

She also questioned why the Fire Insurance Companies who received all the money for fire insurance policies, have no responsibility for paying for any fire fighting. She asked whether there were any cases where these Insurance Companies do pay for fire fighting.

Solicitor Cragg answered the Councillor advising that the Caselaw is that the legislation by which a Municipality can set up Fire Fighting Companies (Fire Departments) is strictly permissive and not mandatory. Therefore, the Municipality does not have any legal obligation to have any fire fighting equipment or personnel anywhere within its jurisdiction. There are provisions, however, which say that Council shall appoint Fire Wards but that is completely different and separate from setting up actual fire departments. The Case Law states that even if a Municipality sets up a Fire Fighting Company the Municipality is not liable for an incomplete or incompetent fire fighting service.

However, he advised that if a Volunteer Firemen does something constructively negligent, then he, as well as the Municipality, can be held liable. The Solicitor gave as an example; if a firetruck on its way to a fire ran over a child, then the driver and the Municipality can be held liable.

He further advised that there would be no liability to the individual Councillor, unless the Councillor was driving the truck or appointed a Fire Chief or Fire Ward knowing that the person was incompetent, or ought to have known that he was incompetent.

Mr. Meech advised that to his knowledge there were no Fire Insurance Companies who would take responsibility for fire fighting services. Deputy Warden Deveaux advised that if they did take some of the financial responsibility that they would probably get it back in the form of higher insurance rates, so it would not really be of very much benefit.

Councillor MacKay suggested in response to Councillor Eisenhower's statements about a shopping centre going near a highway, (which he felt must be referring to the new one proposed for the Kearney Lake Road) that the area rate should be applied against the assessment base for the required fire protection.

Mr. Meech advised that it should be possible with the consensus among the various appropriate bodies.

There was some discussion regarding the eminent expiration of tax concessions with Mr. Meech advising that they have not all expired as yet although the agreements the Municipality had entered into with IEL had all expired as of 1977 or 1978 and there is no longer any requirement on the part of the Municipality to grant a tax concession to an industry that is being financially supported or being provided financing by IEL. He advised that the Municipality still had the Bonus Act but there is a policy at the Provincial level where they discourage tax concession by Municipalities for local, commercial or industrial complexes. There are exceptions, as in the case of Michelin Tire where there was an agreement negotiated between Michelin the Province and the Municipality providing the tax concession.

Councillor Benjamin also advised that there was Federal Property at the Airport that the Municipality was expected to provide fire protection for, this would be the terminal itself.

Councillor Eisenhower suggested that the Municipality should request capital assistance from the Province but should not delegate all its responsibilities regarding Fire Departments to the Province as it would decrease the community motivation which now exists in regard to Fire Departments.

It was moved by Councillor Adams:

"THAT Staff formulate a procedure or policy to deal with all the questions raised tonight by Council as well as to deal with the paper that was presented to Council this evening."

There was no seconder for this motion; it was accepted as a recommendation.

Mr. Meech advised that many of the questions raised this evening by Council were internal questions which Council already has the authority and jurisdiction to deal with and Council would not want to take these issues to the Select Committee to delegate them to the Province.

Mr. Meech further advised that there seemed to be a total lack of direction centrally from the Municipality as to how Staff, Elected People, and Public are to relate to Fire Department Operations. This situation had developed over the years and part of the problem is that it is district oriented and becomes an individual, personal relationship which is why in some Districts interaction between Councillors and Fire Departments works well and in other Districts there are problems. He advised that in the process of solving some of the problems between Councillors and Fire Departments, Council wanted to continue to support Volunteer Fire Department Operations being careful not to take away the local initiative.

Councillor Adams advised that this was the whole point of his previous recommendation: so that the Municipality could deal with the internal problems within its own jurisdiction without involving the Select Committee.

Mr. Meech questioned whether Council felt it would be advantageous for Fire Departments to become locally incorporated bodies with some semblance of independence and that their constitution require them to have annual general meetings at which the public would attend and have the financial activities of the Department revealed to them. Then rather than provide funds on the basis of an area rate, establish a policy whereby a grant is provided and they provide the Municipality with financial statements. He felt this may be a recommendation to take to the Select Committee for consideration.

Councillor Eisenhower spoke on behalf of this recommendation because in this arrangement, the people know what the Fire Department needs and the Fire Department knows what the people are willing to pay. He advised that it was a similar arrangement to that of the Service Commission concept.

Councillor Smith had some questions regarding this concept, asking whether the funding for such an operation would still come through an area rate or would it be raised by the Department on its own.

Mr. Meech advised that it would depend on whether or not they were set up legislatively, giving them the power to determine an area rate. If they were not set up with that power then they would likely look to the Municipality for a grant or funds through an area rate as it would be difficult to generate sufficient revenue to operate the Fire Department completely without some financial assistance from the Municipality.

Councillor Smith also wondered what procedure the Fire Departments would use in order to become independent of the Municipality and was advised by Mr. Meech that the only available method at the moment was the Village Services Act which would empower the Village Service Commission to have the ability to raise funds by the setting of a tax rate for purposes of fire protection. One other method used in the past was to have a special act of the legislature approved which would set out those powers for the incorporation of the body. He further advised that in recent years there has been a move to try and discourage that type of set-up, which gives Service Commissions the right to set a tax rate.

Councillor Smith requested further clarification in regard to the liability of the District Councillor, subsequent to an act of negligence on the part of the Fire Department. As it had previously been determined that a Councillor could not be held liable unless it could be proven that the Councillor had knowingly appointed an incompetent person to the position of Fire Chief or Fire Ward. She requested clarification on what was meant by incompetence.

Solicitor Cragg advised that he had meant to convey that the Councillor could possibly be held liable if he nominated as a Fire Ward a person they knew to be incompetent or ought to have known because of actions or reputation, and that person was totally and grossly incompetent as a Fire Ward.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Committee of the Whole Session adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, the Session adjourned at 9:10 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING

AUGUST 24, 1981

PRESENT WERE: Deputy Warden Deveaux, Chairman
Councillor Poirier
Councillor Baker
Councillor Adams
Councillor Gaetz
Councillor Smith
Councillor MacKenzie
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Margeson
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor MacDonald
Councillor Wiseman
Councillor MacKay
Councillor Benjamin

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Bill Campbell, Policy Division, Municipal Planning
Department
Mr. Ken Meech, Chief Executive Officer
Mr. Robert Gough, Director of Planning & Development
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. Brant Wishart, Municipal Planner
Mr. Donald MacDonald
Mr. Bernac, Secretary-Treasurer, M.B.B. Mechanical
Serv. Limited.
Mr. Conn Marsh, Vice President, Public Participation
Committee
Mr. Robert Pace, Solicitor
Mr. Fraser Parker
Mr. Don L. Mason, D. L. Mason & Associates Ltd.

