

**PENINSULA AND WESTERN REGION
COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 27, 2000

THOSE PRESENT: Councillor Rankin, Chair
Councillor Blumenthal
Councillor Uteck
Councillor Fougere
Councillor Mitchell

ALSO PRESENT: Angela Jones, Municipal Solicitor
Gary Porter, Planner
Paul Morgan, Planner
Mark Bernard, Manager of Solid Waste
Bill McGillivray, By-law Enforcement
Sandra Shute, Assistant Municipal Clerk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Invocation 4

2. Approval of Minutes

 2.1 Regular Meeting - August 30, 2000 4

 2.2 Joint Meeting - September 5, 2000 4

 2.3 Special Council Session - September 12, 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 5

7. Consideration of Deferred Business - None 5

8. Public Hearings

 8.1 Case 00209 - Application for a Development Agreement to Permit
 Tourist Cottages, Shad Bay 5

9. Correspondence, Petitions and Delegations

 9.1 Presentation - Waste Collection Concerns 10

10. Reports

 10.1 Case 7074 - Proposed Amendments to the Low Density University
 (U-1) Zone, Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law (Give First Reading
 and schedule Joint Public Hearing for October 25, 2000 with Chebucto
 Community Council) 12

11. Motions - None 12

12.	Added Items	
12.1	Case 00291 - Proposed Wireless Communication Equipment on the Life Sciences Building, Dalhousie University	12
13.	Notices of Motion - None	15
14.	Public Participation	15
15.	Next Meeting Date	16
16.	Adjournment	17

1. **INVOCATION**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with an Invocation at 2750 Dutch Village Road, Halifax. During the course of the meeting, the Chair recognized Bill Estabrooks, MLA and Peter Delefes (former MLA) in attendance.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 **Regular Meeting - August 30, 2000**

Councillor Rankin pointed out that on page 10, under 10.8.3, the second paragraph, Councillor Uteck should have been identified rather than "she".

MOVED by Councillors Mitchell and Blumenthal to approve the Minutes of Regular Meeting held on August 30, 2000 as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

2.2 **Joint Meeting - September 5, 2000**

MOVED by Councillors Mitchell and Blumenthal to approve the Minutes of Joint meeting held with Chebucto Community Council on September 5, 2000 as circulated. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

2.3 **Special Council Session - September 12, 2000**

MOVED by Councillors Mitchell and Blumenthal to approve the Minutes of Special Council Session held on September 12, 2000 as circulated. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Added Items: Case 00291 - Proposed Wireless Communication Equipment on the Life Sciences Building, Dalhousie University

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

4. **BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES** - None

5. **MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION** - None

6. **MOTIONS OF RESCISSION** - None

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

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

8.1 **Case 00209 - Application for a Development Agreement to Permit Tourist Cottages, Shad Bay**

A Staff Report dated August 29, 2000 was before Community Council. Gary Porter, Planner provided an overview of the application with the aid of overheads. During the course of his presentation, he advised that the property in question was accessed by private road connecting to Coolen's Road and then to Highway 333. The zoning is RB-1 and tourist cottages are classed as motels in the Planning District 4 By-law and not permitted in the RB-1 zone as of right; however, they are permitted by Development Agreement pursuant to Policies IM-9 and RB-10 of the Planning Strategy.

Mr. Porter continued that the agreement requires a buffer to be maintained around the property, the on-site sewer system has been approved in principle by Department of Environment, preliminary testing has been carried out for a well. As well, the agreement requires additional testing of neighbours' wells, which is more than required under provincial regulations. The applicant has agreed to practice water conservation by putting in a retention tank. One of the areas of controversy is Coolen's Beach, which is in the area. He referred to a letter attached to the Staff Report in this regard. Staff considered the concerns of the residents with regard to the beach; Recreation Department does not feel there will be any adverse impact. It has its own waterfrontage and the cottages would be closer to that water frontage and, in addition, there were plans for a swimming pool in future. There was no guarantee that no one would go to Coolen's Beach but it was not likely that everyone would go and dominate the beach.

Mr. Porter advised that the application has been reviewed by the Halifax/Halifax County Watershed Advisory Board. Recommendations from the Board have been included in the Development Agreement. In staff's view, the proposal is consistent with the policies set out in the Planning Strategy. Staff was recommending approval.

