

Council
July 14, 1988

Council. Alderman D. Grant noted that the public meeting had indicated that residents of the City did not wish Implementation Policy 10 to apply generally across the City, however, they had no difficulty with it applying to this small block of land. Alderman D. Grant went on to note that the Canadian Cancer Society urgently need space and this was the best way to achieve their goal. Alderman D. Grant, noting the number of months which have passed since this matter first came to staff, indicated that she would not like to see the matter deferred.

Alderman R. Grant addressed the matter indicating that he had some concerns with this proposed amendment. Alderman R. Grant indicated that he did not fully understand the proposed amendment and was not fully aware of the ramifications of this amendment for his area. Referring to the great amount of time involved with the development and approval of the Mainland South Secondary Planning Strategy, he expressed concern that this Policy could override the policies of the MSSPS.

Alderman R. Grant asked if the use was a designated institutional use and, if so, why a rezoning could not be sought to an institutional zoning. Alderman R. Grant asked if it was not possible to rezone from residential to institutional.

Alderman D. Grant, referring to the number of question, MOVED, seconded by Alderman O'Malley that this matter be deferred to next meeting of Committee of the Whole Council to be held on July 20, 1988 pending receipt of a report from the City Solicitor and an indepth report from the Planning Department regarding the implications of the proposed amendment across the city.

The motion to defer was put and passed.

Case Nos. 4662 and 5036 - Mont Blanc Anchor

MOVED by Deputy Mayor Walker, seconded by Alderman R. Grant that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, Council approve the design of the Mont Blanc Anchor Monument which is a granite pyramid with the anchor shaft attached to the top at an angle of incline with the following substitutions to the proposed inscription:

- i) the use of imperial rather than metric measures;
- ii) the use of the word "area" rather than "site" in reference to the landing.

The motion was put and passed.

Police Club Property - South Street - Proposed Amendment to MPS

It was agreed that this matter be dealt with at this time. This matter was added to the agenda during the setting of

Council
July 14, 1988

the agenda. A supplementary staff report dated July 13, 1988 was submitted.

Alderman Cromwell addressed the matter noting that at last week's Committee of the Whole he had referred this matter back to the Planning Advisory Committee. Referring to the submitted report, Alderman Cromwell noted that although staff did not agree with referring the matter back to the PAC, they were suggesting that if Council wishes to refer the matter back to the PAC they should outline the specific matters Council wishes the Committee to investigate.

Alderman Cromwell went on to note that he had discussed this matter with the applicant and the applicant agreed with the referral to the Planning Advisory Committee. Alderman Cromwell indicated that the Planning Advisory Committee had discussed a R-1 Low Density zone in relation to this matter and he would like the Committee to reconsider this matter and bring back a recommendation to Council. Alderman Cromwell went on to note that it was his understanding that this matter appeared on the agenda of next week's meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee. Alderman Cromwell further noted that he would like this matter to come back to the July 28, 1988 meeting of City Council.

MOVED by Alderman Cromwell, seconded by Alderman O'Malley that, as recommended by the City Planning Committee, this matter be referred to the Planning Advisory Committee for a further review of the R-1 Low Density Zone discussed by the Committee and further that a report come back to the next regular meeting of Halifax City Council to be held on July 28, 1988.

Motion passed.

MOTIONS

Motion Alderman Richard Grant re: Amendment to Ordinance No. 103, Public Hearing Procedures - FIRST READING

This matter was deferred to this meeting from the City Council meeting held on June 29, 1988. Notice of Motion was given regarding this matter at the June 16, 1988 meeting of City Council. Proposed amendments to Ordinance 103 re Public Hearing Procedures were distributed to members of City Council this evening.

Alderman R. Grant addressed the matter noting that the amendments before Council this evening were the recommendations of the Public Hearing Procedures Committee put into a form appropriate for adoption and incorporation into Ordinance 103. Alderman R. Grant indicated that although the Committee had felt that the existing Public Hearing Procedure worked well, they felt

Council
July 14, 1988

a greater level of organization was required and felt that procedural guidelines should be added to the Ordinance in relation to Public Hearings. Alderman R. Grant noted that appropriate public hearing procedures was not detailed within the Planning Act.

