

NORTH WEST COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MINUTES

MARCH 30, 2000

THOSE PRESENT: Councillor Harvey, Chair
Councillor Kelly

ALSO PRESENT: Barry Allen, Municipal Solicitor
Angus Schaffenburg, Planner
Thea Langille-Hanna, Planner
Peter Bigelow, General Manager, Recreation Facilities
Sandra Shute, Assistant Municipal Clerk

Regrets: Councillor Merrigan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Invocation	4
2.	Approval of Minutes	
2.1	Regular Meeting - February 24, 2000	4
2.2	Special Council Session - March 7, 2000	4
3.	Approval of the Order of Business and Approval of Additions and Deletions ..	4
4.	Business Arising Out of the Minutes - None	4
5.	Motions of Reconsideration - None	4
6.	Motions of Rescission - None	4
7.	Consideration of Deferred Business - None	4
8.	Public Hearings	
8.1	Case 00191 - Application to Rezone 30 Old Sackville Road, Lower Sackville	5
9.	Correspondence, Petitions and Delegations	
9.1	Correspondence	
9.1.1	Department of Transportation - One Continuous Name for Glendale Avenue/Duke Street	10
9.1.2	Sackville High School - Request for financial support to upgrade the gymnasium floor	11
9.2	Petitions	
9.2.1	Petition from Sycamore Lane Elementary School Advisory Council	11
10.	Reports	
10.1	Fort Sackville Contract Development Agreement	12

10.2	Bedford Waters Advisory Committee re Testing Results - Paper Mill Lake	12
11.	Motions - None	12
12.	Added Items	
12.1	Renaming of Range Park Diamonds #1 and #2 to Joan Lenihan Memorial Ball Fields	13
12.2	North West Transit Advisory Committee	
12.2.1	Proposal re Beaverbank Park and Ride	13
12.2.2	Route 83 Springfield and Middle Sackville Park and Ride	13
12.2.3	Survey re Transit Concerns in Sackville area	13
12.3	Paper Mill Lake Advisory Sub-Committee	14
13.	Notices of Motion - None	14
14.	Public Participation	14
15.	Next Meeting Date	16
16.	Adjournment	16

5. **MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION** - None
6. **MOTIONS OF RESCISSION** - None
7. **CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS** - None
8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

8.1 **Case 00191 - Application to Rezone 30 Old Sackville Road, Lower Sackville**

A Staff Report dated February 21, 2000 was before Community Council together with a Memorandum dated March 6, 2000 from North West Planning Advisory Committee recommending approval of the application.

Angus Schaffenburg, Planner provided an overview of the application with the aid of overheads. He advised that staff was recommending approval of the proposed rezoning from R-1 to C-3 (Commercial Corridor).

Councillor Kelly asked for clarification re the size of the buildings. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg advised the total was about 8,000 sq. ft. of commercial space.

Councillor Kelly then asked the purposes of an automotive centre. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg advised he understood that things such as paint touch up and auto insurance were permitted. Automotive repair shops were not permitted in the C-3 zone but can be considered through Development Agreement.

Mr. Miller, representing the developer, indicated that the developer was considering a new franchise operation that provides polishing and removal of scratches on expensive cars, the developer's appraisal business - for which he might utilize the existing house - and custom car accessory shop. Given that Mr. Lewis was in the business, one of his interests was to attract people in similar businesses to create the synergy of joint marketing.

Councillor Kelly asked if the existing house could be maintained as a home or would it have to meet the zoning. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg advised that existing dwellings were a permitted use within the zone so the dwelling could be retained. Mr. Miller, however, added that if the house reverted to a commercial use, then the existing single family curb cut and residential driveway for the house should be removed. Access to the property would be internally.

Councillor Kelly asked if the proposed five lots would sell off as individual properties. In response, Mr. Miller advised that they would either be sold off under the master plan

independently or, because of the rights of way and shared entrances, there could be consideration of a ground lease.

Councillor Kelly asked for clarification on water flow. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg advised that water flows towards the main ditch on the 101 which was fairly wide. It was the natural drainage of the property. Wetland was not an issue. The property is immediately adjacent to the 101 which would pose problems with splashing and salt from the 101.