SECRETARY: Mrs. Christine Harvey

Deputy Warden Deveaux brought the meeting to order at 7:10 P.M.

The Deputy Warden outlined for those present in the gallery the procedure which would be used throughout the three rezoning requests, advising that subsequent to an outline by the Planning Department staff, those speakers in favour of the applications would be heard first, then questioned by Council, after which those speakers in opposition to the application would be heard and questioned by Council. Subsequent to these proceedings, the public portion of the hearings would be declared closed and the floor would be open to discussion and a motion from Council.

REZONING REQUEST 4-81, M. B. B. MECHANICAL SERVICES LTD.

Mr. Gough of the Planning Department explained that this was a request to rezone Lot A and Parcel PX-1, Allen Doyle Subdivision located on the St. Margarets Bay Road, Five Island Lake, District 3 from "G" General Building Zone and an Unzoned Status to "I-1" General Industrial Zone.

Mr. Gough then advised that this application for rezoning had been duly advertised as specified under the Municipal Planning Act and no response had been received either for or opposed to the application.

Mr. Gough proceeded to supply some background and general information advising: "M.B.B. Mechanical Services Ltd. is a small Canadian Company which provides expertise in the repair and alteration to large steam generators and process plants such as are found in electrical power stations and pulp mills. Expansion of the company has dictated a need for the local production of precise part components and other assemblies for steam generation including combustion equipment and high technology hardware.

To accomodate this expansion, the applicants have indicated that they would, should their application prove successful, use the two existing buildings on the site for the storage of materials and locate within the buildings boiler steel tube automatic bending equipment and welding equipment for the fabrication of pressure parts. The applicants have also indicated that they may establish a single story office building of approximately 1,700 square feet on the site and envisage a reproduction employment level of 12 - 28 people.

They have also stated that the manufacturing requirements of M.B.B. do not include any environmentally hazardous materials nor does their manufacturing process result in any discharge of odour or smoke into the atmosphere and have also indicated that they intend to grade and landscape the entrance to the property."

Utilizing an overhead projected map, Mr. Gough pointed out and described the surrounding lots and the lot in question as well as the respective zoning of the areas.

Reading from the Staff Report he advised: "Lot PX-1 and Lot A consist of approximately 13.85 acres and have approximately 302 feet of frontage on the St. Margarets Bay Road. The site was originally developed by Famous Players Canadian Corporation as a drive-in theatre and was subsequently purchased by Miller-Johnson Industrial Auctioneers who erected two archdome industrial buildings for equipment storage. It is from these two buildings that the applicants propose to conduct their operations. There is also an unoccupied mobile home on the lot which is slated to be removed.

The property is bounded to the west and northeast by woods and to the north by Highway 101 (although the property line falls 100 feet short of this highway)."

In regard to the existing zoning, Mr. Gough advised that the property in question as well as surrounding properties, are zoned G (General Building Zone) to a depth of 500 feet on either side of the St. Margarets Bay Road. Beyond this point, property is unzoned. He further advised that a rezoning is required for the proposed use as District 3 falls under the Industrial Use Section of the Municipality's Zoning By-Law.

As the proposed use of the site could conceivably generate additional traffic on the St. Margaret's Bay Road the Department of Transportation was asked to comment on the application. They have stated that they "Have no objection to the rezoning application."

The Nova Scotia Department of the Environment has reviewed the request and has stated that, "according to the plan submitted and the type of development proposed, there should not be any detrimental effect on the environment as a result of this proposal."

Mr. Gough summed up his report by advising that on the basis of the following considerations, the Planning and Development Department recommend that this application be approved by County Council:

1. M.B.B. Mechanical Services Ltd. can be classified as a "Clean Industry" in that smoke-odour is not emitted into the atmosphere nor does the manufacturing process utilize hazardous materials.
2. The site in question is in an area, that is, for the most part undeveloped and therefore would not interfere with area residents enjoyment of their land.

Mr. Gough also submitted to Council a small sketch of the lot in question in case some Councillors were interested in the size. He advised that the total area was approximately 14.2 acres.

Questions from Council

Councillor Wiseman questioned Mr. Gough as to where the office part of the complex would be located on the lot, to which Mr. Gough advised, pointing to the sketch that the present two buildings on the lot would be used and there may eventually be a single storey office structure built on the lot. He also advised that the present two buildings were not visible from the road.

As there were no further questions for Mr. Gough from Council the Deputy Warden asked for any persons in the Gallery who wished to speak in favour of the application for rezoning, to come forward.

Speakers in Favour of the Rezoning Application

The first speaker in favour of the rezoning application was Mr. Bernac, the Secretary - Treasurer of M.B.B. Mechanical Services Ltd. Mr. Bernac did not speak at length but merely advised that he was in support of the application and that he wished to answer Councillor Wiseman's question pertaining to office space. He advised that the trailer presently located on the site would be removed and the area landscaped, then at the summit of the hill the new one storey building will be erected. Due to the landscaping he advised that the property would not look out of place with the surroundings. He also advised that any further development would take place way in the back. Mr. Bernac also enlarged on Mr. Gough's description of the M.B.B. Mechanical Services advising they were a new company which has started up business in Halifax in 1977; all of the company's employees had worked for some of the major American auto manufacturers. He advised that they have expanded and are now into manufacturing themselves; their business now taking them across the Country. He went into a detailed description of the work that was carried on at M.B.B.

Questions from Council

Councillor Baker questioned Mr. Bernac as to how many people he anticipated hiring, to which Mr. Bernac replied that their full time staff in the Halifax area was approximately 10 persons. He advised that once all expansion plans are complete this could rise to 40 or 50 persons.

There were no other speakers in favour of the application and none in opposition.

Deputy Warden Deveaux declared the floor open for a motion from Council.

It was moved by Councillor Poirier, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT the request by M.B.B. Mechanical Services Ltd. to zone and rezone Lot A and Parcel PX-1 of the Allen Doyle Subdivision located on the St. Margarets Bay Road (Highway 3) at Five Island Lake from G (General Building Zone) and an unzoned status to I-1 (General Industrial Zone), District 3, be approved by Municipal Council."

Motion Carried.

REZONING APPLICATION 7-81, DONALD MACDONALD

Mr. Brant Wishart of the Planning Department advised that this was a request to rezone Lots 25 and 26 of Hugh Fraser Subdivision, located on the St. Margarets Bay Road at Timberlea, District 2 from R-2 (Residential Two Family Dwelling Zone) to C-1 (Commercial Local Business Zone).

