrington St. from Duke St. to Buckingham, seven (7) feet to the east;
 - (b) To alter and confirm the north street line of Duke St. from Granville St. to Barrington St., ten (10) feet to the north;
 - (c) To confirm the east street line of Barrington St. from Buckingham St. north to Cogswell St. Interchange Ramp;
 - (d) To confirm the southwest street line of Cogswell St. Interchange Ramp from Barrington St. three hundred (300) ft. southeastwardly.

The City Clerk also advised that the Committee of the Whole, at its meeting held this afternoon, requested that another item be added as follows:

Date for Public Hearing - Street Closure of Brockley Lane between Summer Street and Tower Road.

The Chairman briefly outlined the procedure which will be followed this evening for the benefit of those present in the gallery. 8:15 p.m. Alderman MacKeen arrives.

Special Council,
Public Hearings,
September 18, 1974

Public Hearing - Closure of a Portion of Birmingham Street from Clyde St. to approximately one hundred and fifty feet in a northerly direction and Closure of a Portion of Dresden Row from Clyde St. to approximately one hundred and ninety feet in a northerly direction.

The Chairman suggested that although these items were advertised as separate public hearings, persons could speak on either of them or both.

The City Clerk advised that these items had been properly advertised and that two letters have been received from Mr. G. B. Robertson, solicitor for the Spring Garden Merchants Association and Mr. R. Kenneth McGeorge of the Halifax Infirmary requesting that permission be given for representations to be made to Council.

Mr. C. L. Dodge of the Development Department outlined the proposal with the aid of sketch diagrams showing the portions of streets proposed to be closed and the resultant layout of the parking area.

Alderman Stapells was concerned that if the parking area is enlarged and paved, it would prevent any future development on the land which was primarily assembled for development.

The City Solicitor advised that in any Management Agreement which is negotiated between the City and the Spring Garden Merchants Association, this eventuality can be referred to

The Chairman then asked if any persons present wished to speak in favour of the street closures.

Mr. G. B. Robertson, solicitor for the Spring Garden Merchants Association addressed Council and referred to his letter of September 16, 1974. He spoke of the need for a Management Agreement which would assist in the financing of the fencing and paving of the parking area. He urged that the streets be closed so that the parking area can be expanded to serve a vital need in the area.

No other persons indicated a wish to speak in favour of the street closures.

The Chairman then asked if any persons present wished to speak against the street closures.

Mr. L. A. Wilson, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Halifax Infirmary submitted and read a brief which stressed the need for some long-term parking solutions in the area. (A copy of this brief is attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting).

Several questions were asked of Mr. Wilson relating to the need for parking in connection with the Hospital and Mr. Wilson reported on discussions which have taken place

with respect to this need.

It was suggested that Mr. Wilson discuss the possible use of the Spring Garden Area parking lot during the evening hours for patients and visitors to the Hospital with the Spring Garden Merchants Association and Mr. Wilson agreed to do this.

It was ascertained that the parking area will be lighted and paved if approval is given to the street closures.

In response to a question from the Chairman, no other persons indicated a wish to speak on this item.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Meagher that the matter be forwarded to Council without recommendation. Motion passed.

Public Hearing: Permanent Closure of the median at Connaught Avenue and Young Street

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

The City Clerk advised that the matter has been properly advertised and that considerable correspondence has been received to which he would refer later.

Mr. F. Bradbrooke, Traffic Engineer, explained the situation with the aid of sketch diagrams and stated that Staff are recommending the permanent closure of the median at this location, it having reduced accidents considerably and lightened the traffic load on Young Street.

A number of questions were asked with respect to traffic counts and Mr. Bradbrooke reported that the bulk of the Young Street traffic is now using Bayers Road, but that the traffic on Cork Street has increased by some 359 vehicles per day.

The Chairman then asked if any person present wished to speak in favour of the permanent closure of the median.