Councillor Harvey referred to Map 3 and what was proposed as a C-3 property. He pointed out that this was not a Development Agreement. Community Council was not approving what will happen but what is proposed to happen. What could happen was in Appendix B, the by-right permitted uses for a C-3 property. Even if the four buildings were built, they could turn into other uses, if the other uses would fit inside them. This was a straight rezoning of 1.2 acres from R-1 to C-3.

The Chair called for speakers in favour of the application.

Mr. Douglas Miller, Miller Group advised he and HRM staff had worked with Department of Transportation regarding the potential for driveway access and safety. The original plan for the property was residential, with preliminary subdivision approval, for seven driveways, for the existing house and six additional single family houses. The property is an island of remaining Old Sackville lands in a sea of highways and asphalt now. It is a difficult piece of property blocked in by the 101, bridge abutment and drainage sluice. He acknowledged the proposal was only indicative of his client's intentions but his client had a very valid initiative in terms of going forward with a preliminary plan which was not meant to fog the rezoning issue but to see what kind of marketing response he could get. His client was keenly interested in what could be done with shared entrances and the relationship between HRM and DOT as to whether or not there would be improved safety on the site with the location of the driveways as proposed. A section of the Commercial Corridor designation indicates that there be a particular character and wish for development in a mixed use/urban fashion. It was also intimated in the Plan that some of the lands that are not the focal centre of the community, but at the extremities, could be looked at more kindly for this type of automotive-related services. The scale of the operation being proposed, tied in with the geometry and restrictions of the land with some serious setbacks virtually on all sides was a reasonably equitable service commercial use and is at the extremity of the aspirations for increased focal centre at the centre of Sackville Drive.

The Chair having called three times, there were no further speakers in favour of the application. The Chair then called for speakers opposed to the application.

Mr. Dick Boyce, owner of Sackville Tire at 52 Sackville Drive and the service station next door advised that the property in question was right behind his business. He said he was not against development or people in the automotive business but an automotive development was the wrong thing for that particular property. It could be developed for senior citizens housing, along with the house already there. The property is 140 years old; the trees are 75-100 years old. They should be saved.

Mr. Boyce circulated pictures of the area taken in the 70's. He continued that the Fultz House was on one corner, his business on the other, the property in question behind and there were not that many things in Sackville to attract people to come see. He urged Community Council to turn down the application or delay it to look at some other kind of development. There were five or six properties for sale along Sackville Drive as an alternative for these types of businesses. From a business point of view, it would not hurt him because he could do business with the proposed businesses but the trees and the house were worth saving.

Mr. Walter Regan, 43 Candlewood Lane said that lot by lot, house by house, Sackville was losing its heritage. He asked if there was a way for HRM to have a By-law to save and protect heritage. Sackville has very few places like this location and he understood it was the oldest house in Sackville. He encouraged a land swap with HRM or buying the property outright.

Mr. Archie Fader, 44 Walker Service Road asked if the applicant owned the building or was it subject to the zoning. In reply, Mr. Miller advised that he understood if the applicant defaulted on the closing, he would stand to lose a reasonable amount of money.

Mr. Fader said he could not support the proposal. If the property was subdivided and the lots did not sell, then there was a message there due to the nature of the location in terms of traffic. He stated that a traffic count should be done before any decision was made. There were 35 parking spaces for the proposed development which would mean increased traffic. At the entrance to Sackville, there was Fultz House which is a prime location for a heritage property. He suggested another reason for deferral would be to see if the house on the property could be considered for heritage designation. He expressed concern re the potential for flooding as a brook comes across 12 Mile House Lane and through the property. As well, at Sackville Drive and Cobequid Road, there was no flashing left turn light to allow access onto Old Sackville Road.

Councillor Harvey advised there was an extensive capital project undertaken with regard to flooding which has largely rectified the flooding situation.

As to a traffic study, Mr. Schaffenburg advised that Traffic Services did a traffic generation estimate but did not feel a traffic study was necessary as the peak hour trip generation

numbers are extremely low. Based on 9000 sq. ft., morning peak generation of traffic would be 27 and afternoon would be 31. Traffic concerns had been raised at the Public Information Meeting and he had subsequently gone back to Traffic Services to see if a more detailed study was required; however, Traffic Services indicated did not feel this was necessary.

Councillor Kelly referred to the issue of deferring a decision. In response, Barry Allen, Municipal Solicitor advised Community Council could always defer if it felt there was something lacking to make a decision. Ultimately, the decision would be either to approve or not approve.