Mr. Wishart advised that: "this application had been duly advertised as required under the Municipal Planning Act and that to date a number of pieces of correspondence had been received. This evening two letters had been received in support of the application, one from the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Community Recreation Association and another from Mr. D. Campbell, President of the TASA. In addition a petition had been received this evening signed by 70 local area residents in favour of the rezoning application and a petition against the application signed by 11 area residents. As well a memorandum has been received from the Public Participation Committee of Timberlea-Lakeside-Beechville."

Mr. Wishart outlined the report of the Planning Department advising: "An application has been received from Donald J. MacDonald requesting the rezoning of Lots 25 and 26, Subdivision of the Estate of Hugh Fraser, from R-2 (Residential Two Family Dwelling Zone (Commercial Local Business Zone). The applicant has stated, via his Solicitor, that he initially intends to locate a Bottle Exchange within an existing structure on Lot 25 and utilize the remainder of Lot 25 and 26 for parking and a green area. He has also stated that in the future he may operate an Equipment Rental Business from the property to rent small items such as lawn mowers, grass seeders, carpentry tools and machinery, etc.

It should be noted that on two occasions the Chief Building Inspector has written to Mr. MacDonald concerning the apparent illegal operation of a bottle exchange within the R-2 Zone in which the property is located, the first letter dated September 24, 1980 and the second dated October 9, 1980. The first letter requested Mr. MacDonald's immediate attention in that the business should cease and the second advised, "that failure to comply with this request will result in the matter being forwarded to the Municipal Solicitor with the recommendation that legal action be taken against you."

Mr. Wishart continued, advising: "on the date that the Planning Staff conducted a site visit of the property, there was a sign erected on Lot 25 indicating that a bottle exchange business was in operation."

Mr. Wishart utilized a projected over head map to point out the lots in question, the surrounding area and their respective zoning.

He advised: "on lot 26 is a small shed and a temporary field office trailer being utilized by the company overseeing the installation of water and sewer lines in the area (CBCL). Immediately to the south of the lots in question lies a duplex dwelling, adjacent to which is located a single family dwelling. Approximately 500 feet from this home on the same side of Highway No. 3 is located Fitzgerald's store. Adjacent to Lot 26 to the south are a number of single family dwellings while directly across the St. Margaret's Bay Road running north and south are situated several single family units. Directly behind Lot 25 and 26 is a C.N.R. right-of-way and railway line, beyond which lies undeveloped land of the Greenwood heights Subdivision all residential zoned."

Mr. Wishart continued, advising: "the lots in question are presently zoned R-2 as are the surrounding properties to the north, west and south excepting Fitzgerald's store which is zoned C-1. This zoning was implemented in 1975 at the request of the residents of Greenwood heights subdivision.

The Comments of the Department of Transportation were as follows: "Based on existing speeds in the area and sight distance requirements, it has been determined that the sight distance to all three driveways is inadequate, and it is our recommendation that none of the three be used for a commercial establishment at this time.

It was also noted that it would be possible to improve sight distance to one or more of the driveways by cutting some trees and the bank."

The recommendation of the Planning and Development Department, based on the following considerations, is that County Council should reject this application for rezoning:

1. Existing land use in the vicinity of Lots 25 and 26, excluding Fitzgerald's store, is of a residential nature and is consistent with the R-2 Zoning presently in place in the area. Therefore, a commercial site in the area would be inconsistent with the surrounding land use.

In addition, past experience has demonstrated that approval of requests of this nature only serve to encourage similar applications for commercial zonings, which in turn generally tend to erode the residential character of neighbourhoods.

2. The specific use proposed for the property would be inappropriate for the area. A Bottle Exchange by its very nature, would tend to attract traffic and business from beyond the immediate neighbourhood which in turn could conceivably interfere with area residents right to the quiet enjoyment of their land and create a hazard for the motoring public as noted by the Department of Transportation. In addition, the outdoor storage of bottles is not uncommon with this form of business which again could detract from the surrounding neighbourhood and adversely affect property values.
3. As was previously mentioned, there is evidence to suggest that a bottle exchange has and is being carried out from the site illegally.

Generally speaking rezoning illegal uses to a conforming status can negatively affect the credibility of the Municipality's Zoning By-Law. The assurance of protection against incompatible uses that zoning provides may be seriously eroded if uses are permitted to establish in this manner. Approval of rezoning in these cases may serve to encourage other individuals to proceed with projects regardless of County rules and regulations and it is felt that this practice should be discouraged.

Questions from Council

Councillor MacKenzie questioned Mr. Wishart as to how long Mr. MacDonald had been in business and he was advised that Mr. Wishart did not know how long but that the business was first noticed in September of 1980.

Further to this Councillor MacKay questioned Mr. Wishart in regard to whether or not Mr. MacDonald had operated his Bottle Exchange business subsequent to hearing from the Chief Building Inspector, who had contacted him twice by letter.

Mr. Wishart advised that subsequent to receiving the second letter, Mr. MacDonald had advised that he was in the process of applying for rezoning of the two lots in question, but due to the time it took to obtain a survey and all the documentation, the Planning Department did not begin until May of this year. In that interim Mr. MacDonald has been operating to some degree but Mr. Wishart was not certain whether he had been operating full or part time. He also advised in response to further questioning from Councillor MacKay, that the Bottle Exchange was being operated out of the shed on the lot.

At this point in the meeting it was agreed by Council that Mr. Wishart should read to Council the letters and petitions received both in support and opposed to the application.

As previously stated there were two letters in support of the application: 1, from: the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Recreation Association and signed by the President, Mr. Walter Murray, 2, from: Mr. D. Campbell, Vice President of the TASA.

As well he read to Council the two petitions which had been received, one in favour of the application, signed by 70 residents who live in close proximity to the lots in question and one in opposition, signed by 11 persons.

He also read to Council a memorandum to the Members of Municipal Council on the issue, from the Public Participation Committee Timberlea-Lakeside-Beechville. (See memo for detail)

Councillor MacDonald questioned Mr. Wishart in regard to where the people signing the petition resided and was advised that as the petition had been received only this evening, the Planning Department had not been able to ascertain exactly where the people lived, though judging by the addresses it was in the immediate area of the two lots.

Councillor MacKay questioned whether Mr. MacDonald, under the C-1 zoning, would be permitted to carry on the salvage of paper and metals and was advised by Mr. Wishart that he would not and that in order to do this he would have to obtain a license from the PUB for a salvage yard zone from the Municipality. He advised that the lots would only be used for the Bottle Exchange and that if lot 26 were later used for a small rental business, as has been indicated by Mr. MacDonald, this would also be a permitted legal use under C-1 zoning.

In regard to a quote in the memo from the PPC, "an exemption to the lands specified in the rezoning application but nevertheless subject to a contract between Mr. MacDonald and the Municipality", Councillor MacKay questioned the Solicitor as to whether that would be legal at the present time or would the Municipality have to wait until the MDP was implemented in November or December.

