

CHEBUCTO COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 1, 1999

THOSE PRESENT: Councillor Bill Stone, Chair
Councillor Russell Walker
Councillor Stephen D. Adams

ALSO PRESENT: Kulvinder Dhillon, Director, Engineering & Transportation
Sandra Shute, Assistant Municipal Clerk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Invocation	4
2.	Approval of Minutes - December 7, 1998	4
3.	Approval of the Order of Business and Approval of Additions and Deletions ..	4
4.	Business Arising Out of the Minutes	
4.1	Status Sheet Items	
4.1.1	Snow Removal from Sidewalks	4
4.1.2	Dumping - Harrietsfield and Williamswood and Possibility of Gate	5
4.1.3	Feasibility of Community Transit - Sambro/Harrietsfield	5
4.1.4	Highway 102 and Lacewood Drive Interchange	5
4.1.5	Legal Matter - 823 Herring Cove Road	5
4.1.6	4 Melville Avenue	5
5.	Motions of Reconsideration - None	11
6.	Motions of Rescission - None	11
7.	Consideration of Deferred Business - None	11
8.	Public Hearings - None	11
9.	Correspondence, Petitions and Delegations	
9.1	Delegations	
9.1.1	Halifax Regional Development Agency - Progress Report on Activities for 1998/99 Based on Current Business Plan	11
10.	Reports - None	13
11.	Motions - None	13

12.	Added Items	
12.1	Request for Mailbox at 3 Ford Street	13
12.2	Tax Rate for Fergusons Cove Area	13
13.	Notices of Motion - None	13
14.	Public Participation	13
15.	Next Meeting Date	16
16.	Adjournment	16

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. with an Invocation at 2750 Dutch Village Road, Halifax.

Councillor Adams referred to last month's cancelled meeting, outlined what had been done to notify residents of the cancellation and why it had been cancelled. He expressed sincere apologies on behalf of Community Council members and staff for any inconvenience to residents but noted that the article that appeared in the Sunday issue of the Mail Star was unfortunate and published in error.

Councillor Stone advised that Councillor Hanson had submitted his resignation from Halifax Regional Council effective February 2, 1999 due to ill health. He noted Councillor Hanson's valuable contributions to Regional Council and Community Council and previously with the former City of Halifax. He acknowledged Councillor Hanson's dedication to serving his community and its citizens.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - DECEMBER 7, 1998**

MOVED by Councillors Adams and Walker to approve the Minutes of meeting held on December 7, 1998 as circulated. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

3. **APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS**

Added Item: Request for Mailbox at 3 Ford Street - Councillor Walker
Tax Rate for Fergusons Cove Area - Councillor Adams

MOVED by Councillors Adams and Walker to approve the Order of Business as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. **BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES**

4.1 **Status Sheet Items**

4.1.1 **Snow Removal from Sidewalks**

Councillor Walker requested a report from staff as to the new assessments to see what effect there would be on area rates since assessments were up. Since the Municipal Government Act comes into effect on April 1, 1999, he also wanted staff to advise what the

area rate would be if applied to commercial. He requested this information for the next meeting.

4.1.2 Dumping - Harrietsfield and Williamswood and Possibility of Gate

On-going discussion is taking place with Department of Transportation.

4.1.3 Feasibility of Community Transit - Sambro/Harrietsfield Area

Councillor Adams requested that the same type of report be provided for this item as has been requested with regard to snow removal from sidewalks.

For the benefit of the public, Councillor Stone advised that with the new Municipal Government Act, there was a possibility of the area rate being included on commercial assessment as well as residential.

4.1.4 Highway 102 and Lacewood Drive Interchange

Kulvinder Dhillon, Director of Engineering and Transportation Services advised verbally that the Municipality and Department of Transportation are proceeding with a joint design concept report which was expected to be available shortly. He provided information on the proposed improvements for the on and off ramps, synchronization, pedestrian movement and possible upgrades by Bayers Lake Industrial Park for sidewalk, widening of ditch and landscaping.

Councillor Stone said he was concerned with getting the project included in the 1999/2000 budget as he assumed there would be cost sharing involved with improvements. In response, Mr. Dhillon said the cost of ramps and lights would be subject to discussion. The Municipality paid half the cost of the interchange and the province designed it. He understood that since they owned the structure, the province would look after future upgrading.

4.1.5 Legal Matter - 823 Herring Cove Road

No report. Councillor Adams expressed concern that the report has been outstanding for two months when it was a simple request. The Clerk advised she had already followed up but would do so again.