Ms. Katherine LaPierre, 168 Old Sackville Road asked for clarification that no one from Traffic actually went to the site but used a formula. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg advised that Traffic Services knows the general area and did not stand at the site and do an actual traffic count. Traffic Engineers normally use a manual for trip generation.

Ms. LaPierre said that because she lives so close to the intersection, she found fault with the amount of traffic estimated and asked if a traffic study could be conducted and a decision deferred in the meantime. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg clarified that the traffic generation figures were the traffic felt would be additional based on the new proposed development. Given that the numbers are very low, there would be a very small change in the overall trips on Old Sackville Road.

Ms. Darlene Hickey, 33 Old Sackville Road said she understood that heritage properties fell under certain guidelines which allowed certain protections. In response, Councillor Harvey explained that the house in question was not a registered heritage property. Generally, the owner of the property approaches the Municipality with an application to register or perhaps a group like a heritage society could approach an owner and ask if they would be interested in having an application brought forward. There were rare exceptions where the Municipality has registered a property over the objection of the owner. It was too late in the sense that this application is legitimately before Community Council for rezoning. The people who own the property have not come forward to have it registered.

With regard to traffic, Ms. Hickey referred to the sidewalks constructed a number of years ago in the area and asked if there was a need for a sidewalk in front of the property in question. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that the sidewalks were put in there because of considerable route and pedestrian traffic and Traffic Services would have considered the need for a sidewalk in front of the property.

Ms. Hickey pointed out that children in the area wait for the school bus on 12 Mile House Lane and there could be more use of 12 Mile House Lane if the proposal is approved.

Ms. Hickey then referred to the trees on the property and asked if consideration has been given to where the property actually begins. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg advised that the house will stay where it is; it is encroaching on the street right of way. If it were to be removed, it would not be possible to encroach again. All the new buildings are meeting the new By-law requirements for a setback of 30' from the front, 30' from the rear and 15' of the sides.

Another concern brought up by Ms. Hickey was the brook and not being able to redirect the running water. As well, the steep area on the property would require fill. In response, Mr. Schaffenburg advised there would be two stories at the rear and one story at the front. There would be bank stabilization but a watercourse cannot be altered without Department of Environment approval. If it is necessary to truck in fill, there would have to be plans to ensure no siltation which would be part of the building permit stage. Because the property abuts the 101, Department of Transportation will be asked to give consent.

Ms. Hickey stated that this was a heritage property and should be maintained in the state it is in now.

Councillor Harvey pointed out that retaining the R-1 zoning as it is now in no way guarantees that the property will stay the way it is now. It depends on who owns the property. Dividing it as R-1 property is by right and it would not come before a public meeting or Community Council. It would be handled under the Subdivision By-law and staff would deal with it as it did with the seven lot proposal. A person who owns the house could own it as R-1, tear down the house, the outbuildings, the trees and decide to build a modern house, 30' back from the road on a one acre lot. They would only have to get a demolition permit for the house.

Mr. Miller, in rebuttal, agreed that research suggests that the house is one of the oldest in Sackville. He suggested to his client in as many ways as possible that he keep the house. If his client takes down the house, the new setback requirements are so onerous. The house was not intrusive and has a use that fits in with the other uses he is considering. He would be on the losing end if he took the house down prematurely on a whim. With the setbacks required, the buildings would sit pretty lightly on the slope. He was not looking at remassaging the whole site with massive loads of fill.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to close the Public Hearing. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Councillor Harvey pointed out that Community Council could decide to approve the rezoning, deny it or defer a decision to a future meeting. The application has been made in good faith under the existing Plan and all steps have been followed.

Councillor Kelly asked, with regard to the overall approach, could there be modifications. In response, Mr. Allen said there could be modifications; however, the issue before Community Council was a parcel of land with certain policies that apply. There has been a request to rezone the land and the question is whether or not the rezoning that has been requested applies with the policies. If, in the view of Community Council, they do, then the rezoning should be granted. If not, then it should be turned down. With regard to what is actually done with the land later on, anything could happen.