The Solicitor advised that the Municipality would only have such power when the MDP comes into effect, but that contract zone was not in effect yet.

Councillor Smith questioned how many members were in attendance at the PPC Meeting where the consensus, as mentioned previously in regard to contract zoning, had been taken.

She was advised by Mr. Wishart that there were approximately four members in attendance besides the chairman. She was further advised by Mr. Bill Campbell, Policy Division of the Planning Department, that there is usually a fluctuating number of members in attendance at these meetings, with an average of 8 - 10 per meeting.

Councillor MacDonald then questioned, since contract zoning was presently illegal; "if this property was rezoned, would it be eligible to have batteries, lead, etc, on the property?"

Mr. Wishart advised him that the PUB has informed the Municipality that anything beyond bottles requires a license from their Department and in addition the Chief Building Inspector informs that such use requires salvage yard zoning from the Municipality. He reiterated his previous comments that a rental equipment facility would be legal under the C-1 zoning.

There were no more questions from Council.

Speakers in Favour

Mr. Conn Marsh, the Vice Chairman of the Public participation Committee of Timberlea-Lakeside-Beechville.

Mr. Marsh advised that the PPC was not either for or against the application. However, he went over the memo from the PPC advising Council that the PPC's intentions were to the area and specified the following points which had been stressed in the memo.

1. The Committee would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm its emphasis on the importance of the Public Hearing Process and to relate the important concepts and principals which the Committee has used in considering future and existing commercial and industrial use. (See memo for detail)
2. (Most Important) Depending on the applicant's ability to demonstrate historical acceptance of the proposed land use and the ability to minimize noise, aesthetic, traffic and other land

use conflicts to adjoining and proximal properties, the Committee is prepared to consider under the draft Municipal Development Plan, an exemption to the lands specified in the rezoning application but nevertheless subject to a contract between Mr. MacDonald and the Municipality.

In regard to Councillor Smith's question, as to how many were present at the PPC Committee Meeting, he advised that there are usually 10 - 12 members at the meetings with a nucleus of about 4 - 5 who always attend all the meetings. He advised that this particular meeting was quite low in attendance but that the decision had already been made at a prior meeting.

Councillor MacKay asked if the Committee had been aware that at this point in time the Municipality cannot enter into contract zoning and that at this time, they have an opportunity to either reject or accept the zoning. Mr. Marsh advised that the Committee had been ignorant of the fact that the particular lot was even zoned, they had not known that the area had ever been considered part of Greenwood Heights Subdivision. The Committee basically had no objections to the application but desired some stipulations put in it to safeguard the area down the line.

There were no further questions for Mr. Marsh.

The next speaker in favour of the application was Mr. Robert Pace, Solicitor for Mr. Donald J. MacDonald.

Mr. Pace and Mr. MacDonald proceeded to the front of the Council Chambers to give their presentation on behalf of the application for rezoning.

Mr. Pace advised that Mr. MacDonald has lived in the area for the past eighteen years and was a very community minded person. He felt that the letters in support of his application were evidence of that fact. He also pointed out that when the Lakeside-Timberlea area began installation of their water and sewer services, Mr. MacDonald permitted CBCL to locate their trailer on his property free of charge. CBCL could not find a location previous to this.

He advised that Mr. MacDonald has operated a Bottle Exchange in that area since 1975 and in 1979 he bought the lots in question next door to his home with the intent to operate a Bottle Exchange business. As Mr. Marsh pointed out, Mr. MacDonald did not realize that he could not operate this Bottle Exchange business as no one ever knew including the County, how these lots were zoned. He operated this business for one year on the subject lots with no difficulty until he put up a sign to advertise that he was operating this business. Shortly thereafter he received the correspondence from the County advising him that he was operating illegally and at that point he began the rezoning process which has taken a considerable amount of time. He has now taken down his sign but has not received any additional letters or documentation from the County.

He advised that the intended use of these lots is initially to operate a bottle exchange business. At some time in the future he would like to operate a rental equipment business as he has felt for some time that there is a great need for both businesses in this area. The rental business would encompass the rental of small gardening tools, camping equipment, etc. It was Mr. Pace's feeling that such a business would be an asset to the area.

Mr. Pace also pointed out in regard to the Comments by the Department of Transportation, who indicated that the entrances to the driveways would be acceptable if certain trees and the bank were cut down, that Mr. MacDonald was prepared to comply with these stipulations.

Mr. Pace then circulated to the Council members a pictorial sketch of the lots in question, as they would be in their completely landscaped state, in the future.

Mr. Pace advised in answer to a question from Councillor MacKenzie, that there was no liquor commission in the Timberlea area, to his knowledge. Councillor MacKenzie, therefore, felt that a Bottle Exchange would enhance that area.

Mr. MacDonald advised in response to a question from Councillor MacDonald that he was in no way associated with J. W. MacDonald Bottle Exchange.

Councillor Baker questioned Mr. MacDonald as to how many people he would expect to employ. Mr. MacDonald informed him that to date he employs only his own son. Mr. Pace advised the Councillor, however that there was a possibility of employing more people if and when the rental business is established in the future.

Councillor MacKay questioned whether Mr. MacDonald had looked into the matter of zoning of the land when he opened his Bottle Exchange business. Mr. MacDonald advised that he did not check with the County when he opened his business but that he had checked when the land was purchased, at which time the Planning Department had no record of the zoning.

Councillor Poirier advised Council that in regard to the zoning in the area, that she knew nothing of the zoning and that when she had reason to go to the Planning Department, they also did not know about any zoning on the property and that it was only recently that it had been discovered that when Greenwood Heights had been zoned this property was included in the zoning for that area.

Councillor Wiseman advised that she had noticed some discrepancy in a few of the statements that were made. She understood from the presentation of the Planning Department that a sign was in place when the Planning Department visited the site. However, Mr. Pace had advised that the sign was taken down after the rezoning process had began.

Mr. MacDonald clarified that the sign had been taken down until after the application for rezoning had been made in the Spring; the sign was then put back up after being down all winter.

There were no further questions for Mr. Pace and Mr. MacDonald.

However, Mr. Pace made a further comment in regard to the people who signed the petition against the rezoning application; he advised that subsequent to Mr. MacDonald taking his pictorial sketch around to those people, his next door neighbour on one side has signed in support of the application as well as the people across the street, therefore some of those people who were originally in opposition are now in support of the rezoning application.

As there were no more speakers in favour of the rezoning application, the Deputy Warden called for all those in opposition to come forward.

Speakers in Opposition

Mr. Fraser Parker came forward to speak in opposition to the rezoning application. He advised that he lived next door to the proposed Bottle Exchange and that he had lived there for sixteen years.