MOVED by Alderman R. Grant, seconded by Alderman O'Malley that City Council give First Reading to the proposed amendments, as follows, to Ordinance 103 and that these amendments be forwarded to the next regular meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council to be held on July 20, 1988 for consideration and report;

BE IT ENACTED by the City Council of the City of Halifax that Ordinance 103, Respecting the Rules of Order of Council, as enacted by City Council and approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as amended, be and the same is hereby amended as follows:

1. Ordinance 103 is amended by adding as Section 9A the following:

"At any special meeting of Council called for the purpose of a public hearing, the following additional rules shall apply:

1. The Chairman of the meeting will introduce the first item on the agenda.
2. The Chairman of the meeting will ask for a staff presentation.
3. The Chairman of the meeting will ask the proponent of the item to address Council.
4. The Chairman of the meeting will then ask members of the public to speak in the following order:
 - (a) those in favour
 - (b) those in opposition
 - (c) anyone else who wishes to comment on the item
5. After each presentation by staff, the proponent or other members of the public or members of Council may ask questions.
6. After the presentation by all speakers, members of Council may ask further questions or request further reports or information.
7. The Chairman of the meeting will call for a motion on the item and then proceed to the next item on the agenda.

Council
July 14, 1988

8. When the meeting is not completed by 11 p.m. Council may adjourn the matter to another day.
9. When individuals or organizations wish to address Council they should:
 - (a) Where possible advise the City Clerk by noon of the day of the hearing.
 - (b) Where written material will be presented it shall be delivered to the Clerk 72 hours before the hearing.
 - (c) Give their name and address at the commencement of their presentation and indicate if they are representing any other person or body.
 - (d) Restrict their presentation to 10 minutes except with the leave of Council. Where a presentation is being made on behalf of an organization, the 10 minute limit applies to the organization.
 - (e) Each person or organization may speak only once except with the leave of Council.

Motion passed.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Award of Tender #88-21 - Paving Renewal - Rockwood Area

A staff report dated July 5, 1988 was submitted.

MOVED by Alderman Jeffrey, seconded by Deputy Mayor Walker that Tender #88-21 for paving renewal in the Rockwood area be awarded to Municipal Contracting Ltd. for a bid price of \$79,709.00 and a total project cost of \$95,650 and with funding authorized from Account #CE045.

Motion passed.

9:45 p.m. The meeting adjourned for a short recess.

10:00 p.m. The meeting reconvened with all the same members being present.

Council
July 14, 1988

QUESTIONS

Question Alderman R. Grant re: Bikes in Graves Oakley Park

Alderman R. Grant indicated that he had received a complaint regarding bikes in the Graves Oakley Park. Alderman R. Grant indicated that although he was not certain, he believed the complaint referred to motor bikes. Alderman R. Grant asked if the Police Department has received complaints regarding all terrain vehicles or bikes in the parks in his area during the evening hours and, if so, what action they are taking to ensure this does not continue.

Question Alderman R. Grant re: Salt Depot - Cowie Hill

Alderman R. Grant referred to the discussion regarding the location of the Parks and Grounds facility at Cowie Hill and noted that he had requested that this facility provide winter salt storage for the Mainland area. Alderman R. Grant asked if the salt had been stored at the Cowie Hill facility and, if so, had it been a successful undertaking. Alderman R. Grant further asked if staff intend to store the salt there this winter.

Question Alderman R. Grant re: Information Report - Travel Expenses

Alderman R. Grant noted that the Information Report regarding Travel Expenses indicated that he had requested this report. Alderman R. Grant indicated that, in fact, Alderman Jeffrey had requested the report.

Question Deputy Mayor Walker re: Opening of Citadel Hill

Deputy Mayor Walker referred to the closure of Citadel Hill between dusk and dawn and requested that Council forward a letter to Parks Canada requesting that Citadel Hill remain open during the evening hours. Deputy Mayor Walker noted that Council did receive a letter dated June 16, 1988 regarding the closure, however, he has since had a number of inquiries regarding the closure.