Councillor Kelly referred to traffic flow and asked the Municipal Solicitor if Community Council had the right to defer pending further information. In response, Mr. Allen said it becomes problematic if you look for additional information after a Public Hearing is closed because if some information comes forward that the public wants to comment on, the Hearing would have to be re-opened to make sure everyone has the opportunity to be heard. It could be done but it becomes difficult. Unless there was something specific that Community Council felt must be answered in order to make a decision, the preferable way would be to proceed on the information before Community Council at this time.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to reject the application to rezone 30 Old Sackville Road, Lower Sackville.

Councillor Kelly provided his reasons for rejecting the application. It is contrary to Policy IM-13 of the Sackville Municipal Planning Strategy, Section (b), Subsection iv, Section (c), Subsection iii and Section (d).

Councillor Harvey provided his reasons for seconding the motion. Old Sackville Road is a residential street/road. The Commercial Corridor is Sackville Drive. As pointed out by one of the speakers against the application, there was ample C-3 land available on Sackville Drive for any number of businesses. If the land is rezoned, any uses in Appendix B could fit on this 1.2 acre site. There could be an acre of used cars being sold by right which was a concern. He came to the conclusion that either the zoning is inconsistent with the designation, which is Commercial and has been for 20 years, or that the designation is inconsistent with the zoning, which is R-1. He believed the Plan is in error in including this piece of land as Commercial designation and that the community, at the next opportunity to review the Plan, should consider removing this property from the Commercial designation. In his opinion, the zoning was correct. This was the beginning of a residential street, not the beginning of a commercial corridor which is on Sackville Drive. He acknowledged it is an island surrounded by asphalt, as Mr. Miller said, but he saw it as an oasis, not a desert island which leads into a residential neighbourhood. There is still quite a residential atmosphere. He did not think it was in the community's best interests to have the property zoned C-3; the community's interest is what is at the basis of the Plan. If it is rezoned C-3 tonight, it would compound what he felt was an error, which

would not be reversible because the zoning would be C-3 in a Commercial designation, just as any part of Sackville Drive.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9. **CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

9.1 **Correspondence**

9.1.1 **Department of Transportation - One Continuous Name for Glendale Avenue/Duke Street**

A letter dated March 14, 2000 from Kenton Sperian, Department of Transportation was before Community Council urging Community Council to reconsider naming the former Captain John Gorham Boulevard in its entirety. Should Community Council be unable to propose an alternative, a final decision will be made by Department of Transportation. A reply was requested by April 30, 2000.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to refer this matter to a meeting with the Minister of Transportation in order to resolve this issue as it appears staff of Department of Transportation have one strong stance and Community Council also has a stance which it has taken. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9.1.2 **Sackville High School - Request for Financial Support to Upgrade the Gymnasium Floor**

A letter dated February 29, 2000 was before Community Council requesting consideration of financial support to upgrade the gymnasium floor in order for the school and the community to have a safe area.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to refer this request to the Sackville Landfill Compensation Fund Committee for review and consideration, with a recommendation to come back to Community Council. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9.2 **Petitions and Delegations**

Mr. Alan Barnhill, 29 Aspen Court, Chairman of the Sycamore Lane Elementary School Advisory Council presented a Petition to Community Council for safer conditions for students walking along and crossing Riverside Drive. He explained the problems and concerns associated with children attempting to get to school from the District 19 side of Riverside Drive to Sycamore Lane Elementary School in District 20. Among the concerns were inadequate snowplowing, excessive speeding on Riverside Drive. HRM was being

requested to provide either a sidewalk on the far side of Riverside until they meet the marked crossing at the top of the hill or look at putting two additional marked crossings at Alder and Balsam. Riverside Drive is the only route left between Glendale and Sackville Drive which is straight and has no stop signs or traffic control and with a rolling hill.

Councillor Harvey advised there would be a sidewalk built on Sycamore Lane this year from Riverside Drive down to Raymond Drive. He was willing to present the Petition to Regional Council on April 4, 2000 and have it sent on to Traffic Authority. He pointed out that the sidewalk issue is separate from traffic considerations but it could be recommended to Engineering Department as a project.

**MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to refer the Petition to Regional Council.
MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

In further support of the Petition, Ms. Avis Taylor suggested a solution might be three or four way stops at every intersection on Riverside Drive. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that stop signs have been requested over the years but have been denied by Traffic because of the hill. He pointed out that Council does not decide on such things as stop signs, traffic lights; it is Traffic Authority.