He stated that although Mr. MacDonald was a fine gentlemen, he was still opposed to having a Bottle Exchange next door to him. He advised that those people who had signed the petition against the exchange were all people on the same side of the road. Those on the other side of the road, he felt were not opposed because that side of the road was zoned commercial. Therefore, he felt those people should have no say in the matter.

It was pointed out to Mr. Parker by Councillor MacKay that the land across the street was unzoned and zoned G (General Building Zone) to a depth of 500 feet. This was backed up by Mr. Wishart of the Planning Department.

Mr. Parker advised that there were several businesses across the street, including two body shops, a heavy industry rentals and one other business which he could not name. However, it was determined that these businesses were allowed under the present zoning.

Councillor Lichter questioned Mr. Parker as to whether or not the Bottle Exchange had so far caused him any problems. Mr. Parker replied that it had caused no serious problems to date, other than minimal noise which did not occur either in early morning or late evening, but it had caused considerable devaluation of his property.

Councillor MacKay asked whether the property in question, once landscaped, would add to the value of his property. Mr. Parker advised that it might, but to this point in time his property value had decreased. In fact, he advised that he had his property appraised fifteen months ago by Nova Scotia Savings and Loans who dropped the property value by \$10,000, due to the Bottle Exchange.

Mr. Parker also advised that he expected some problems with his driveway which joined at the bottom with one of the Bottle Exchange driveways and which swung in different directions further on. He felt that the additional traffic which could be caused by the Bottle Exchange would cause some disturbance.

Councillor Wiseman wondered if, with the contract zoning in the future, there could be some correction with the two adjoining driveways, in that another driveway could be established at another location. However, Mr. Parker did not feel that this would be possible as Mr. MacDonald had a garage at the end of his driveway.

Councillor Margeson showed Mr. Parker the sketch which had been supplied by Mr. Pace. Mr. Parker advised that the sketch showed everything on a straight line when in fact, the property was on a curve. Mr. Parker further advised Councillor Margeson that he was not against this application in particular but was opposed to it in principle because if it was successful, anyone can open the same type of business.

Councillor Margeson advised that anyone could apply to do the same thing but that such application would have to be addressed separately on its own merit.

Councillor MacDonald advised Mr. Parker that any further improvements or expansion would have to be done under contract zoning when the plan is in place which would give Mr. Parker a lot of protection. However, Mr. Parker still maintained that once one section of that side of the road was rezoned than anyone else can come along, buy another section, and put it to the same use, which is why he was against the application.

Mr. Campbell of the Planning Department attempted to clarify the MDP plan, advising that as it is now evolving for Timberlea-Lakeside-Beechville, the intent is to deal as the PPC indicated, allowing existing operations to expand by contract. He advised that right now without a MDP plan someone can apply for another commercial rezoning adjacent to that property and have another type of commercial operation. However, through the draft plan that would not be able to take place and rezonings would be limited along the Number 3 Highway to what will be called local commercial uses only (variety store or small grocery store of limited square footage) in order to control strip development of large commercial development, as indicated in the memo from the Public Participation Committee. As the draft plan is emerging, it has to go through a public process and be viewed by the Public to determine whether it is acceptable or not. He further advised that spot rezoning on an adhoc basis would be governed by the plan so another rezoning for a Bottle Exchange in that locality may not be able to take place.

Deputy Warden Deveaux requested whether a business of this type which has been classed as non-conforming would be able to carry on a non-conforming status with the proposal or would they have to apply.

Mr. Campbell advised that there were very few non-conforming uses being created. The Committee is trying to deal with existing operations continuing and expanding by this contract method. He advised that there were several situations between existing residents and existing commercial operations where the Committee has suggested a non-conforming use status, but only in a limited number of cases.

There were no more questions for Mr. Parker from Council and no more speakers in opposition.

Therefore, the Deputy Warden declared the public portion of the Hearing closed and the floor was open to a motion from Council.

It was moved by Councillor Poirier, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"THAT the request by Donald J. MacDonald to rezone Lot 25 and 26, Hugh Fraser Subdivision located on the St. Margarets Bay Road (Highway 3) at Timberlea from R-2 (Residential Two Family Dwelling Zone) to C-1 (Commercial Business Zone), District 2, be approved by County Council."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Poirier spoke briefly on behalf of Mr. MacDonald, giving Council some background information on him and on his previous business. She advised that this was not a usual non-conforming use as Mr. MacDonald thought when he purchased the land that it was unzoned. Councillor Poirier advised that she also thought it was unzoned as did the Planning Department originally and it was not until recently that it was discovered to be zoned. Councillor Poirier gave examples of several incidents in which Mr. MacDonald had offered his support and help to the community, which indicated that he was a very community-minded man and a good citizen. She advised that although she respected Mr. Parker's opinion as well, she fully supported Mr. MacDonald's application.

APPLICATION 10 - 81, INDUSTRIAL ESTATES LIMITED

The next application for rezoning was a request by Industrial Estates Limited to rezone Lot A, lands of Winnifred and Martha Alley and Lot 1 land of Industrial Estates Limited, located on the Cobequid Road, Lower Sackville, District 20, from R-1 (Residential Single Family Zone) to I-1 (General Industrial Zone) in District 20.

Mr. Gough of the Municipal Planning Department advised that this application had been advertised as required under the terms of the Planning Act and no written communications either in favour of or opposed to it have been received.

He advised that the request to rezone had come from D. L. Mason and Associates Limited, representing Industrial Estates Limited.

He also advised "Lots 1 and A are surrounded by sites within the Sackville Industrial Park and this application is simply a "Housekeeping Measure" to bring the land use and zoning of these lots into conformity with the surrounding Industrial Park. It should be noted that IEL is purchasing Lot A by Agreement of Sale on August 31, 1981 and both lots will eventually form a portion of the industrial site."

Mr. Gough showed the property to be rezoned by the use of an overhead projected map which showed the surrounding areas and facilities and their respective zones.

He advised that Lot 1 and A are surrounded on three sides by approximately 200 acres of land which was zoned I-1 (General Industrial Zone) in 1980 to accommodate the location of an industrial park on the site. He advised that the major portion of lands along the Cobequid Road opposite to the properties in question, retain the R-1 zoning which was applied in 1972. However, spot commercial rezonings have accommodated individual commercial uses along the road.

Officials of the Department of Transportation stated that they have no objection to the proposed rezoning and the comments of the Dept. of Public Works are as follows: "These lots of land are located on Cobequid Road Lower Sackville. The surrounding areas are already zoned I-1. There is no reason from Engineering and Works point of view why a rezoning cannot be given."

Mr. Gough advised that the recommendation from the Municipal Planning Department was as follows: "As the properties in question are surrounded on three sides by 200 acres of industrially zoned land and fall (or will) under the ownership of Industrial Estates Ltd. the Planning and Development Department recommends that this rezoning be approved by County Council."