4.1.6 4 Melville Avenue

An Information Report dated January 13, 1999 was before Community Council. Community Council members agreed to hear from the public in this regard but, prior to

that, to obtain information from Kulvinder Dhillon, Director of Engineering and Transportation.

Mr. Dhillon advised that staff dealt with this issue for more than a year and had tried to come up with a compromise for both sides. He offered to answer questions after hearing from the public.

Mr. Albert Gibson, 6 Melville Avenue stated that the only thing that was not addressed by staff was the fact that the two driveways are together and there is some overlap. Overall, however, he felt it was the best solution possible. He did not know what the legalities were of driving over each other's driveway. He felt there should be some separation but did not know how much. If the driveway was moved any further east down Melville, it would become steeper and it was hard enough to get out. Mr. Hynes had the option of going further and splitting with each giving a little. Mr. Hynes went over to his 20' mark but that was forcing the rest to push down further to allow for a buffer. He was prepared to give up 2-4' to settle the matter even though he felt he had given enough; however, it was in front of his house so he felt the permit should be in his name and he would control the buffer zone and greenbelt. Landscaping was a big issue and he had to look at it every single day out his window.

Dr. Laurie Mallery, 14 Melville Avenue advised she was a physician and required to be on call. The last snowfall it took six attempts at night before she could get out of her driveway. This problem did not occur before the driveway was changed. Her concern was her safety, the safety of her children and having a negotiable driveway.

Dr. Mallery advised that she and her husband developed the property that is now 4 through 10 Melville Avenue and at their expense they were included in the subdivision because they could not safely exit. They incurred considerable cost for a new driveway for that purpose. From 1994 through 1998, there was a driveway that everyone could use safely and efficiently. Mr. Hynes purchased his property when the driveway was already in place knowing its configuration. Mr. Hynes asked for a permit to construct his own driveway which was initially denied and which would encroach over the driveway in use. She felt there should not be any further cost incurred. Money has already been spent accommodating the changes made. Concern had been expressed that even minor changes to the driveway moving it in an easterly direction would make it much more difficult to exit the driveway in snowy weather because there would be a higher grade and a left hand turn just at the point where you enter onto Melville Avenue.

Nevertheless, despite objections, Dr. Mallery said that Mr. Dhillon finally granted permission to Mr. Hynes to construct a driveway and they were forced to move the driveway easterly. Mr. Hynes' driveway could easily have been constructed much further to the west. There was never agreement to construction of Mr. Hynes' driveway although

at one time there was temporary agreement but subsequently concerns were expressed by the residents. It was finally decided that if the residents wanted the permit revoked, they would have to consult their own lawyer.

In order to have a safe and reasonable access onto Melville Avenue, Dr. Mallery stated that there was a need to go in a straight direction onto Melville Avenue without turning left. M. E. Donovan, Solicitor for the Municipality was consulted as to whether or not there was a legal right to drive over Mr. Hynes' portion of his driveway that was in fact HRM property.

Dr. Mallery then quoted a portion of the response provided by M. E. Donovan as referred to in the written text provided.

Dr. Mallery advised that Mr. Hynes has been constructing barriers and actually puts the barriers onto their property which include rebar and a recycling can with the wheels taken off and filled full of rocks and boulders on the driveway itself. They are dangerous and unneighbourly. It was believed there was a solution in that the residents would be permitted to drive over Mr. Hynes' portion of the driveway that is in fact HRM property only during snowy weather and at all other times they would respect his driveway. There needed to be parameters that would ensure safe egress. There is a proposal to move the driveway in a further easterly direction; however, she and her husband vehemently disagree with this because it will increase the slope, the degree of turn required to turn to the left and make things more difficult. If Mr. Hynes desires a greenbelt dividing the properties, he could do that by moving his driveway in a westerly direction.

Following her presentation, Dr. Mallery provided a written overview of her presentation, and copies of correspondence from their lawyer and Legal Services and pictures of the area. She and her husband subsequently provided further information on the pictures presented.

Councillor Adams referred to the construction of the road marker during the spring of 1995 in accordance with the permit approved by City Council. He asked if it was approved by staff or Council. In reply, Mr. Landon Mallery advised it was City Council because it was an encroachment on City property. Dr. Mallery further advised that the marker was located where it was after negotiations with all the people living on Melville Avenue, including Mr. Hynes.