Mr. Wayne Selig addressed the meeting and referred to two petitions signed by 39 and 34 persons respectively, in favour of the permanent closure of the median.

A number of questions were asked of Mr. Selig by members of the Council.

No other persons indicated a wish to speak in favour of the permanent closure of the median.

Special Council,
Public Hearings,
September 18, 1974

The City Clerk advised that letters were received from the following persons in favour of the median closing:

G. T. Oldfield, 2717 Windsor St. #308
Evelyn C. Young, 6457-61 Young St., #11
Harold Todd, 6577 Young St.
W. T. Garnett, 6468 Young St.

The Chairman then asked if any persons wished to speak against the closing of the median.

Mrs. E. C. Wheeler of 3030 Connaught Avenue spoke in support of a letter she had written outlining her reasons why she does not favour the permanent closing of the median at Young Street. She considered that all that is necessary are signs at each median from Bayers Road to Almon Street stating "No left turn 4 p.m. to 6 p.m."

Mr. Graeme Hicks of Young Street, spoke against the permanent closing and stated that the drive straight through Young Street from Barrington Street is a convenient way to reach the Shopping Centre. He said that he and members of his family now use Cork Street, making it necessary to make two left turns.

Mrs. Frank Beazley addressed Council in support of a petition signed by 96 persons reading as follows:

" We the undersigned residents and home owners of Cork Street are hereby against the use of Cork Street as a thoroughfare for all heavy duty vehicles such as trucks, moving vans, etc. We hereby attach our signature to this petition in protest of this usage.

We sincerely sympathise with the problems of the people living on Young Street have with vehicular traffic, but we feel the residents of Cork Street should not now take over their burden. We feel an alternate route (commercial route) should proceed along Connaught Avenue and then up Bayers Road to the destination involved."

In reply to a question, the City Solicitor said that enforcement of the truck route scheme is required since Cork Street is not a part of the designated truck route.

No other persons indicated a wish to speak in opposition to the median closure.

The City Clerk advised that correspondence was received opposing the closing from the following:

Frank N. McCarthy, 6537 Cork St.
Shaf AlMolky, 3046 Connaught Avenue
Petition signed by four property owners.

MOVED by Alderman Stapells, seconded by Alderman Connolly that the matter be forwarded to Council without recommendation. Motion passed.

Public Hearing:

- (a) To alter and confirm the east street line of Barrington Street from Duke Street to Buckingham Street, seven (7) feet to the east;
 - (b) To alter and confirm the north street line of Duke St. from Granville St. to Barrington St. ten (10) feet to the north;
 - (c) To confirm the east street line of Barrington St. from Buckingham St. north to Cogswell St. Interchange Ramp;
 - (d) To confirm the southwest street line of Cogswell St. Interchange Ramp from Barrington St. three hundred (300) ft. southeastwardly.
-

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

The City Clerk advised that the matter has been duly advertised but that no correspondence has been received for or against the items.

Mr. C. L. Dodge of the Development Department explained the proposals and indicated the areas on a sketch map displayed

The City Manager referred to and read a letter from the General Manager of the Halifax Transit Corporation stating the need for the widening of Duke Street between Granville Street and Barrington Street to permit proper turning movements for transit vehicles.

The Chairman asked if any person present wished to speak in favour of the matters.

No person indicated a wish to speak.

The Chairman then asked if any persons present wished to speak against the street lines.

Mr. George Cooper, solicitor for the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, submitted and read a brief opposing the widening of Duke Street between Granville and Barrington Streets. (A Copy of this brief is attached to the Official Minutes of this meeting).

Mr. L. W. Collins, Chairman, Halifax Landmarks Commission spoke in opposition to the widening of Duke Street between Granville Street and Barrington Street. He was concerned about the Prince of Wales building at the corner of Duke and Granville Streets which might have to be demolished or moved at enormous cost.