Councillor Blumenthal noted that he and Councillor Fougere had made a site visit recently. He asked if the road would remain a dirt road. In response, Mr. Porter advised there were no plans to pave the road but work is presently being undertaken by Department of Transportation to improve site distances by removing trees and additional caution signs will be erected regarding the beach.

Councillor Fougere asked if Coolen's Beach is a public beach. Mr. Porter confirmed that it was.

Councillor Mitchell referred to the estimate of 500 vehicles present per day on Coolen's Road during the summer months and felt this was an unbelievable estimate. He never saw more than 10-20 cars while he was there. In response, Mr. Porter advised it was information provided by Department of Transportation. It did not mean there were 500 vehicles on the road but vehicle trips over a 24-hour period.

Councillor Uteck asked if a caretaker would be on site for the 12 cottages and the other building. In response, Mr. Porter advised that the applicant was in attendance this evening but he understood there were plans to hire a manager but he did not know if the manager would be on site 24 hours a day. The applicant actually lives next door and has the closest house to the development.

The Chair acknowledged the presence of the applicant and said he assumed that the applicant or representative would come forward and allow a chance to ask questions.

Councillor Rankin referred to the Public Information Meeting where there had been concern expressed regarding the beach. He asked if this was the main concern. In response, Mr. Porter agreed this was one concern but the road was a serious concern to residents as well as the overuse of the beach.

Councillor Rankin acknowledged this was by Development Agreement but asked what density would be allowed by right for the six-acre lot in terms of residences. Mr. Porter, in response, advised that in the RB-1 zone single unit dwellings were permitted but the lot size would be dependent on Department of Environment. There would not be an opportunity for 12 individual lots on the property, however.

The Chair called for speakers in favour of the application.

Mr. Mike Beamish, 56 Coolen's Road stated he would be the closest property owner to the proposed development and probably the one who would be most affected by noise. This type of development is usually in a small community. Given the fact that the applicant is working towards water testing, ensuring the road will be properly monitored and widened and working with the community as a resident as well as an owner, he supported the applicant because it would be good for the community and tourism of the area. Neighbours might come forward with concerns, some of which he shared, but he hoped that Community Council would look at the proposal as an economic development and the potential if managed and run properly.

Councillor Rankin asked if Mr. Beamish was speaking on behalf of the applicant. In response, Mr. Beamish advised he was speaking in favour of the application and was not connected with the proposal.

The Chair called three times for further speakers in favour of the application. There were none. He then called for speakers against the proposal.

Ms. Valerie Coolen, 46 Coolen's Road, on behalf of a group of opposed residents of the area, expressed concern with the narrow dirt road which is not up to the standard of 66'. Although there are improvements presently being done, the road cannot be widened. Two cars cannot pass each other. With the increased traffic that the proposal would bring, it would mean more stopping waiting for someone to pass. There was no sidewalk area for the children to walk or bike and for homeowners to walk pets. It was not considered to be a safe road for the development. Safety of children should be over what anyone wants. There are 20 permanent homes and one or two cottages. There are 27 children under the age of ten who have to walk down the road to catch the school bus. In the summer, children who do not live on Coolen's Road walk or bike to the beach which means extra children along the road. Route 333 is a main tourist route. She could not imagine 2500 trips on a daily basis. Safety of children should come first. If the proposal is approved and it becomes a booming business, because the applicant owns more land, the business could expand. Residents fought long and hard for the beach, which has a history of being community based. People knew who was at the beach and it was an opportunity to know your neighbours. If the cottages run at full capacity, there might not be room for the local children at the beach. People who use the beach have to park on the side of the road if they cannot walk. Across the bay, there is a Youth Camp and the noise from it can be heard across the bay. She expressed concern re property values going down.

Mr. David Landry, Coolen's Road submitted a Petition signed by residents of Coolen's Road and read from prepared text. He added that it was fantastic to suggest an appropriate speed limit of 50 km/h on a dirt road approximately 25' wide and .3 km long, with 5/6 hidden entrances and two blind crests, one going each way.

Ms. Linda Keddy, Chair of PROS (Please Respect Our Safety) said she could not understand 2500 trips per day. She did not know the area and could not comment on it but was concerned with Highway 333. Coolen's Road comes off a sharp end of Highway 333 and now there was a proposal to send 2500 more cars per day through that area.

For clarification purposes, Councillor Rankin advised that 2500 vehicles per day was what Department of Transportation stated that the road was capable of carrying. With this proposal, there were predicted 110 trips per day.