Questions From Council

There were no questions from Council for Mr. Gough. Therefore, the Deputy Warden requested that anyone wishing to speak in favour of this rezoning application, come forward at this time.

Speakers in Favour

Mr. Donald Mason of D.L. Mason and Associates came forward to speak on behalf of the rezoning application.

Mr. Mason advised that he was the design engineer responsible for the Sackville Industrial Park and advised that the rezoning application was merely a "housekeeping item" to bring the two lots into the industrial zone of the larger land tract. He advised that subsequent to this report and to the application being made, IEL has in fact purchased the Alley property and has taken possession of it as of July 2nd, 1981.

Mr. Mason also gave a brief summary of the activity to date, advising that the 25 acres of land adjacent to the Cobequid Road has now had the sewer, water and roads installed, paving to begin next week. Also a second contract has been awarded for the additional 25 acres of land site grading which would bring the saleable land up to fifty acres. He advised that he expected most of the construction to be completed by New Years 1981.

In response to a question from Councillor MacDonald, Mr. Mason advised that lots should be available for sale by the first of 1982. He had advised IEL to hold off the sale of lots until full access to the lots was achieved so that construction of the buildings would not be overtaking installation of sewer and water.

Councillor MacDonald advised that Sackville people were looking forward to the Industrial Park's establishment and the industrial tax base that would come with it.

There were no further questions for Mr. Mason and no more speakers either in favour or opposed to the application. Therefore, the Deputy Warden declared the public portion of the meeting closed and the floor open to a motion from Council.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT the request by Industrial Estates Limited to rezone Lot 1, Lands of IEL and Lot A, Lands of Winnefred and Martha Alley, located on the Cobequid Road, at Lower Sackville from R-1 (Residential Single Family Dwelling Zone) to I-1 (General Industrial Zone), District 20, be approved by Halifax County Council."
Motion Carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Councillor Margeson advised Council that there was a C.T.C. hearing tomorrow a.m. at Gaetzbrook at the Legion Hall at 10:00 in connection with the termination of some of the rail services between Dartmouth and Musquodoboit Harbour and as well a hearing at 11:00 at Citadel Inn in connection with the Via Rail Proposals.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor MacKenzie, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer:

"THAT the Public Hearing adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, the Public Hearing adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

INDEX

August Council Session - 1981

Arsenic	47
Bears - Letter	14
Bridges - Letter re Streach and Lantz	17
Berringer Property	33
Building Permits - Letter re Issuance	33-34
Boundary Changes	35-38
Board of Health - report	47
Cobequid Industrail Park - Letter	2
Community Contact Committee - Nomination	6&44
Chief Building Inspector's Supplementary Report	8&47
County Owned Vehicles	8-11&20
Committee Vacancies	42-43
District School Board	18-20
District Officers	40
Dog By-Law	46
Drains & Culverts - Letter	49
East Preston Day Care Centre - Partial Tax Exemption	40
Enersave Program	45-46
Halifax - Dartmouth Bridges - Letter	2-3
Halifax County Exhibition Parade	14
Interest Rates	13&39
Letters & Correspondence	2&17
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary	1&16
Motion - Approval of Minutes	1-2&17
Motion - Letters & correspondence	2&17
Motion - Letter re Cobequid Industrial Park	2
Motion - Letter re Halifax - Dartmouth Bridges	2-3
Motion - Letter re School Area Rates	3-4
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Report	4&32
Motion - Public Hearing Application #7-81	4
Motion - Public Hearing Application #10-81	5
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Supplementary Report ..	5
Motion - Public Hearing Application #4-81	5
Motion - Nominations re Community Contact Committee	6&44
Motion - Management Committee Report	6&25
Motion - Temporary Borrowing Resolutions	6-7&40
Motion - Management Committee Supplementary report	7&39
Motion - Street Paving	7-8
Motion - Chief Building Inspectors Supplementary Report ..	8&47
Motion - Policy Committee Report	8&21
Motion - County Owned Vehicles	8-11&20
Motion - Letter re Paraplegic Association	11-12
Motion - Rail Service	12-13
Motion - Interest Rates	13&39

Motion - Halifax County Exhibition Parade	14
Motion - Letter re Bears	14
Motion - Letter re Reserve Squadron Shearwater	15
Motion - Adjournment	15&49
Motion - Letter re Streach and Lantz Bridges	17
Motion - Letter re Schools	17-18
Motion - District School Board	18-20
Motion - Social Services Office	23
Motion - Municipal Parking Changes	25-27
Motion - Berringer Property	33
Motion - Letter re Issuance of Building Permits	33-34
Motion - Public Land Donation	34
Motion - Redistribution Committee	35
Motion - Boundary Changes	35-38
Motion - Partial Tax Exemption re East Preston Day Care Centre	40
Motion - District Officers	40
Motion - Report to Special Election	42
Motion - Vacancies re Committees	42-43
Motion - Appointment of Metropolitan Authority	43
Motion - Delegates re UNSM Conference	43
Motion - Appointment of Urban Services Committee	44
Motion - Enersave Program	45-46
Motion - Dog By-Law	46
Motion - Volunteer Fire Services	46-47
Motion - Report re Board of Health	47
Motion - Letter re Aresenic	47
Motion - Letters re Drains & Culverts	49
Planning Advisory Committee Report	4&32
Public Hearing - Application #7 -81	4
Public Hearing - Application #10 - 81	5
Planning Advisory Committee Supplementary Report	5
Public Hearing - Application #4 - 81	5
Policy Committee Report	8&21
Paraplegic Association - Letter	11-12
Public Land Donation	34
Recording Secretary - Appointment - Motion	1&16
Rail Service	12-13
Redistribution Committee	35
School Area Rates - Letter	3-4
Street Paving	7-8
Shearwater - Letter re Reserve Squadron	15
Schools - Letter	17-18
Social Services Office	23
Special Election - Report	42
Temporary Borrowing Resolutions	6-7&40
U.N.S.M. Conference - Delegates	43
Urban Services Committee - Appointment	44
Volunteer Fire Services	46-47

COUNCIL SESSION

AUGUST 4, 1981

PRESENT WERE: Warden Lawrence, Chairman
Councillor Walker
Councillor Williams
Deputy Warden Deveaux
Councillor Baker
Councillor Poirier
Councillor Topple
Councillor Gaetz
Councillor Smith
Councillor MacKenzie
Councillor McCabe
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Benjamin
Councillor Margeson
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor MacDonald

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk-Treasurer
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. Ken Wilson, Director of Finance

SECRETARY: Mrs. Christine Harvey

OPENING OF COUNCIL - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden Lawrence brought the Council Session to order at
2:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhauer, seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT Mrs. Christine Harvey be appointed Recording Secretary."
Motion Carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Poirier:

"THAT the minutes of the July 21, 1981 Council Session be approved."
Motion Carried.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

It was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Deputy Warden Deveaux:

"THAT the Letters and Correspondence be received."
Motion Carried.