Mr. James Brown of Durham Leaseholds Ltd. stated that in the Agreement between the Company and Historic Properties, the Company has covenanted to retain the frontage of the Prince of Wales building on Duke Street. He made reference to the other proposed street lines and expressed some concern about the location of the bus bay on Barrington Street.

Special Council,
Public Hearings,
September 18, 1974

Mr. Jim Baird of the Ecology Action Centre spoke in opposition to the widening of Duke Street between Granville and Barrington Streets. He suggested that in the future, the transit vehicles might well be serving the historic buildings complex on the waterfront and not be using Granville Street to turn on to Duke Street, but would be turning closer to the water.

Mrs. Helen Stewart of Preston Street felt that the laying down of these street lines is being done in a piece-meal fashion. She felt that it is not necessary to widen Duke Street to permit transit vehicles to turn more easily and referred to the possibility of a regional transportation system in the future when mini-buses might be in use.

Mr. George Rogers of the Heritage Trust spoke in opposition to the widening of Duke Street between Granville and Barrington Streets and expressed concern about the Prince of Wales building.

Mrs. Phyllis Blakeley of 2160 Connaught Avenue spoke against the widening of Duke Street and briefly outlined the history of the Prince of Wales building. She said that her grandfather once had a dry goods business in this building and it is of great historical significance.

Mr. John Fiske of Historic Properties suggested that a solution might be found to the traffic difficulties on Duke Street if it is made one-way going west from the waterfront to Barrington Street and if George Street is made one-way going east from Barrington Street to the waterfront. He also suggested that the bus stop presently at the corner of Duke and Barrington Street should be eliminated.

Mr. George Balcom spoke in opposition to the street lines proposed for Barrington Street and he contended that the street should be much wider than is proposed because of the present traffic congestion. He suggested that Barrington Street be widened along the three blocks, George Street to the Cogswell Street Interchange.

The Council heard briefly from Mr. Dodge who explained a few of the points raised.

No other persons indicated a wish to speak on the matter.

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman Sullivan that the matter be forwarded to Council without recommendation. Motion passed.

DATE FOR HEARING - STREET CLOSURE OF BROCKLEY LANE BETWEEN
SUMMER STREET AND TOWER ROAD

This item was referred to Council from the meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council held this afternoon.

The City Clerk advised that a date must be set for

a public hearing into the above matter.

The City Clerk recommended the hearing be held on November 6, 1974.

Since there appeared to be some urgency on this item and it was hoped that it could be resolved by the end of October, it was MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Meagher that the date for the public hearing to consider the Street Closure of Brockley Lane between Summer Street and Tower Road be held at the regular Council Meeting on October 17, 1974. Motion passed.

10:50 p.m. Council adjourned.

HEADLINES

Public Hearing - Closure of a Portion of Birmingham Street from Clyde Street to approximately one hundred and fifty feet in a northerly direction and Closure of a Portion of Dresden Row from Clyde Street to approximately one hundred and ninety feet in a northerly direction.	379
Public Hearing - Permanent Closure of the Median at Connaught Avenue and Young Street	380
Public Hearing:	
(a) To alter and confirm the east street line of Barrington Street from Duke St. to Buckingham St. seven (7) feet to the east;	
(b) To alter and confirm the north street line of Duke St. from Granville St. to Barrington St. ten (10) feet to the north;	
(c) To confirm the east street line of Barrington St. from Buckingham St. north to Cogswell St. Interchange Ramp;	
(d) To confirm the southwest street line of Cogswell St. Interchange Ramp from Barrington St. three hundred (300) ft. southeastwardly.	382
Date for Hearing - Street Closure of Brockley Lane between Summer Street and Tower Road	383

ACTING MAYOR L. C. HOGAN
CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD
CITY CLERK

HALIFAX INFIRMARY

1335 QUEEN ST., HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA



AREA CODE 902 429-9111

Brief to City Council, Halifax, N.S., September 18, 1974, 8:00 p.m., regarding the closure of sections of Dresden Row and Birmingham Street, reference public notices DP-706,707, Halifax Herald.

Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Halifax, we, the Board of Directors of the Halifax Infirmary wish to present to you certain statements related to the above in the hope that in so doing we may emphasize the extremely serious situation which exists in the vicinity of the Halifax Infirmary relative to parking.

First of all, let me emphasize that our Board of Directors do not oppose per se the closure of portions of Dresden Row and Birmingham Street. We believe that any measure which will increase the number of parking spaces for use by the general public in the area of the Halifax Infirmary is commendable indeed.

However, we hasten to point out that the measure in question can be viewed merely as a stop-gap measure which hardly affects the long-term problem at all.

The Halifax Infirmary is the second largest hospital in the City (and in the province of Nova Scotia) which provides a full range of health services to the entire city of Halifax. In addition, a very large number of our patients come from Dartmouth, Spryfield, Sackville, and other peripheral communities, which means that because of the lack of adequate public transportation, many of these people are forced to use automobile transportation. Furthermore, each day some 2,500 employees, medical staff, students and visitors come to our hospital.

By all reasonable standards, this hospital should be able to provide a minimum of 350 parking spaces for patients, staff, and visitors, yet we now have only 30 spaces which, out of necessity, have been assigned to specific people. Currently we provide no visitor and patient parking, and only 30 employee parking spaces. Efforts to effect an arrangement with the Spring Garden Merchants Association for the assignment of certain spaces for hospital parking have not met with any success.

Indeed, we recognize that the problem of parking in the areas in question is a very complex one involving considerations such as the adequacy of public transportation, city transportation policy, the development of available space, and others.

Recommendation

Since it is obvious that the Spring Garden merchants, the Halifax Infirmary, the Province (i.e. Nova Scotia Technical College), the City, and the Halifax Transit Corporation have a large stake in this matter, and since the problem really is of crisis proportions, we would recommend that action on the closure of Dresden Row and Birmingham Street be deferred only until the previously mentioned groups are able to jointly work out a realistic comprehensive plan to alleviate the parking problem in the area in question.

Respectfully submitted,

L. A. Wilson, Chairman
Board of Directors
Halifax Infirmary

NOVA SCOTIA COLLEGE OF ART AND DESIGN

SUBMISSION TO BE MADE TO HALIFAX CITY COUNCIL AT PUBLIC HEARING
September 18, 1974

Your Worship and Aldermen,

For the record, my name is George Cooper, and I am the solicitor for the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design. The College opposes the widening of Duke Street between Barrington and Granville Streets.

So that everyone will understand the story behind the preservation of the historic precinct between Scotia Square and the Halifax Harbour and to the north of Duke Street, I think it is important that I dwell for a moment on the facts leading up to today's meeting.

In the spring of 1971, having determined to preserve what was left of the historic waterfront area (if this were economically possible), City Council issued a call for proposals for the preservation of this historic area. It consisted only of the area to the east of Water Street, between Water Street and the Harbour, and between the Court House and the parking lot on the site of the victualling depot, not the area between Scotia Square and Water Street, sometimes called the "Upper Area". By this time the College had decided it wanted to move to these areas - both the Halifax Waterfront Area and the Upper Area - for two reasons. First, the College believed the areas were architecturally worthy of preservation. And secondly, the College believed it was important for a college of art to mix as closely with the people of its city as

possible, and vice versa, and these areas provided enough space for this purpose. For these reasons the College decided to support any developer who wished to move to the historic area, by agreeing to rent 116,000 square feet of space from that developer, located in both areas.

I do not need to tell Council how vitally important such a commitment is to the developer of any project. If you do not have guaranteed tenants, you cannot finance your project, and it is bound to fall to the ground. And I want to say that if the College had not agreed to be the tenant of Historic Properties Limited, both in the waterfront area and in the Upper Area, today there would be no Historic Waterfront Area such as Council wished, no Upper Area restored and refurbished as it is now, and no historic precinct in Halifax.