Ms. Keddy went on to say that the bridges in Shad Bay and Whites Lake are in need of repair. Additional vehicles using the cottages would be crossing the bridges. The structures have been deemed safe to carry the legal vehicle load traveling Route 333. At the last meeting with Department of Transportation, her committee was advised that the amount of traffic was just about maxed out. Because of the number of vehicles, until such time as the road is upgraded, she could not agree it would be a good thing for the area.

At this time, Councillor Mitchell read a letter into the record from Larry Burke dated September 26, 2000 on behalf of the Shad Bay Homeowners and Residents Association.

The Chair called three times for additional speakers against the application. There were none.

**MOVED by Councillors Blumenthal and Mitchell to close the Public Hearing.
MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

Councillor Mitchell indicated, by way of the map, his concern with the narrowness of Coolen's Road even though some upgrades are taking place at this time. He felt there would be a lot of traffic and he was concerned for the safety of children. He asked, if the application is approved, where the developer will place garbage and how would it be controlled. He referred to controls on the beach and if the residents in the area would lose it to the people in the cottages. He expressed concern that some Development Agreements do not work and asked what controls there would be on this particular proposed Development Agreement.

In response to Councillor Mitchell's last statement, Mr. Porter advised it would not be any different from any other Development Agreement. There were conditions between the Municipality and landowner and the landowner was expected to live up to it. If not, there were remedies in the agreement for fines and the possibility of revoking the permit. There were always problems with enforcement if a developer is not cooperative and it could be difficult to enforce the agreement.

Councillor Mitchell also expressed concern over the number of people who might be in one cottage or visiting at same and there would be no control over the number. There would be traffic going back and forth at night and people in the area were used to a quiet neighbourhood. Mr. Porter, in response, said he did not think it was possible to control how many people are in the cottages. With regard to garbage collection, conditions could be put in the agreement, if Community Council wishes, that refuse containers be located on the property. He understood the applicant intended to collect the garbage and keep it in an outbuilding.

Councillor Rankin pointed out that the development was not by right but by contractual agreement that provides for a range of enforcement and remedies. As far as refuse containers are concerned, HRM does not provide them on streets quite often. He did not want to see a condemnation of Development Agreements although admittedly there were problems with some but not all Development Agreements are bad.

MOVED by Councillors Mitchell and Blumenthal to reject the application.

Councillor Blumenthal advised he had made a site visit and acknowledged that the road was very narrow. He agreed with economic development and tourism but when the community goes against the project and for the safety of the area, he would have to support the community. He could not support the application.

Councillor Uteck said she could not support the development. She acknowledged this was a unique area, having spent weekends in Prospect Bay, and while there was potential for development, she did not feel this was the right kind. She was especially concerned with noise issues. Everyone had the right to quiet enjoyment of their property and there was no indication that there was a 24-hour caretaker on site.

Councillor Fougere said she would not support the development. She also spent time in the Prospect area. The cottage lifestyle would be strongly impacted by commercial development.

Councillor Rankin acknowledged that the application could be challenged at the Utility and Review Board, which was the right of the applicant. If Community Council does not make the decision on sound principles, then the applicant will win the appeal. The number of people who could be in a cottage was not the basis of rejection, nor was quiet enjoyment nor the beach because it was a public beach, not for the exclusive use of the quiet community. The road, however, seemed to be the concern and issue could be taken with Department of Transportation. Department of Transportation indicated the road could carry 2500 vehicles safely.

Councillor Fougere said there were houses abutting the road to the point where the road cannot be widened anymore. In the summer, because there is a public beach and no parking available on the road, it substantially narrows the road to the point where access to and from the proposed development is hampered and unrealistic. If the proposed development had direct access to Route 333, that would be more realistic.

Councillor Mitchell stated that most of the people who go to the beach walk there and park their cars on Route 333. If the development was in a different place, Community Council might be able to do something; however, in this location he was unable to support it. He

also had no problem with economic development but did not support development in a residential area.

Councillor Rankin confirmed that the motion for rejection was because Community Council could not accept the road as it is, relative to more development. Should road conditions change, however, then the proponent could revisit the application.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

9.1 Presentation - Waste Collection Concerns

Mr. Bill McGillivray, By-Law Enforcement Officer and Mr. Mark Bernard, Manager of Solid Waste were in attendance for this item.