Letter From Mr. Graham Thomas, Chairman, Riverlake Residents Association

This letter from Mr. Thomas was a thank you letter for Council's recent Public Hearing of June 29, and July 2 regarding the proposed PUD Agreement for the Cobequid Industrial Park. As well, the letter reaffirmed the Riverlake Residents Association's public statement that it would abide by whatever decision is handed down by the Environmental Control Council.

Councillor Lichter enquired whether or not the PUD Agreement had been forwarded to the Environmental Control Council and if so, with what results. Mr. Kelly informed the Councillor that it had been sent to the Environmental Control Council but that no reply had yet been received.

It was moved by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Councillor Benjamin:

"THAT Council write to the Environmental Control Council requesting an up-date on their progress with the PUD Agreement for the proposed Cobequid Industrial Park and requesting an indication of how long it will be before they have made a recommendation on it."
Motion Carried.

Letter from the Grace Maternity Hospital

This letter, from the Administrator of the Hospital, was a thank you letter to Council, in regard to the recent grant to the Hospital. It was information only.

Letter from Transport Canada

This letter from the Parliamentary Secretary to Jean-Luc Pepin, was in response to the Municipality's letter in support of the Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission's request for Federal financial assistance for improved protection for the Bridge piers. This letter advised that Transport Canada had no responsibility in this area and was not willing to assume any responsibility in the matter.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT the Municipality follow up with another letter advising the Minister of Transport of the serious matter of safety on the Halifax Dartmouth Bridges, and to clarify the Municipality's position on this issue."
Motion Carried.

Letter from the Minister of Education - School Area Rates

This letter, from the Hon. Terrance B. Donahoe, was in acknowledgement of the Municipality's letter of June 19, 1981, "requesting the Minister of Education to consider removing Section 57 respecting School Area Rates, from the Education Act." He advised that "it becomes a matter in which both the Department of Education and the Department of Municipal Affairs are involved. In addition, there will be a need to look at present legislation respecting the implementation of recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Public Education Finance...Your request will be examined along with other legislative changes at that time."

Deputy Warden Deveaux felt that some representation should be made when this matter is reviewed, however, he was advised by the Waarden that the Munciipality had a long record of opposition to School Area Rates.

The Deputy Warden then inquired as to the possibility of some individual representation, rather than through Council. Warden Lawrence advised that she would definitely look into the matter for him.

Solicitor Cragg reported on his requested committee meeting with representatives from the Attorney General's Department, Municipal Affairs, Department of Education and the School Board. The Attorney General's Dept. had advised that they do not wish to become involved in the matter. Mr. Gillis of the School Board has advised that he wishes to sit on the Committee himself, while the Ministers of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Education are both on vacation which will hold up the meeting of this Committee for six to eight weeks.

Councillor Margeson felt that this letter should be acknowleged with a response and that a copy of it should be addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for his information.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor Lichter:

"THAT a letter of acknowledgement be sent to the Minister of Education and that a copy of that letter be addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for his information."
Motion Carried.

Warden Lawrence advised Deputy Warden Deveaux in response to his earlier request, re representation for School Area Rates, that if and when there are changes and amendments to the Education Act they will

go through the Law Amendments Committee, at which time anyone can make representation on those proposed changes.

Councillor Topple advised in regard to the letters he had written to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Education regarding this issue, that he had received a response from the Minister of Education indicating that the matter should be worked out between Municipal Council and the School Board. He felt it should be made clear to the Minister of Education that the Municipality's main concern is the application of area rates which Council has no control over.

Letter from Department of Municipal Affairs

This letter was advising that the MDP plan for the Preston Area had been approved by the Department and congratulating the County on it.

The Warden advised that Mr. Birch had wished to convey to Council that the Municipality has issued its first Municipal Development permit.

Letter from the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities

This letter advised that the Annual Conference of the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities would be held September 9th through to the 12th, 1981 at the Hotel Nova Scotian and requested that the Municipality appoint its delegates and have their names sent to the Union's office not later than August 24th.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT Warden Lawrence appoint both the voting and non-voting delegates for the Annual Conference of the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities and report back at the August 18th Session."
Motion Carried.

REPORT OF THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

It was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Planning Advisory Committee Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Rezoning Application #7-81

The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed application #7-81 to rezone Lots 25 and 26, Lands of Hugh Fraser Subdivision located on the St. Margarets Bay Road at Timberlea, District # 2, From R-2 to C-1, and recommended to Council that a Public Hearing be held August 24, 1981 at 7:00 P.M.

It was moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT a Public Hearing be held on August 24, 1981 at 7:00 P.M. for rezoning application #7-81."
Motion Carried.

Rezoning Application #10-81

The Planning Advisory Committee also reviewed application #10-81 to rezone Lot A, Lands of Winnifred & Martha Alley, Lot 7, Lands of Industrial Estates Limited located on the Cobequid Road, Lower Sackville, District 20, from R-1 to I-1, and recommended that August 24, 1981 at 7:00 P.M. be the date and time for a Public Hearing.

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT the application for rezoning #10-81 be dealt with at a Public Hearing, August 24, 1981 at 7:00 P.M.."
Motion Carried.

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

It was moved by Deputy Warden Deveaux, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the Supplementary Report of the Planning Advisory Committee be received."
Motion Carried.

Rezoning Application #4-81

The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed rezoning application #4-81 to rezone Lot A and Parcel PX-1, Lands of the Allen Doyle Subdivision located on the St. Margarets Bay Road at Five Island Lake, District #3, from G to I-1 and recommend that this application be dealt with by Council at an August 24, 1981, 7:00 P.M. Public Hearing.

It was moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT application #4-81 for rezoning be dealt with at a Public Hearing, August 24, 1981 at 7:00 P.M."
Motion Carried.

Community Contact Committee

The Planning Advisory Committee recommended that names be brought forward for nomination to this Community Contact Committee at the next Council Session, August 18, 1981.

The Warden read to Council a letter to herself, from Mr. Ron Simpson (and attached to the Council Supplementary Agenda) requesting that Council select two more representatives to this Committee, one resident from Districts 1 or 3 and a resident of District 9.

Councillor Lichter requested whether there was any representation on this Committee from Districts 10, 11, 12 or 13.

Mr. Kelly advised that Mr. Stephens from District 10 was on this Committee.