Now the College was concerned, and Historic too, about saving the original streetscape of Granville Street. The streetscape - i.e., the facades on both sides of Granville Street - were seen by the developer and the College as vitally important to both the quality of the historic project as a whole, and also the commercial success of it. Consequently, the developer and the College agreed that the Prince of Wales building at the corner of Duke and Granville Streets, and one other building on the west side of Granville Street, should be purchased. This effectively prevented any other developer from buying up that block, tearing the buildings down, and putting up a modern building.

I want to emphasize that this was not done to prevent commercial uses in the historic project. Quite the contrary. The overall project of Historic Properties Limited is highly commercial, at the wish of both the College and Historic. It will yield large commercial revenues, and high taxes to the City. It is not a scheme of historic preservation subsidized by the civic tax payer.

I return to the sequence of events leading up to this meeting.

In April 1972, the final leasing arrangements were agreed to, the agreement for the leasing and preservation of the area was signed, and Historic Properties Limited took the whole package to a mortgage company and obtained a mortgage for almost five million dollars. In the meantime, Durham Leaseholds Limited had purchased all of the buildings in the block between Barrington and Granville Streets, except the two key buildings (including the Prince of Wales building) over which the College and Historic had control. Durham had also purchased a building on the east side of Granville Street.

Then in June of 1972, the City on its own initiative began a moratorium on building in the downtown area, including the Historic Waterfront Area, the Upper Area and various other blocks. The purpose of the moratorium was to permit all those interested in downtown development, especially developers, to come together and arrive at a mutually satisfactory scheme for both preservation and development.

The moratorium continued for six months, and then a month or two extra. At the end of this period, City Council

adopted on March 29, 1973 the following resolution:-

"As recommended by the Committee of the Whole Council and the Department of Development of the City wherein it was expressed that City Council feels that the Granville Street area; Duke Street to Buckingham Street and both sides of Granville Street to the waterfront should be saved, and Council work toward this end to see it developed."

As a direct result of City Council's expressed intention to preserve this area, and in particular both sides of Granville Street, the two contending developers, Durham Leaseholds Limited and Historic Properties Limited, and the College, got together and agreed they must come up with a scheme to preserve Granville Street. After lengthy negotiations, they entered into an agreement on December 5, 1973. Under it, Historic and the College agreed to give Durham the two buildings on the west side of Granville Street, and Durham agreed to give Historic and the College its building on the east side of Granville Street. There was also a cash adjustment. This Agreement permitted Durham to go ahead and develop the block between Barrington and Granville Streets, but on condition that Durham preserve the facades on the west side of Granville Street. Likewise, Historic was to preserve the facades on the east side of Granville Street. All this was done with the encouragement of Council, but with no financial assistance from any government. It cost the tax payers of the City of Halifax not a penny. And Council knows well that Durham and Historic have already gone to a great deal of trouble and expense in planning to preserve these facades in keeping with their agreement.

And so the historic precinct of Halifax of which we are all so proud was born - through the joint action of Council, the two developers, and the College - all with the blessing of the mortgage company which agreed to put up a large portion of the financing costs.

Now it is proposed that Council reverse its direction and change the whole basis on which this agreement was entered into in good faith between the two developers and the College. Remember, Historic and the College gave up control of the subject block by agreeing to the sale of the Prince of Wales building) on condition that these facades be preserved. The action now suggested - which is in direct conflict with Council's resolution of March 29, 1973 on which the agreement among the developers and the College is based - would mean the College and Historic have given up their control of the area, without receiving their side of the bargain - preservation of the facades and the original streetscape. In my submission, Council would not be serving the City well if it were now to go back on its resolution of March 29, 1973 - on which all subsequent actions of the two developers and the College were based - and put a hole through the agreement with Durham of December 5, 1973.