The following items were before Community Council:

1. Information Report dated September 12, 2000 re Strategic Enforcement Initiative for Dangerous and Unsightly Premises
2. Information Report dated September 12, 2000 re Youth LIVE Partnership with By-Law Enforcement Section
3. Statistics re By-law Enforcement Complaints January 1 - August 1, 2000
4. E-mail from Jane Cale dated September 18, 2000 re Waste Management Concerns

Mr. Bill McGillivray provided information on the first three items submitted to Community Council. Staff recognized the importance of working closely with the Councillors, particularly for District 12 and 13 regarding the transient population. By-law Enforcement has a complaint driven initiative; however, the focus will have to be changed to work different hours and work with actual law enforcement officers re illegal dumping and scavenging. Scavenging was a loss in revenue to HRM and is an offence under the Act. There has not been an initiative to focus on economically disadvantaged people even though it is a violation under the Act as it is a social issue. When there is a loss of one half to a million dollars a year, however, due to scavenging, it is a serious problem. If more revenue can be generated, it would allow more By-law Enforcement Officers.

Councillor Fougere asked what areas are going to be targeted other than Dartmouth North. In response, Mr. McGillivray advised they planned on targeting Districts 11, 12 and 13 in the very near future. An education process to the transient community needed to be focused on. Rural areas seemed to be coping better, probably due to the lack of density. By-law Enforcement was going to take a more proactive approach to some of the problems - it was a changing philosophy.

Councillor Mitchell asked how much time is spent out in the field per week. In response, Mr. McGillivray advised the By-law Enforcement Officers spent as much time out in the field as they could; however, there was an inherent amount of paperwork. He pointed out that Dangerous and Unsightly is a legal process with a fair amount of paperwork involved.

Councillor Mitchell stated he supported uniforms for the By-law Enforcement Officers. In response, Mr. McGillivray agreed to pass Councillor Mitchell's comments on.

Councillor Uteck expressed concern that landlords are not required to educate their tenants on the rules and regulations of garbage removal under the Tenancy Act nor was there a requirement under the Municipal Government Act for landlords to post garbage regulations. She did not feel there was a strong enough education program. There were a great number of good landlords in her District but it was the small number who could ruin it. The Apartment Owners Association are fully willing to cooperate.

Mr. Mark Bernard advised that with regard to a question raised at the last meeting re household hazardous waste pickup on a bi-annual basis, this was not recommended because of costs.

Community Council then considered Ms. Jane Cale's correspondence.

With regard to the lack of garbage receptacles, Councillor Uteck explained they often end up through car windshields or stolen. In the current budget, staff was considering the garbage receptacles which can be clipped to poles. The only thing that can happen to them would be graffiti.

With regard to illegal dumping and scavenging, Mr. McGillivray advised that staff was looking seriously at scavengers cutting open bags and leaving garbage behind. With regard to garbage receptacles downtown, staff was trying to put a program together, in conjunction with Police and Public Works, to deal with all the downtown core.

Councillor Fougere pointed out there were three different departments dealing with waste and litter. She suggested that the three departments should get together and discuss how to address general litter abatement. In response, Mr. McGillivray advised that over the past month a new strategy is being developed with Solid Waste.

Councillor Blumenthal raised the concern with garbage left after someone moves from an apartment building. In response, Mr. McGillivray advised that an initiative is under way over the last few weeks. Tickets have been issued to the property owner; it is an educational process.

Councillor Rankin suggested advertising as a means of a deterrent. Subsequently, he thanked staff for their presentation.

10. **REPORTS**

10.1 **Case 7074 - Proposed Amendments to the Low Density University (U-1) Zone, Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law**

A Staff Report dated August 23, 2000 was before Community Council recommending First Reading to the proposed amendments to the U-1 Zone of the Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law and to schedule a Public Hearing for October 25, 2000.

MOVED by Councillors Uteck and Fougere to give First Reading to the proposed amendments to the U-1 zone of the Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law as contained in Appendix B of the Staff Report dated August 23, 2000 and to schedule a Joint Public Hearing with Chebucto Community Council for October 25, 2000. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

11. **MOTIONS** - None

12. **ADDED ITEMS**

12.1 **Case 00291 - Proposed Wireless Communication Equipment on the Life Sciences Building, Dalhousie University**

A Staff Report dated September 25, 2000 was before Community Council recommending support of the proposed installation of wireless communication equipment on the Life Sciences Building, Dalhousie University.