Councillor Stone asked if the marker was on the HRM right of way. Mr. Mallery, in response, advised yes and the property line was 25-30' from the travelled way. He indicated the area in question including where the driveway had originally been located.

Mr. Wade Hynes, 4 Melville Avenue advised that when he bought his property in 1994, the private road was originally located in front of 6 Melville Avenue in the area where Dr. and

Mr. Mallery planted four trees and grass to cover it up. When service pipes were put in, Mr. Mallery's contractor advised it would be better to lay the road above the pipes for a lesser grade. At that time, it was not an issue but he decided to put concrete in, there were objections to having a driveway all the way to the street. He obtained a permit which was appealed by the neighbours and subsequently Mr. Dhillon agreed to how far from the road he could place his concrete. His driveway was a very expensive concrete heated driveway and he did not want it damaged. He put protective barriers up to protect the driveway - and was told by an HRM official that he could put the green garbage container there which would not be considered an obstruction. No matter where anyone lived on Melville Avenue, there was a hill and everyone had the same problem getting out of their driveways. The road marker presents a safety issue for him as when he stops at the end of his driveway and looks to the left, the marker would be in blind sight. It was a safety issue for him and if the road marker was removed or relocated, there would be a lot of problems solved.

He provided drawings and photographs as well for the Councillors.

Councillor Stone asked if there was a driveway to the east at one time which cars actually used. In response, Mr. Hynes referred to a drawing indicating the excavation that was there at one time and where the entrance had already been considered. Now the entrance cuts across the last 3' of his property and they expected him to stop his concrete 3' from the edge of the asphalt which did not make much sense to cross 3' of gravel to get to Melville Avenue. That was why he proposed the 20' to go directly to the road and at the time he proposed to relocate the road marker while the excavator was in to give everybody more room but there was opposition to that at the time.

Councillor Stone asked if Mr. Dhillon had indicated Mr. Hynes' driveway could go where it is now. Mr. Hynes responded yes, it was in an August 17 letter. It measures 20' exactly from the road marker.

Councillor Stone asked why Mr. Hynes had a problem with people driving over his driveway. In response, Mr. Hynes said it was mainly a snowplow or a big truck. If a big truck comes across and cracks the concrete on the edge, he would lose a heating loop in his driveway. To repair it, it would have to be removed entirely and it was a \$15,000 driveway.

Mr. Hynes went on to say that he and Mr. Gibson had discussed putting in a rock, having a 4' separation and make a planter out of the rock. He thought he and Mr. Gibson were in agreement.

Mr. Gibson interjected he was only in agreement if it was in his name. Subsequent to Mr. Gibson's statement, Mr. Hynes said he had no problem with that.

Mr. Gary Brown, 10 Melville Avenue advised he was the caretaker of the property but spoke for the owners. He supported everything the Mallerys said and added that Mr. Hynes has been rude to the point where the police were called several times. Mr. Hynes placed obstructions in front of the driveway, placed large boulders on the side of the road on HRM property that cannot be seen at night and drilled rebar in the middle of the night intentionally to destroy their vehicles. He also placed obstacles on their side of the driveway - on the previous remaining bit of driveway they can get out of. With regard to safety onto the road, Mr. Hynes would park his car right up to the closest mark he could so no one could drive across his driveway and on two occasions he was almost hit by a vehicle coming down because he could not see it. The marker was not that big and easy to see around.

Mr. Brown referred to police reports and suggested Councillors should check with the police officers involved with Mr. Hynes.

Mr. Brown stated that the intent of the neighbours was not to drive over Mr. Hynes' driveway except if it was slippery and the car slid over, then it might be necessary. The neighbours did not want an obstruction so their cars would be damaged. He asked for a resolution of the issue. Speaking on behalf of the owners of 10 Melville Avenue, they did not want to spend any more money on the situation but simply wanted a driveway to be able to drive in an out of without an obstacle.

Councillor Adams asked when Mr. Hynes put his vehicle at the end of the driveway and Mr. Brown pulled out and almost had an accident, why could he not see. In response, Mr. Brown indicated on the drawings available where Mr. Hynes parked his car, the steepness of the grade and the problems encountered.

Mr. Landon Mallery, 14 Melville Avenue stated that during the construction phase an engineering firm prepared engineering drawings re the shared driveway and also the services to the properties. It was part of the requirement from Engineering Department for subdivision approval which was received in 1994. If Mr. Hynes wants a buffer, that is fine as he has 4' on the other side of his driveway towards Winchester and it could have easily been installed in that location. The water lines underneath the concrete are in excess of 36" from the boundary of the driveway. He could remove a portion of the driveway if he wanted a buffer and still not impact the water lines. Mr. Hynes, however, chooses to place objects in the other driveway to force the issue.