I point out that it was not until December 13, 1973 - eight days after this agreement was entered into - that this whole idea about widening the street was raised at the special meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council. Yet the City was kept continuously informed of the progress of the December

5 agreement as it was being negotiated - indeed Council encouraged the agreement from the beginning. And the Mayor was given a copy on the day it was executed.

The second point I want to make is short. Others will be speaking of the valuable architecture of the area. I will simply point out that my client takes the position that this Prince of Wales facade is one of the very important keys to this historic precinct. Council's whole idea, and that of the developers and the College too, in calling for preservation of the Granville facades in the first place was to keep intact the only streetscape of its period still remaining in North America. Balance on both sides of the street is all important. If you knock out the Prince of Wales building or alter its position, you have lost that balance. It is like having half a haircut. You have destroyed the main entranceway to the historic precinct of Halifax. The Council, the developers, the College - and, most important, the citizens of Halifax - will be the losers.

Finally, let me say just this. A great deal of acrimony and bitterness has been generated over some recent development projects, because of firmly-held views on both sides of the particular issue. Here, however, there is no controversy at all: everyone is agreed - the two developers, the College, the Heritage Trust, most citizens (I suggest) - and you, the Council, as expressed in your resolution of March 29, 1973. Our historic precinct is not much - only about five acres. Let us not cut it down further for the sake of

- 7 -

widening a short street. Let us not harm at the outset the development of a historic precinct of which we can all be proud.

CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
MINUTES

Council Chamber
City Hall
Halifax, N. S.
September 19, 1974
3:15 P.M.

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

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

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

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

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

1. Case No. 3054 - Commercial Developments (Maritime) Ltd.
Proposed Office Tower, Barrington St. at George St.
2. Case No. 3085 - Lands of Commercial Developments
Maritimes Ltd. - Proposed Office Towers - Salter St.
- Modification of Height Setback and Consolidation

It was agreed that Case No. 3054 be considered at a meeting of Committee of the Whole Council and that Council now consider Case No. 3085.

Case No. 3085 - Lands of Commercial Developments Maritimes Ltd.
- Proposed Office Towers - Salter St. - Modification of
Height Setback and Consolidation

A staff report dated September 13, 1974, was submitted for consideration.

In response to a question whether the City Manager has had further response from the Provincial Government re the proposed Waterfront Development, His Worship advised that the City Manager at this time was meeting with members of the Provincial Government re the proposal.

It was agreed that discussion of this item be deferred pending the City Manager's attendance.

MOVED by Alderman Moir, seconded by Alderman MacKeen,
that the meeting adjourn to Committee of the Whole Council.
Motion passed.

Special Meeting
Committee of the Whole
September 19, 1974

Council convened in Committee of the Whole with the same members in attendance.

Case No. 3054 - Commercial Developments (Maritime) Ltd.
- Proposed Office Tower, Barrington St. at George St.

A report dated September 13, 1974, was submitted by staff.

Mr. B. Algee, Development Dept., with the aid of diagrams and sketches, reviewed briefly the proposal, staff's recommendations made at previous meetings, and the status of negotiations with the developers of the whole block re these recommendations. He stated that staff is recommending that the modifications not be considered until the developers get together and work out a design for the whole block.

Alderman Connolly entered the meeting at 3:25 P.M.

Mr. Algee then responded to questions from members of Council.

Mr. R. Grant, Director of Development, responded to questions from members of Council, stating that there are developments that can proceed on this particular block but due to the significance of the block, staff had hoped that there would be some sort of comprehensive design for the whole block and think it would be unfortunate if the developments proposed were not blended one to the other.

MOVED by Alderman Sullivan, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that the application for lot consolidation and setback modification be approved.

Mr. Grant suggested that representatives of the developers involved be heard.

MOVED by Alderman Sullivan, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that representatives of the developers of the block under discussion be heard. Motion passed.