It was moved by Councillor Topple, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT names be brought forward for nomination to the Community Contact Committee, at the August 18, 1981 Council Session and that these be names of residents from District 1 or 3 and District 9."
Motion Carried.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT

Warden Lawrence advised that this report outlines a list of approvals given and is for Council's information only.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF CHIEF OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

This report was also an information item which listed the following dates for presentations of Draft MDP Plans and Zoning By-Laws to be made to the MDP Plan Committee:

1. August 19, 1981 - Sackville
2. September 2, 1981 - Timberlea-Lakeside-Beechville
3. September 16, 1981 - Cole Harbour-Westphal
4. September 30, 1981 - Eastern Passage-Cow Bay

These presentations would be made at the regular meetings of the MDP Committee at 7:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers and all Councillors were welcome to attend.

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

It was moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT the Management Committee Report be Received."
Motion Carried.

Temporary Borrowing Resolutions

The Committee recommended approval of the following two temporary borrowing resolutions:

1. Installation of Water Services, Waverley \$3,500,000
2. Humber Park Sewer Installation \$ 185,000

It was moved by Councillor Benjamin, seconded by Deputy Warden Deveaux:

"THAT temporary borrowing resolutions be approved as follows:

1. Job #170-W-78 Installation of Community Water Services, Waverley, in the amount of \$3,500,000.00; and, 2. Job # 183-E-80 Humber Park Sewer Installation, Highway #7, Westphal, in the amount of \$185,000.00."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Benajmin advised Council that there was a substantial increase in the amount of the funding estimates for the Waverley Water Installation, and he advised that as the money is borrowed there would be an additional borrowing resolution brought forward to Council at a later date if and when the Province advises how much of the additional funds they will cost-share.

The Warden advised that consideration of the additional amount is going to Cabinet this week.

SUPPLEMENTARY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

It was moved by Councillor Poirier, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer:

"THAT the Supplementary Management Committee Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Renewal of Temporary Borrowing Resolution

The Management Committee received temporary borrowing resolution #76-1 for a renewal of temporary borrowing for District 7 Service Commission in the amount of \$179,720.72 and recommended that Council approve this resolution.

It was moved by Councillor Topple, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT Temporary Borrowing Resolution #76-1 for District #7 Service Commission be approved in the amount of \$179,720.72."

Additional Suburban Street Paving

The Management Committee received a request to have Camelot Drive, Camelot Lane and Sunrise Drive (designated as "C" Type streets by the Department of Transportation) included in the 1981 Street Paving Program and petitions are now being circulated to obtain the required majority of signatures. This paving program was previously approved by Municipal Council and was submitted to the Department of Transportation. The cost to the abutters for paving these three streets are \$2.25 per foot frontage.

The Management Committee, having reviewed these requests, recommend that Council approve the addition of the streets to the 1981 Suburban Paving Program subject to obtaining the majority of required signatures and subject to the approval of the Minister of Transportation.

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhauer, seconded by Councillor MacKenzie:

"THAT Camelot Drive, Camelot Lane and Sunrise Drive be included in the 1981 Suburban Paving Program subject to obtaining the required majority of signatures and subject to approval of the Minister of Transportation."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Kelly further advised that two of the streets, Camelot Drive and Sunrise Drive had already received the required number of signatures.

BUILDING INSPECTORS REPORT, RE: LESSER SIDE YARD CLEARANCE

It was moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Supplementary Building Inspectors Report be received and that the one application for lesser side yard clearance contained within the report be approved."
Motion Carried.

The Application for lesser side yard clearance of 7.4', was for Lot 15, John Brownell Subdivision, Wellington, Applicant, Stanley MacDougall.

POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT the Policy Committee Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Report, Re: County Owned Vehicles

Mr. Wilson was present in the Gallery to answer questions pertaining to this report.

Deputy Warden Deveaux advised that he had brought in a motion at the Policy Committee that 11 vehicles be approved as recommended by staff, based on the fact that over the years the Municipality had been trying to come up with a reasonable budget and subsequent tax base. It was the opinion of staff that a great deal of money could be saved yearly by the purchase of these 11 vehicles. However, that motion had been defeated and a motion passed that 2 vehicles be purchased.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT Municipal Council accept the Staff recommendation and purchase 11 vehicles on a one-year trial basis, in lieu of the two vehicles as recommended by the Policy Committee."

At this time, Warden Lawrence reviewed the Policy Committee Report:

"The Policy Committee reviewed a report prepared by David Ardley, Purchasing Co-Ordinator, respecting the viability of the County supplying vehicles to service groups. Attached is a copy of that Report. Also included is a report to the Policy Committee from Mr. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer, recommending that the Municipality provide 11 vehicles for certain positions travelling over 15,000 miles per annum. The report further indicates a detailed examination will be carried out for Social Services and Engineering and Works Departments for recommendation at a later date. Schedule 2 of Mr. Ardley's Report outlines the estimated cost and savings to the Municipality if vehicles were provided to specific service groups. The Policy Committee recommend to Council that two vehicles be purchased for two of the high mileage employees of the Executive Office and that this be carried out on a one-year trial basis to be evaluated at the expiration of this time period." (NOTE: For detail see Report of Mr. Ardley, attached to Council Agenda.)

Deputy Warden Deveaux's motion was debated at great length, with many Councillors indicating their concern about the cost of on-going maintenance as well as the initial cost of the vehicles. Those who shared this feeling and who spoke in opposition to the motion were:

Councillors Topple, Walker, Lichter, Margeson, Benjamin, Poirier, Eisenhauer and Margeson.

Councillor Topple questioned Mr. Wilson regarding the difference between purchasing the vehicles and leasing them. Mr. Wilson advised him that this was considered and that there was a yearly difference of approximately \$150 more per vehicle for leasing the cars.

Councillor Lichter and Councillor Walker were concerned about the maintenance of the vehicles; although Mr. Wilson pointed out there would be insurance on the vehicles and that they would be under warranty, Councillor Lichter felt that with the high mileage cars, to remain under warranty they would have to be traded every four to six months. Regarding maintenance and the fact that Mr. Wilson's estimations were partially based on information obtained from the City of Halifax who own their own cars, Councillor Walker pointed out there was a great deal of difference travelling up and down paved streets in the City and driving through unpaved County roads. He expressed much concern about maintenance costs and based on this could not support Deputy Warden Deveaux's motion.

Councillor Poirier felt that if the employees were driving the cars back and forth to work, then the County was in fact paying their way for travelling to and from work; thus these employees were obtaining a salary raise. She felt this was unfair. Mr. Wilson, however, advised her that taking the cars home at night was a defense against the possibility of vandalism, should the cars be parked at the Municipal Building overnight.

Councillor Eisenhauer spoke briefly expressing some doubt as to the cost of maintenance and Councillor Benjamin had some doubts about the estimated \$40,000 saving.