Councillor Walker asked who paid for the marker and Mr. Mallery replied he did except that Albert Gibson provided the cap.

The Chair called for further speakers; there were none.

Councillor Stone asked if the driveway was approved to the point where it ends now. In response, Mr. Dhillon stated yes.

Councillor Adams referred to the marker which was approved by the former City Council in 1995 and asked if it came to Council as a separate issue or was it part of a Development Agreement. In response, Mr. Dhillon said he thought it was a separate encroachment.

Councillor Adams asked why two rocks which are 50-75 lb. were considered obstructions but a cement block 2' wide and 3' high not an obstruction. In reply, Mr. Dhillon stated the rocks were not supposed to be there according to his approval.

Mr. Dhillon then went on to provide a history of the issue from staff's perspective. When he approved the driveway, there was supposed to be no obstruction 5-6' from the edge of the travelled way because it would provide for room for pedestrian traffic. If the rocks were within 5' of the travelled way, they should be moved. When Mr. Hynes applied for the permit to construct a 22-24' driveway, it was cancelled following discussion with other users of the land. There had to be dialogue with the other users before a permit could be issued. This was started and after meeting with three property owners, it was late 1997 when the property owners were asked to come back with a plan regarding the division of the driveway. Some kind of compromise plan was received from Mr. Gibson April, 1998 to divide the space equally which was about 43-44' - 22' each side - but Mr. Hynes wanted 24'. Mr. Mallery and Mr. Gibson did not agree with 24'. During the summer, discussion continued. Subsequently, it was his understanding from Mr. Gibson that they were prepared to give another foot or so if the matter was resolved and, based on that, he wrote a letter giving Mr. Hynes 20' from the marker with the condition that it would be a common driveway and if they wanted to have a space they would have to spread equally on both sides and set back their driveways as initially agreed. The condition of the permit was that they could not put flower pots or anything similar without approval. He did not agree with the comments that the marker is a safety hazard or side vision problem.

Councillor Stone asked for clarification that the green cart should not be there but the car could be there out to the edge as long as Mr. Hynes is on his driveway. Mr. Dhillon advised that as part of the Solid Waste By-law, the cart could only stay out at a certain time. As far as the car was concerned, the driveway was for access and should not be parked on public property.

Councillor Stone then clarified that by allowing the driveway to go to the end does not give the ability to park the car on that part of the driveway that is on public right of way. Mr. Dhillon agreed that people were not supposed to park up to the curb to allow people to walk on the public portion of the travelled way.

Councillor Stone asked who was responsible for damage of the heating coils in the driveway. In response, Mr. Dhillon replied it was the property owner. If something is damaged because of being on HRM property, HRM is not liable because the property owner undertook the risk in building on HRM property.

The Chair asked what was expected of Community Council. In response, Mr. Dhillon suggested that Mr. Hynes should not be putting any obstructions for at least 6-7' from the edge of the travelled way and, in addition, if there is any change in the use of HRM property, then a permit is required. He understood the By-law Enforcement Officer had talked to Mr. Hynes about rock obstructions.

Councillor Stone referred to Mr. Gibson's offer to find a solution because it is in front of his property and asked if Mr. Gibson could do that. In response, Mr. Dhillon said he would have the ability but a permit would have to be issued.

Councillor Walker asked if the marker was moved back, would the driveway be wider. In reply, Mr. Dhillon advised that if the marker is moved either back or on the other side of the driveway, the area would have to be regraded and will be steeper but not unusually steep.

Councillor Stone asked if there was information available regarding the Engineering proposal. Mr. Dhillon advised that if it was part of the subdivision approval, then it would be available.

MOVED by Councillors Adams and Walker to defer this matter to the next meeting in order to look at the information, check the permits and consider options in the interim. Further, that a report be provided from Traffic Authority as to whether or not the marker is a safety hazard. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

5. **MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION** - None

6. **MOTIONS OF RESCISSION** - None

7. **CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS** - None

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS** - None

9. **CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

9.1 **Delegations**

9.1.1 **Halifax Regional Development Agency - Progress Report on Activities**

for 1998/99 Based on Current Business Plan

Ms. Helen Matheson, Chair, Halifax Regional Development Agency and Mr. Greg Brown, General Manger were in attendance. Ms. Matheson acknowledged RDA supporters in the audience as well.