3:50 P.M. - His Worship Acting Mayor Hogan retired from the meeting and Alderman Meagher assumed the Chair.

Mr. R. Medjuck, representing Commercial Developments Maritimes Ltd., explained the difficulty in obtaining a comprehensive development for the whole site, reviewed briefly their proposed development and its history, indicating that in the context of what the proposal is, the benefits to the City, the attempts made re materials used, setbacks on Barrington St., the lowness on Granville St., the setback of eight ft. on George St., these constitute a fairly strong compromise to a very nice building which is designed as a very prestigious and important building.

Special Meeting
Committee of the Whole
September 19, 1974

Mr. Medjuck then responded to questions from members of Council.

The City Manager entered the meeting at 4:00 P.M.

Mr. J. Brown, representing Durham Leaseholds Ltd., stated his company has not made application for setback modifications etc., to date. With the aid of plans, Mr. Brown illustrated their proposal, indicating the consequences to the development of complying with staff's suggested changes, and responded to questions from members of Council.

It was agreed by Alderman Sullivan and Alderman Stanbury that the motion be amended to read "that the application for lot consolidation and setback modification be approved subject to the view planes legislation".

Alderman MacKeen asked if it would be possible, before the next Council meeting, to have staff prepare an urban design criteria showing schematically or in some manner what staff considers the ideal for the site. Considerable discussion ensued re the request during which the City Manager advised that part of the request is available, some is already listed in the report submitted by staff, but she did not know whether it is possible to present something concrete within the specified time limit.

The motion was then put and passed.

4:45 P.M. - meeting adjourned.

The meeting reconvened in Council at 4:45 p.m. with the same members in attendance.

Application for Resubdivision, Lot Consolidation and Modification of the Zoning Bylaw - Proposed Development, Commercial Developments (Maritimes) Limited, Waterfront Lands at Water Street - Case No. 3085

The City Manager advised that her late arrival at this meeting was due to her attendance at a meeting with provincial and federal officials re the proposed waterfront redevelopment wherein specific proposals were not discussed but rather the mechanics of getting a waterfront development proposal off the ground. She stated the strong indication is that a waterfront development is very definitely going forward and at this point it is a matter of working out the mechanics.

Special Meeting,
City Council,
September 19, 1974

Alderman Moir stated that the indication is that something real is going to happen and he was fearful that if Council approves of this development, it may well, to a degree, jeopardize the major plan. He felt that Council should not proceed at this time and should wait for the negotiations and indicated to Council that the present owners, if their plan could meld with the major waterfront development, they will be no worse off for waiting.

Alderman Sullivan read a letter addressed to him, dated August 28, 1974, from the Minister of Development for the Province of Nova Scotia. He stated that as of September 19, 1974, Council is no further ahead than they were on August 28, 1974. He stated that the proposal meets the zoning bylaw regulations and the view planes legislation.

MOVED by Alderman Sullivan, seconded by Alderman Stanbury that:

- (1) the application for modification of the height setback requirements to permit the construction of a 16 and a 20 storey office building on Blocks B-2 and D-2 respectively as shown on Plan No. P200/6664 of Case No. 3085 be granted by City Council;
- (2) As shown on Plan No. P200/6664 of Case No. 3085, City Council approve Blocks B-1, B-2, D-1 and D-2 as separate lots; Blocks A and C as part of Lower Water Street;
- (3) As shown on Plan No. P200/6664 of Case No. 3085, City Council approve Block E as a separate parcel of land and authorize City staff to negotiate its purchase.

Alderman Stanbury stated she believed it is logical and intelligent to approve this proposal and suggested that the waterfront be kept as a waterfront and not developed with frills.

Alderman Connolly stated he supported an overall waterfront development from the beginning and is still in favour of such a development but with a year's stall by the Provincial government, the City is still hoping something will indeed happen but cannot be too sure. He suggested that perhaps one way to initiate action is to approve a project such as the one being presented.