Question Deputy Mayor Walker re: Use of Punch Bowl Drive by City Vehicles

Deputy Mayor Walker advised that he had received complaints regarding city vehicles using Punch Bowl Drive. Deputy Mayor Walker noted that Punch Bowl Drive was in a state of disrepair and indicated that residents felt that the city vehicles were adding to the poor condition of the street. Deputy Mayor Walker requested that staff be asked to refrain from using Punch Bowl Drive.

Council
July 14, 1988

Question Alderman Dewell re: Admission Fee - Seaview Park

Alderman Dewell referred to the MicMac Indian Pow Wow held at Seaview Park over the weekend and expressed concern that residents wishing to use the Park had been required to pay an admission fee to enter the park. Alderman Dewell noted that many residents had been turned away from the park when they refused to pay the admission fee.

Alderman Dewell indicated that it was his understanding that admission could not be charged to a city park. Alderman Dewell indicated that only those persons participating in the event should have been charged admission. Alderman Dewell asked what the City's policy was in terms of charging admission to a city park.

Question Alderman Downey re: Pool on Central Common

Alderman Downey, referring to the heat wave experienced by the City last week, noted that the pools on the Central Common were not operational. Alderman Downey noted that he had witnessed city staff working around the pools recently and asked why the pools were not filled.

Question Alderman Downey re: Gottingen Street Development

Alderman Downey referred to the requested staff report on the Gottingen Street Development and asked if this would be coming to the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole Council.

His Worship indicated that the report would be available very shortly and noted that staff would report as to exactly when the report would be coming before Council.

Question Alderman Meagher re: Historic Properties Outfall

Alderman Meagher advised that he had visited the waterfront over the weekend and had noted that the outfall at Historic Properties was quite unsightly and odorous. Alderman Meagher indicated that he would like the matter added to the agenda for the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole scheduled to be held on July 20, 1988 with the intent of finding a solution to this unsightly and odorous situation.

Question Alderman Meagher re: Skid Marks - Driveways on Yukon Street

Alderman Meagher indicated that a small tractor type vehicle had been used recently in replacing faulty sods on Yukon Street. Alderman Meagher noted that the operator of that small tractor had turned in every driveway on Yukon Street and had left a large circular black skid mark in each of the driveways.

Council
July 14, 1988

Alderman Meagher indicated that he felt this was disgraceful and asked staff to ensure that the contractor removed these marks before leaving the site.

Question Alderman Meagher re: 6292-6294 Yukon Street

Alderman Meagher addressed the matter thanking staff for the report received this week regarding 6292-94 Yukon Street. Alderman Meagher indicated that he would like this matter referred back to the Planning Department for a report regarding amendments to the front yard and lot consolidation regulations in the old part of the City. Alderman Meagher indicated that he wished to ensure that situations such as the Yukon Street situation did not occur in other areas of the old city.

Alderman Meagher indicated that he would also like staff to report regarding the City's policy regarding to land surveys. Alderman Meagher noted that the survey document provided for the Yukon Street development had not been stamped by anyone. Alderman Meagher indicated that he felt such a document should be stamped or signed by an architect, land surveyor or an engineer to ensure they are correct. Alderman Meagher asked if it was the policy of the city that plans or other official documents received in relation to a development be signed by an architect, land surveyor or engineer.

Alderman Meagher further indicated that he understood that the units developed on Yukon Street were to be sold as condominiums and asked that staff review the development to ensure that it fits the general city policy relating to condominiums.

Alderman Meagher indicated that he had not yet received the information he requested regard water and sewer in relation to the Yukon Street development. Alderman Meagher noted that construction was almost complete on the development and water and sewer has not been connected as of yet.

Question Alderman Jeffrey re: Opening of Streets for Water and Sewer - Required Repair

Alderman Jeffrey noted that recently an apartment building had been constructed on Frederick Street in his area and the street had been opened to connect water and sewer to the building. Alderman Jeffrey indicated that the building was complete and filled with tenants and the required repair work on the street had not been carried out by the contractor.