Paul Morgan, Planner provided an overview of the application and read into the record e-mail correspondence from George Hastings, Director Nova Scotia, Industry Canada dated September 27, 2000. With the aid of overheads, he showed photographs showing the nature of the antenna. During the course of his presentation, he advised that the Municipality does not have regulatory authority over this matter. The Federal government has exclusive jurisdiction but there is an opportunity for comment. Planning staff, in this particular instance, was recommending that Community Council not object to the proposal. He emphasized that Planning staff has not looked at the proposal from a health perspective; staff does not have any knowledge of effects on health. He advised that with regard to aesthetics, where the building was fairly central on the campus and buildings around it to screen it from the surrounding neighbourhood, from a visual standpoint the proposal would be relatively innocuous. He advised that Maria Jacobs was in attendance on behalf of Rogers Wireless Inc.

Mr. Morgan advised that as requested by Councillor Uteck, notification went to people in the surrounding area advising of the meeting tonight. He advised that there were people in the audience wishing to comment.

Councillor Rankin pointed out that this was not a Public Hearing and public comment was not required; however, if Community Council wished to hear from the public, that would be acceptable.

Councillor Uteck stated that she had received concerns from residents of Coburg Place, problems with health issues. She asked what would be the nearest closest residence outside the university campus. In response, Mr. Morgan said he felt South Street and Dalhousie Street would be closest. Oxford Court might be roughly the same distance but he had not made any measurements.

Councillor Fougere asked if, other than Administration at the University, other people were consulted such as the Student Union and Faculty Association. In response, Ms. Jacobs advised the proposal went through the university at the administrative level.

Community Council agreed to hear from the public on this matter.

Ms. Rose McGinn, Oxford Court said she was interested in health concerns. There were 100 people living in her building and they had no knowledge of what was going on until yesterday morning.

With regard to notification, Mr. Morgan advised that there was no requirement pursuant to federal regulations for notification. In this case, it was done by staff with participation from Rogers. The federal government has jurisdiction but the Municipality can provide comment. He referred to the name provided by Mr. Hastings as a contact person at Health Canada.

Ms. McGinn continued that she has not had an opportunity to determine what Health Canada's Safety Code 6 means. In response, Councillor Rankin advised that Community Council might want to postpone decision to allow people more opportunity to put comments in writing.

Ms. Elizabeth Ryan, Oxford Street expressed concern with notification as well. She said she had a lot of questions to raise both in this venue and with Dalhousie. She said aesthetics were not the concern.

Councillor Uteck clarified that she was aware of the application through Mr. Morgan; however, she was not aware of the number of antenna proposed. When she found out that 14 antenna were proposed, that was when she asked for notification to residents.

Ms. Ann McCormick, Dalhousie Street advised that people on her street were not informed. She said it seemed a strange area to be erecting something of this type; there were other tall buildings in the area which could be used. She had concerns with health effects.

Ms. Maria Jacobs, Rogers Wireless advised that Dalhousie was considered because there was no coverage in that area - two km. around Dalhousie. If the equipment cannot be located on a high building, then a tower would have to be built to achieve the coverage. Rogers was trying to be unobtrusive but achieve as much coverage as possible. Rogers felt that the proposed installation blended with the building. The underground shelter would be unobtrusive as possible.

Ms. Ryan asked if there had been a proposal in the past to erect an antenna in the area. In response, Ms. Jacobs advised there had been with Coburg Place but even though a lease was signed with the administration of Coburg Place, because there was not unanimous agreement with all of the co-owners, Rogers chose to withdraw.

The Chair asked how Community Council wished to proceed. He suggested that if more information was required, then a decision could be postponed to the next meeting to allow opportunity for the residents to contact federal government agencies. He pointed out that Community Council would not be commenting on health aspects.

Councillor Uteck said that part of the problem this evening was notification. She was concerned that some of the residents in the area did not know about the proposal. She agreed with a deferral for further information. She pointed out she understood, however, that there was going to be a cell site somewhere in District 13.

The Chair asked Ms. Jacobs if there was any problem on Rogers' part with a deferral. Ms. Jacobs agreed to a deferral to the next meeting.

Councillor Rankin urged members of the public not to rely on the Municipality for questions on health. There was an opportunity between now and the next meeting for the public to obtain answers.