Alderman Bell stated he will vote for the motion and agreed with the previous speaker's comments. He felt that the proposal will blend with an overall waterfront proposal.

Alderman MacKeen stated that the fact remains that Council is approving one building as opposed to a project. He stated that perhaps other levels of government have not moved as quickly as they were wanted to but Council should take into consideration that there is a great deal of merit in the fact that a development take place in one package.

Special Meeting
City Council
September 19, 1974

Alderman MacKeen suggested that should Council give approval at this time, it may indicate to the other levels of government that it is not interested in the project as a whole and the changing value of land and costs to the other levels of government that such an approval might entail should be taken into consideration. He suggested that it is Council's duty re the value of the whole project, not demeaning the value of the present one before Council, to delay it. If approval is given at this time, Council will be acting in great haste and showing some disinterest in the whole project which might be of some great value.

Alderman Stapells stated that a representative of Y & R Developments Ltd. stated before Council he saw no reason, if Council deemed it wise and gave favourable approval to this proposal, it could not be incorporated into the overall waterfront scheme. He further stated that Mr. Medjuck at that same time stated he would be willing to have his architects work with the architects for the proposed waterfront development to incorporate both schemes. Alderman Stapells stated he did not see why Council should delay a project which at this time meets all zoning regulations and view planes legislation.

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

FOR: Aldermen Bell, Connolly, Stanbury, Stapells, Sullivan and Wentzell

AGAINST: Aldermen MacKeen and Moir

Alderman MacKeen gave notice that at the next regular meeting of City Council to be held on September 26, 1974, he would move reconsideration of the foregoing motion.

Meeting adjourned - 5:20 P.M.

HEADLINES

Case No. 3085 - Lands of Commercial Developments Maritimes Ltd. - Proposed Office Towers - Salter St. - Modification of Height Setback and Consolidation 384, 386
Case No. 3054 - Commercial Developments (Maritime) Ltd. - Proposed Office Tower, Barrington St. at George St. 385

ALDERMAN N. P. MEAGHER
CHAIRMAN

R. H. STODDARD
CITY CLERK

SPECIAL COUNCIL - PUBLIC HEARING
M I N U T E S

Joseph Howe School
Maynard St., Halifax
September 24, 1974
8:05 P.M.

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

Present: His Worship Acting Mayor Hogan, Chairman; Aldermen Connolly, Bell, MacKeen, Meagher, Moir, Stanbury, Stapells and Wentzell.

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

His Worship advised that the meeting was called to consider an application for rezoning of Civic Nos. 2544-2550 (Lots 10 & 11) Maynard St., Lot 11, Maynard St. and Lot 35, Charles St., and one-half of Lot 36, Charles St., from R-3, Multiple Dwelling Zone, to C-2, General Business Zone.

This matter was duly advertised and one letter of objection was received from M. M. Millett, 5678 North St., Halifax, N. S.

Mr. B. Davidson, Development Department, with the aid of a map, explained the application for rezoning and indicated that the purpose of the application is to construct a new building on the site to be leased to the Nova Scotia Liquor Commission for a retail outlet.

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

Mr. Murray Warrington addressed the meeting in support of the application and read a brief, copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Mr. S. McInnes, representing the applicant, explained that the reason this particular site was chosen was that Dominion Stores have agreed that their premises can be used to accommodate additional parking. He also stated that this area is over one-third commercially zoned at present and he felt that traffic problems would not increase. Mr. McInnes then responded to questions from members of Council.

Alderman Sullivan entered the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Mr. Buddy Day addressed the meeting and stated he has two young children attending Joseph Howe School. He indicated that he had no objection to the rezoning. He submitted a letter containing eight signatures of residents of the area who were not opposed to the application. He also submitted a letter from Mr. & Mrs. A Chandler which states they are not opposed as well.