Ms. Heather Tillman, 6 Aspen Court pointed out that there had been a fatality in 1977. She was the crosswalk guard at the top of the hill where there are high winds which hamper her ability to ensure the children cross safely because she could not hear. As well, the crosswalk during nighttime hours is not well lit. She suggested red lights as flashing amber does not work. She and another crosswalk guard carried out traffic counts on her own initiative. Because of inadequate snowplowing, during the snowstorms this season, the children could not walk on top of the snowbanks and were forced to walk on the road. She indicated she had available pictures of situations that occurred in the area.

Councillor Harvey recommended that the School Advisory Council should invite Mr. David McCusker, Manager, Traffic and Transportation Services to one of their meetings and present their concerns to him. It could be publicized through the school that the meeting was taking place. He indicated as well that he would be pleased to attend the meeting to hear first hand from Mr. McCusker what the possibilities are. He pointed out there were some things that could not be changed because of the geography.

10. **REPORTS**

10.1 **Fort Sackville Contract Development Agreement**

A Memorandum dated March 13, 2000 was before Community Council advising it had been determined and agreed that if the developer were to address several immediate

issues, such as chip sealing, in the time period agreed upon, then Community Council would not proceed with the motion adopted at its last meeting.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to accept the report. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

10.2 Bedford Waters Advisory Committee re Testing Results - Paper Mill Lake

A report dated March 20, 2000 from Bedford Waters Advisory Committee was before Community Council alerting Community Council to its concerns with the deterioration of the water quality of Paper Mill Lake, especially with regard to total and fecal coliforms and providing a recommendation.

Councillor Kelly stated it appeared there were some high fecal counts and staff have been unable to determine where they are coming from.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to refer this matter to staff, as well as Department of Environment, to continue testing and reviewing the situation to see why there are high counts and to try to rectify the situation. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

11. **MOTIONS** - None

12. **ADDED ITEMS**

12.1 Renaming of Range Park Diamonds #1 and #2 to Joan Lenihan Memorial Ball Fields

A Staff Report dated February 27, 2000 was before Community Council in this regard.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to approve the renaming of Range Park Ball Diamonds #1 and #2 to Joan Lenihan Memorial Field in memory of the effort and commitment that Mrs. Lenihan dedicated to the youth and the sport of baseball in her community and province and allow Bedford Minor Baseball to prepare for the rededication during the upcoming Bedford Days. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.2 North West Transit Advisory Committee

12.2.1 Proposal for Beaver Bank Park and Ride

A report from North West Transit Advisory Committee dated March 29, 2000 was before Community Council.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to request a staff report on the availability of land that was held for the Second Lake Connector Corridor and whether or not it would be advantageous to acquire the land for a future Park and Ride. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.2.2 Route 83 - Springfield and Middle Sackville Park and Ride

A report dated March 29, 2000 from North West Transit Advisory Committee was before Community Council with a recommendation to bring the proposal forward again in six months time.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to bring the proposal forward again in six months time. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.2.3 Survey re Transit Concerns in the Sackville Area

A report dated March 29, 2000 was before Community Council requesting input from Community Council re implementation of a survey in the Sackville area.

Councillor Harvey pointed out that Councillor Merrigan was the Liaison Councillor on the Transit Advisory Committee and it would be useful to have his input at this point.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey to defer pending Councillor Merrigan's attendance at Community Council. In the meantime, however, staff to be requested to advise whether or not there are funds available to achieve the survey. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

12.3 Paper Mill Lake Sub-Committee

Councillor Kelly referred to a citizens' request to form a Sub-Committee with regard to the review of the Contract Development Agreement for Paper Mill Lake at the last meeting. Subsequent to the meeting, he discussed the matter with staff and advised that a final report would be forthcoming.

MOVED by Councillors Kelly and Harvey that pending the final report, staff take the opportunity to meet with the four people wanting to form the Committee and that staff come forward with a report and recommendation. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13. NOTICES OF MOTION - None

14. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Walter Regan, Sackville Rivers Association raised the following points:

- He asked for an update on a Silt Inspector. In response, Councillor Harvey advised he raised this issue during budget deliberations. There is change coming in terms of personnel which may benefit the enforcement of the By-law in question.
- He asked for an update with regard to a land swap or purchase between the Housing Authority in the area of Second Lake. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that a report should be available for the next meeting.
- He pointed out that various areas of HRM have had environmental studies done, i.e. Western Common, Birch Cove, Morris Lake. He asked if it was possible to have such a study done in the Bedford/Sackville area to plan for the future and ensure what should be protected. It was agreed to refer this matter to staff to find out if the same criteria existed in this area.
- He asked for information on the Sackville Drive Design Study. Ms. Thea Langille-Hanna advised that request for proposals has been developed to look at Sackville Drive. The purpose was to come up with a visual identity study for Sackville Drive - what should Sackville look like and what image does it want to portray. There would be public participation involved. The other component would be a design manual which will show areas along Sackville Drive where improvements can be made with regard to landscaping, sidewalk improvement, signage. It was expected the time frame would be about three months after the consultant has been picked.
- He referred to a Tax Sale of a vacant property adjacent to the Little Sackville River off Riverside Drive and asked if it would be possible, because it was waterfront and because of the floodplain, for HRM to retain it. In response, Councillor Kelly advised that Tax Sale would have to go forward and the owner has until the day of the Tax Sale to pay it off. HRM could be a bidder in the process, however. Since Peter Bigelow, General Manager, Recreation Facilities was in attendance, he agreed to look into this matter once Mr. Regan provided further information to him.
- He asked, now that Community Council refused the application for 30 Old Sackville Road, was it possible for HRM to acquire the property. In response, Councillor Harvey advised it was an issue that would have to be referred to staff for a recommendation and the community would have to come to an understanding as to whether or not they wished to play a role. He asked that Mr. Bigelow also provide an opinion on this property when he looks into the other one.

Mr. Walter Regan, Candlewood Lane expressed concern with the crossing on Riverside Drive and said it was only a matter of time before a child was hit.

Mr. Tony Edwards, Bedford raised the following points:

- He advised that a problem with designating 30 Old Sackville Road as a heritage property would be that it has vinyl siding.

- With regard to one single name for Glendale/Duke, he suggested a compromise as extending Duke Street all the way to Cobequid; otherwise, it should be left alone.

Mr. Archie Fader raised the following points:

- He asked for clarification regarding the Glendale/Duke street naming. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that Department of Transportation is insisting on one name for the whole length of the road. There is an expense to the businesses that are on the road that would have to change their address. Community Council does not see a need for change.
- After Councillor Harvey's explanation, he stated it should be left the way it is.
- He suggested putting a set of red lights at the top of the hill on Riverside Drive during the time the crosswalk guards are there. In response, Councillor Harvey said issues and suggestions would have to be taken directly to Traffic Services.

Ms. Laurie Boudreau asked what would happen next with regard to Riverside Drive traffic concerns. In response, Councillor Harvey said that the Petition would go forward and, as far as the sidewalk was concerned, the Capital Budget has been set for 2000/01. It would have to be dealt with during the next budget deliberations.

Ms. Avis Taylor, Middle Sackville raised the following points:

- She asked for clarification regarding the new elementary school on Lucasville Road re sidewalks and safety. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that there is three-way sharing being worked on to pay for sidewalks for the P-3 School. The province and the developer would pay together with HRM. As far as crossing Lucasville Road, the proposal is to have a set of RA-5 flashing lights and the potential for a crossing guard.
- She pointed out that there was a blind corner on both sides where the crossing guard would be stationed.
- She asked for an update re the proposal to close Old Sackville Road. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that under the HRM Traffic Calming policy, the proposal has been on-going for a number of years to sever Old Sackville Road between the two entrances to the cemetery and force traffic onto Sackville Drive to avoid through-cutting to the 101. It would be on a six month trial; however, in light of the changing of the school location, he asked staff to get reconfirmation from Emergency Services that they are still prepared to support the closing. As well, he was asking the citizen committee to reaffirm the option, if they are prepared to do so.
- She asked for clarification as to who was on the citizen committee - what area they were from. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that the people on the

committee were primarily from Lucasville Road down to Beaverbank Connector Road.

- She expressed concern, because she lived above the proposed closure, that if the closure takes place, there was a possibility of being cut off when accidents occur and road closures take place as a result. If anything should happen between Lucasville and Millwood Drive, she would be cut off. People in her vicinity might not know there was a proposal to close Old Sackville Road.

15. **NEXT MEETING DATE** - Thursday, April 27, 2000.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion from Councillor Kelly, the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Sandra M. Shute
Assistant Municipal Clerk