Ms. Matheson provided an overview of the current business plan and progress and addressed the possibility of further budget cuts by HRM with the hope of having some discussion on its impact.

Ms. Matheson advised that the request that came to the RDA via the CAO's Office from the Minister of Economic Development re funding for the 2000-2005 Initiative has not been responded to by HRM. The RDA was seeking a clear indication of support from Council to go to the province. The province is pleased with the performance of the Halifax Regional Development Agency but needs to hear that from core sponsors such as HRM. The RDA cannot leverage resources from other programs without a solid foundation of support from HRM as it directly impedes growth.

Councillor Walker said he would be happier when he saw "urban" in the Mission Statement. There was still the need to think of small business in the urban area and gave an example of Dutch Village Road in his District, which was going downhill fast and needed something to pick it up. In his opinion, the RDA could do that. In response, Mr. Brown advised that the RDA was very encouraged by Community Council's reaction last spring but discouraged by the staff report that came forward.

Councillor Walker asked what the amount of the proposed cut was. In response, Mr. Brown said he was not sure but might go from \$225,000 to \$200,000 although the original cut was more than that. It was hoped that the allocation could remain the same at \$225,000.

Councillor Adams acknowledged that the RDA has been very attentive to the needs of the rural and suburban areas and if you compared that to the Greater Halifax Partnership, the results of the RDA were distinctly measurable whereas the results of the Greater Halifax Partnership are not. When you cut back on bodies that generate jobs and income, then perhaps HRM might not benefit directly from tax dollars generated but the citizens do. He used the Pennant Park project as an example which was measurable. He acknowledged that a cut in the RDA's budget was recommended but there may be a way to minimize it. There was a report coming back to Council.

Ms. Matheson expressed appreciation of Community Council's support and reiterated the fact that the RDA was still awaiting some kind of communique from the CAO's office concerning the letter from the Minister of Economic Development re furthering the cause

of RDA's in the province. The Minister was asking for feedback as to what the Municipality would like to see in the next phase of funding. Since there was nothing being done, this was a cause of great concern. She encouraged Community Council to make some recommendation to Council about the letter. Marine Drive Valley and Canal Community Council had put forward a motion to the Mayor encouraging the CAO's Office to reply to the letter.

Councillor Stone pointed out that until Council gets to budget deliberations there was no way to know what the effects of cuts will be.

10. **REPORTS** - None

11. **MOTIONS** - None

12. **ADDED ITEMS**

12.1 **Request for Mailbox - 3 Ford Street**

MOVED by Councillors Walker and Adams to support the request for the installation of a mailbox at 3 Ford Street, Halifax in front of the Seniors Residence - the MacDonald Laurier building. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Councillor Walker advised that since the Capitol Stores closed, there was a desperate need for a mailbox and previous requests by seniors for the last three years have not been approved.

12.2 **Tax Rate for Fergusons Cove Area**

Councillor Adams requested a report from staff regarding the Fergusons Cove area - the former District 5 area just outside Purcells Cove - re their tax rate. Since they are being taxed at the urban rate, he requested that they be considered for suburban since they fall under the criteria. He asked for a report for the next meeting in order to expedite the matter during budget deliberations.

13. **NOTICES OF MOTION** - None

14. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Peter Pelham, 100 Hebridean Drive, Herring Cove, a Director of the Herring Cove Ratepayers Association raised the following points:

- C He expressed concern that Priority and Policy Division had been phased out and he - along with others in his area who were included on a distribution list - was no longer receiving Minutes and information he had received previously.

Councillor Adams advised that the Priority and Policy Division has been dispersed but most of the staff were still employed. It appeared that the practice to keep residents informed has not continued.

- C He expressed concern regarding notification of cancellation of the Chebucto Community Council meeting which was scheduled for January 4, 1999.

- C He noted he had received an Agenda package for this meeting of Chebucto Community Council and asked for clarification as to why the Minutes were so late and with regard to the lands on Forward Avenue.

Councillor Walker provided information regarding Forward Avenue, which has not gone forward to Public Hearing as yet. Additionally, the Clerk clarified that with regard to notification of Community Council meetings, she had added Mr. Pelham's name to the mailing list in consultation with Councillor Adams. As to Minutes, as per the Rules of Procedure, only approved Minutes were sent out. She offered to make additions to the mailing list if requested.