Alderman Jeffrey asked why it was taking so long for the street to be repaired and asked what the City's policy was in this regard. Alderman Jeffrey indicated that it was his understanding that the contractor was required to return the street to its

Council
July 14, 1988

original condition and noted that the roadway on Frederick Street was in extremely poor condition.

Question Alderman Jeffrey re: Home Occupancy Policy

Alderman Jeffrey noted that over the last few weeks he had received a number of calls regarding home occupancy in terms of where a sign may be erected advising of the occupancy. Alderman Jeffrey indicated that he would like a report outlining the city's policy in this regard.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice of Motion Alderman Meagher re: Amendment to Section 227 of the City Charter - The Tax Exemption Provision - Inclusion of Disabled Persons

Alderman Meagher gave Notice of Motion that at the next regular meeting of Halifax City Council to be held on July 28, 1988 he proposed to introduce an amendment to Section 227 of the City Charter, The Tax Exemption Provision, to include in that section disabled persons. Alderman Meagher advised that the effect of this amendment would be to make it possible for a disabled person to receive the same tax benefits as do widows, widowers and heads of single-parent families.

ADDED ITEMS

Award of Tender #88-42 - Sidewalk Renewals

A staff report dated July 11, 1988 was submitted.

MOVED by Alderman Dewell, seconded by Alderman Downey

that:

1. Tender #88-42, as follows, be awarded to King Concrete Contractors for a total bid price of \$151,152.50 and a total project cost of \$182,000.00;
 - A. - Connolly Street - E/S - Roslyn - Bayers
- Bayers Road - S/S - Connolly - Oxford
- Oxford Street W/S - Edgewood - Cloverdale
 - B. - Connolly Street - W/S - London - ~~Wedgewood~~ *Edinburgh*
- Dublin Street - E/S - Cork - Liverpool
 - C. - Windsor Street - W/S - Almon - Windcrest
- Edinburgh Street - S/S - Dublin - Windsor
2. Funding authorized from account numbers CB270, CB254, CB302, CB269, CB273, CB322, CB279; and

Council
July 14, 1988

3. Funding Transfers be approved as follows:

<u>Account #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
From CB269 to CB279	S/W Renewals	\$2,000

Motion passed.

Award of Tender #88-12 - New Sidewalk

A staff report dated July 11, 1988 was submitted.

MOVED by Alderman Leiper, seconded by Alderman Jeffrey that Tender #88-12 for new sidewalk, curb and gutter (Central Avenue - N/S - Dutch Village Road - Gesner) be awarded to H. S. Walker Construction Ltd. for a total bid price of \$296,185.00 and a total project cost of \$356,000.00 and with funding authorized from Account Number CA006.

Motion passed.

Police Club Property - South Street - Proposed Amendment to MPS

This matter was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

City Club and Kyber Building

A staff report dated July 13, 1988 was submitted.

MOVED by Alderman O'Malley, seconded by Alderman Downey that Council authorize staff to prepare a borrowing resolution allowing for the withdrawal of \$1,175,000.00 from the Sale of Land Account, to be authorized by the Municipal Affairs Department.

Motion passed.

Hakodate Committee

This matter was added to the agenda during the setting of the agenda. A press release from His Worship the Mayor dated July 14, 1988 was submitted.

Alderman Jeffrey addressed the matter noting that he had requested at the Committee of the Whole last week that a report regarding this matter be available for this evening's meeting. Alderman Jeffrey indicated that this report was not available, however, he would like to ask a few questions regarding this matter. Alderman Jeffrey then referred to the submitted press release noting that it appeared the trip to Hakodate had been a success.

Council
July 14, 1988

Alderman Jeffrey then referred to the July 5, 1988 confidential report forwarded to members of Council from His Worship the Mayor. Alderman Jeffrey noted that the report indicated significant outside funding had been obtained in relation to the Hakodate trip. Alderman Jeffrey asked why a portion of that funding had not been allocated to the cost of the Alderman and Mayor visiting Hakodate.