Ms. Beverly Miller, 6182 South Street asked why the issue was not on the Agenda. In response, Mr. Morgan advised that Rogers Wireless asked staff to put the matter on the Agenda as quickly as possible. Staff agreed because the Municipality could only deal with aesthetics. He was asked to consult with Councillor Uteck who requested that notices go out to the neighbourhood. Staff might have underestimated the concern from residents of the area but they seemed to be health related. Neither Councillors nor staff have expertise with regard to health issues.

MOVED by Councillors Uteck and Fougere to defer this matter to the next meeting in order for the public to avail themselves of information on health related issues and to provide additional public notice by staff and Rogers Wireless. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13. **NOTICES OF MOTION** - None

14. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Ms. Amery Boyer, 5688 North Street referred to Ms. Cale's correspondence received during the Presentation on solid waste concerns and submitted additional specific examples of illegal dumping on business properties in the Commons North neighbourhood. She advised she was a member of CNNA (Commons North Neighbourhood Association) and expressed disappointment with the presentation on solid waste. As per the presentation, there were four departments dealing with solid waste - Solid Waste itself, Public Works, By-Law Enforcement and Police; however, only two representatives were present. She suggested that staff should get together and co-ordinate. She expressed disappointment that the Councillor for District 12 was not present, nor did he want to be present. Getting a strategy together with District 12 was an issue. She was concerned with the percentage of time By-law Enforcement staff spent on paperwork rather than enforcement. She expressed disappointment that staff did not stay for the Public Participation portion of the meeting. If there was a problem with the Municipal Government Act with By-laws, then it was up to Council to fix them.

In response, Councillor Rankin advised there was a Solid Waste Committee meeting being held on October 4, 2000 and suggested that Ms. Boyer come forward at that meeting. He expressed regret that staff did not stay for Public Participation. He requested that the Clerk ensure there is a By-law Enforcement Officer in attendance at the Solid Waste Committee meeting on October 4, 2000.

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

- With the new Western Commons, was there any progress in getting a fish passage over the dam at Big Indian Lake. In response, Councillor Mitchell advised that a trail is being developed which passes right by the dam. He acknowledged that the dam needed work. It was still in the planning stages.
- North West Community Council is considering an environmental study of the Sackville River watershed. He asked for consideration and support from this Community Council. It was agreed that Community Council would consider it.
- He understood that the old school in Hammonds Plains was not hooked up to water and recommended that it should be for water quality and fire fighting purposes. In

response, Councillor Rankin advised the school was eligible for water but has not received it yet.

- Sackville Rivers Association is planning to put in a boat launch on McCabe Lake and has run into several difficulties. He asked for help in solving the problems. Councillor Rankin agreed to assist.

Ms. Dawn Sloan, Creighton Street expressed the following concerns:

- There should be more street cleaning because there is still garbage in front of homes in District 12.
- Recycle bins are too big for people in her area unless you have a back yard. In District 12 most houses do not have accessibility to a back yard.
- She suggested worm farms (Red Wigglers) - and take away green bins.
- She suggested garbage pickup once a week in District 12 because there is no place to hide garbage in District 12.
- Because there are no garbage bins, people put their refuse, when they decide to use one, in the green bin. This means that the homeowner is responsible for picking up someone else's garbage and removing it from the green bin.

Councillor Rankin advised that if people have other solutions that still provide for diversion, they should bring them forward. Staff would have to respond to suggestions like these and he suggested that Ms. Sloan contact Jim Bauld of Solid Waste Management. As far as weekly collection was concerned, Council has considered it but the cost was estimated to be at least \$1 million because extra equipment would be required.

Ms. Linda McAlpine, 6044 Pepperell Street referred to an upcoming proposal for the old painted houses in her area. She stated that the residents of her area would like to see something done with the properties in a responsible manner. Residents of the area have a number of concerns and will be providing information at a later date.

Ms. Beverly Miller, 6182 South Street said she understood the difficulties and economics of more frequent garbage collection but one thing that comes out of the reports is education. She pointed out that people could not be educated into driveways and outside hose connections. There was a need to be more creative in areas where there are row houses and no hoses, no driveways or no place to put debris. She did not think there was any other solution other than more frequent pickup because of the pattern of buildings in the older areas of the city.

15. **NEXT MEETING** - October 25, 2000

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion from Councillor Mitchell, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Sandra M. Shute
Assistant Municipal Clerk