Ms. Doris Young, 93 Kearney Lake Road raised the following points:

- C She provided information on traffic flow on Dunbrack Street and expressed concern that she could not get all the traffic lights green unless she went at a speed of 70 km/hr. She requested that consideration be given to reviewing the lights to synchronize them so that the flow of traffic is not interrupted going south on Dunbrack.

- C She expressed concern that the blue paint on parking lots denoting handicapped parking was slippery when wet or icy.

- C Her car was ticketed on a Sunday on the innermost parking lot at Point Pleasant Park with the explanation that she had parked the wrong way in the parking lot. She advised what she had done in pursuit of an explanation and subsequently the ticket was withdrawn. She suggested that when people file a complaint with regarding to ticketing, it should be looked into better than the explanation she had received from staff.

Ms. Debbie Hum, 169 Cresthaven Drive provided information on the Mainland North Traffic and Safety Committee dealing with traffic and safety around schools. Among concerns

were crosswalk safety, particularly because of the recent death of a student in a crosswalk in Halifax, and she cited two safety incidents on Kearney Lake Road in one day. She asked what else the school community could do to address crosswalk safety concerns beyond a report to come from a public relations firm. She suggested a pedway for Kearney Lake Road.

Councillor Stone advised that CCL Group would be carrying out an education program across HRM. He did not know if a pedway was under consideration. There was no automatic answer except education. Regional Council has requested a report on options for improving crosswalk safety.

Mr. Danny Chedrawe, 153 Spinnaker Drive raised the following points:

- C He expressed concern with a recent serious accident at the intersection of Purcells Cove Road and Ramsgate Lane and the visibility problem at that location. Last summer, at his own expense, because he owned the property in the vicinity, he moved the stone walls back 10' in an effort to reduce risk and increase view along Purcells Cove Road. Since the recent accident, however, he would be proposing, in conjunction with Mr. Raju of Melville Ridge Holdings, to pay for lights at that intersection. This might help slow down traffic on Purcells Cove Road. He requested support from Community Council to staff in his efforts in this regard.
- C He explained that he was the owner of the Irving station site at Sackville Street and Dresden Row. He expressed displeasure and frustration with the Heritage Advisory Committee. He outlined his concerns since he did not want to tear down a heritage property.

Councillor Walker requested that Mr. Chedrawe put his concerns in writing and he would forward it to Regional Council.

Mr. Hiram Tiller, 4 Thackeray Close raised the following points:

- C He expressed concern that Mr. Dhillon might not have a high priority for the Lacewood/102 Highway. He brought up this matter with Community Council on January 7, 1997 and it was only in the last couple months that a report has been imminent; however, recommendations were no good unless you had money to implement them. He also expressed concern that some of the proposals coming forward were considered previously but not adopted. In response, Councillor Stone stated he would make sure it was considered in this year's budget.
- C With regard to traffic on Dunbrack Street, people were making U turns on Dunbrack and Lacewood at the traffic lights.

- C There is no signage on Highway 103 to get off into the Bayers Lake Business Park.
- C He also expressed concern with blue paint being slippery and treacherous. In response, Councillor Stone advised that blue paint on private property was the responsibility of the owner. There was no reason why a better kind of paint could not be suggested, however.

Councillor Stone advised that the Clerk would be asked to follow up on some of the points Mr. Tiller raised.

Mr. Don Siteman, 46 Rosedale Avenue raised the following points:

- C He expressed concern with glow signs in Bayers Lake Park which ruined the look of the park. In response, Councillor Stone advised that if the signs were on HRM property, then something could be done; however, the retailers have figured out that as long as they are not within the street line, they are allowed.
- C He asked why residents were not allowed to use grocery bags for milk cartons when you could use them for newspapers but had to use blue bags for milk cartons. Using grocery bags would cut down on purchases of blue bags and use up some of the grocery bags. In response, Councillor Walker advised he would check regarding milk cartons as he thought it might be allowed under the By-law.
- C He asked why the stop sign was changed at Frederick and Willow because Rosedale Avenue traffic has increased since the change. In response, Councillor Walker explained the reason the Traffic Authority made the change. He agreed to request a traffic count for Rosedale Avenue.
- C He asked for an update on the off ramp from the BiHi to Fairview. In response, Councillor Walker advised that this was being negotiated with the province at this time and advised the reasoning behind the decision to build the new ramp.

15. **NEXT MEETING** - March 1, 1999

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion from Councillor Adams, the meeting adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

Sandra M. Shute
Assistant Municipal Clerk

C