Alderman Jeffrey then indicated that he would like to know what it cost per person to visit Hakodate and who had paid for the airline tickets to Hakodate. Alderman Jeffrey asked if reimbursement would be received from the private funding received for the trip to Hakodate.

Alderman Jeffrey then referred to the discussions held at the November 18, 1987 meeting regarding the establishment of the Hakodate Committee. Alderman Jeffrey noted that he had indicated at that time that he had no difficulty with the establishment of the Committee, however, he was concerned that Council not be committed to future expenditures in relation to Hakodate. Alderman Jeffrey went on to note that His Worship had indicated that the establishment of the Committee did not commit Council to an expenditure of funds, however, there was a commitment that the City provide an exhibit between June and September for the Expo celebrations in Japan. Alderman Jeffrey noted that His Worship had indicated that there was no suggestion that the City would be paying for travelling expenses to Hakodate.

Alderman Jeffrey, quoting from the November 18, 1987 minutes, noted that Alderman Cromwell had asked what benefit Halifax had received as a result of twinning with Hakodate. Alderman Jeffrey noted that Alderman Cromwell had asked what tangible results had been realized in the last five years since Halifax had twinned with Hakodate.

Referring to the April 28, 1988 Information report regarding expenditures relating to the twinning with Hakodate, Alderman Jeffrey noted that a total of \$42,829.19 had been spent in 1985 and \$6,627.72 in 1987. Alderman Jeffrey further noted that it appeared that \$8,247.00 had been spent on air fare to travel to Hakodate in 1985. Alderman Jeffrey went on to note that a \$20,000 grant had been provided to Hakodate to aid with the expense of travelling to Halifax. Alderman Jeffrey indicated that he did not agree that the City should be assisting Hakodate in this manner.

Alderman Jeffrey went on to note that as of April of 1988 the City had spent approximately \$50,000 in relation to the Halifax/Hakodate twinning. Alderman Jeffrey asked what the City was gaining by expending this money. Alderman Jeffrey noted that if money is to be expended, members of Council should be aware of these expenditures.

Council
July 14, 1988

Alderman Leiper addressed Council as Chairman of the Halifax/Hakodate Committee and noted that as there were still some private individuals involved in the Hakodate trip, it was not possible to give a full report at this time. Alderman Leiper indicated that the Committee would, however, give a full report at a later time. Alderman Leiper noted that the budget for the Halifax/Hakodate Committee was approved by Council and not merely committed by the Committee.

Alderman Leiper noted that Alderman Jeffrey was a member of the Halifax/Hakodate Committee and indicated that she believed that he was receiving notices of the meetings of the Committee. Alderman Leiper went on to note that the visit to Hakodate was discussed in some detail in the minutes of the Committee. Alderman Leiper indicated that perhaps all members of Council were not aware of the plans, however, the three Aldermen who are members of the Committee would have received the minutes.

Alderman Leiper noted that a great deal was achieved during the trip to Hakodate. Alderman Leiper went on to note that a member of the City's Industrial Commission had indicated that if the City wishes to become involved with Japan it must become known to Japan. Alderman Leiper went on to note that the Canadian Ambassador to Japan indicated that Halifax was taking a major step in becoming involved with Japan and that this was an opportunity which was being lost to the rest of eastern Canada. Alderman Leiper went on to note that a number of private companies in Halifax were, as a result of last week's visit, negotiating with companies in Hakodate.

In closing, Alderman Leiper indicated that the Committee would provide Council with a full and informative report in this regard. Alderman Leiper indicated that she felt a great deal has been achieved, however, it was difficult to measure the tangible results without using some vision and imagination. Alderman Leiper noted that she was comfortable in suggesting that the concrete examples would follow.

His Worship briefly addressed the matter reviewing very briefly sources of funding for the trip to Hakodate and the contacts and results of the visit to Hakodate.

Alderman O'Malley addressed the matter indicating that he had requested that the minutes of the Halifax/Hakodate Committee be distributed to all members of Council some time ago and noted that he had not received these to date. Alderman O'Malley went on to note that a representative of the Industrial Commission seeking to join in the visit to Hakodate had been denied this opportunity.

His Worship addressed the matter once more noting that there would be an attempt in the future to expand relations with

Council
July 14, 1988

Hakodate. His Worship noted that Federal and Provincial involvement in Phase II of the proposed program made it difficult to discuss at this time.

Alderman O'Malley noted that he was not condemning the efforts made to date, however, he felt Council should be more involved in future efforts in this regard.

A further short discussion ensued with no further action being taken in this regard.

11:00 p.m. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

HIS WORSHIP MAYOR RON WALLACE
CHAIRMAN

E. A. KERR
CITY CLERK

mmd/sh

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
of 07/14/88

Heritage Trust of Nova Scotia 463
MINUTES 462
APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS 462
PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS	
Petition - Alderman Dewell - Exclusive Bus Lane 463
Halifax Police Commission 464
REPORT - FINANCE AND EXEC COMM	
Encroachment License - 5286-88 South Street 464
Halifax Hall 464
Transit Cost-Sharing By Assessment 464
Monitoring Committees - Home Care Program 465
Tourism Halifax 466
Land Exchange - Ravine Park Residential and Shopping Complex 467
Acquisition of Parcel TP-1, Forrest Hill Drive 467
Parking - Grand Parade 467
Lease - Adsum House (2421 Brunswick Street) 467
Additional Costs - New Computer 468
Recommendations: Tax Concessions and Grants Committee 468
REPORT - COMMITTEE ON WORKS	
Award of Consultant Services - Renewal: Sackville Street Combined Sewer 474
Design and Construction Agreement: Interchange to Bayers Lake Industrial Park 474
Local Improvement Project - Wren Street 474
Overhead Traffic Sign: Harvard Street and Chebucto Road 475

HEADLINES FOR CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
of 07/14/88

REP.- COMM. OF WHOLE COUNCIL	
Amendments to Ordinance 151, The Automatic Machines Ordinance - SECOND READING 475
Amendment to Parking Meters and Parking of Motor Vehicles Re: an Early Payment Discount - SECOND READING 476
Report - Halifax Taxi Commission - Use by Taxis of Exclusive Bus Lanes 476
Amendment to Ordinance 116, The Taxi Ordinance - SECOND READING 476
REPORT - CITY PLANNING COMM.	
Belmont-on-the-Arm 477
PAC Report & Staff Report - Implementation Policy 10 Dev. Proposal - Cdn Cancer Society - 5220-30 South St. 478
Police Club Property - South Street - Proposed Amendment to MPS 480
Case Nos. 4662 and 5036 - Mont Blanc Anchor 480
MOTIONS	
Motion, Alderman R. Grant Re: Amendment to Ordinance 103, Public Hearing Procedures - FIRST READING 481
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS	
Award of Tender #88-21 - Paving Renewal - Rockwood Area 483
QUESTIONS	
Question, Alderman R. Grant Re: Information Report - Travel Expenses 484
Question, Deputy Mayor Walker Re: Opening of Citadel Hill 484
Question, Deputy Mayor Walker Re: Use of Punch Bowl Drive by City Vehicles 484
Question, Alderman R. Grant Re: Salt Depot - Cowie Hill 484
Question Alderman R. Grant Re: Bikes in Graves Oakley Pk 484
Question, Alderman Dewell Re: Admission Fee - Seaview Pk. 485
Question, Alderman Meagher Re: Historic Properties Outfall 485
Question, Alderman Meagher Re: Skid Marks - Driveways on Yukon Street 485
Question, Alderman Downey Re: Pool on Central Common 485
Question, Alderman Downey Re: Gottingen Street Development 485
Question, Alderman Meagher Re: 6292-6294 Yukon Street 486
Question, Alderman Jeffrey Re: Opening of Streets for Water and Sewer - Required Repair 486
Question, Alderman Jeffrey Re: Home Occupancy Policy 487

HEADLINES FOR CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
of 07/14/88

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Notice of Motion, Alderman Meagher Re: Amendment to Sec. 227
of the City Charter - The Tax Exemption Provision 487
Award of Tender #88-42 - Sidewalk Renewals
..... 487

ADDED ITEMS

Police Club Property - South Street - Proposed Amendment
to MPS 488
Hakodate Committee 488
City Club & Ryher Building
Award of Tender #88-12 - New Sidewalk
..... 488

**SPECIAL COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES**

Council Chamber
City Hall
Halifax, Nova Scotia
July 20, 1988
5:00 p.m.

A special meeting of Halifax City Council, Public Hearings, was held on the above date.

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor J. Albert Walker, Acting Chairman; and Aldermen D. Grant, Cromwell, Downey, Meagher, O'Malley, Dewell, R. Grant, Jeffrey, Leiper and Flynn.

ALSO PRESENT: City Manager; Mr. W. Anstey, representing the City Solicitor; City Clerk and other members of City staff.

ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

The City Clerk advised that the following items were added to this evening's agenda from the Committee of the Whole Council meeting held earlier today.

1. Recommendations - Tax Concessions and Grants Committee - Buskers
2. Halifax Hall - Teas
3. Award of Tender #88-20 - Paving Renewal - Elgin Street
4. Award of Tender #88-41 - Sidewalk Renewal
5. 1988 Capital Budget - Award of Tenders

The City Clerk further advised that requests have been received that consideration of the following items be deferred to the Special Council scheduled for August 17, 1988, to which Council agreed:

- Minor Variance Re: Appeal of Variance Approval - 5280-82
South Street
- Minor Variance Re: Appeal of Variance Approval - 1526
Lilac Street

Recommendations - Tax Concessions and Grants Committee - Buskers

This matter was added to the agenda from the Finance and Executive Committee held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman Downey, seconded by Alderman Meagher
that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee,
*the Buskers Festival be granted the balance of the monies from
the Tax Concessions and Grants up to \$20,000.*

Motion passed.

Halifax Hall - Teas

This matter was added to the agenda from the Finance and Executive Committee held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman Jeffrey, seconded by Alderman Flynn
that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee teas
be held in Halifax Hall every week day for the remainder of July
and August and further that the teas also be available to
residents of the City.

Motion passed.

Award of Tender #88-20 - Paving Renewal Elgin Street

This matter was added to the agenda from the Committee on Works meeting held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman R. Grant, seconded by Alderman Leiper
that, as recommended by the Committee on Works:

1. Tender #88-20 for paving renewal, curb and gutter renewal of Elgin Street be awarded to Municipal Contracting at a bid price of \$127,103.00 for Alternative II (Full depth asphalt) and a total project cost of \$153,000.00;
2. Funding be authorized from Account Number CE042; and
3. Council authorize the funding transfer of \$105,00.00 from CE040 to CE042.

Motion passed.

Award of Tender #88-41 - Sidewalk Renewal

This matter was added to the agenda from the Committee on Works meeting held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman Downey, seconded by Alderman Meagher
that, as recommended by the Committee on Works:

MOVED by Alderman Downey, seconded by Alderman Meagher
that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee,
as per the recommendation of the Tax Concessions and Grants
Committee, the Buskers Festival be granted \$6,375.00 immediately
and \$6,375.00 upon receipt of 1988 audited statements.

Motion passed.

Halifax Hall - Teas

This matter was added to the agenda from the Finance and Executive Committee held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman Jeffrey, seconded by Alderman Flynn
that, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee teas
be held in Halifax Hall every week day for the remainder of July
and August and further that the teas also be available to
residents of the City.

Motion passed.

Award of Tender #88-20 - Paving Renewal Elgin Street

This matter was added to the agenda from the Committee on Works meeting held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman R. Grant, seconded by Alderman Leiper
that, as recommended by the Committee on Works:

1. Tender #88-20 for paving renewal, curb and gutter renewal of Elgin Street be awarded to Municipal Contracting at a bid price of \$127,103.00 for Alternative II (Full depth asphalt) and a total project cost of \$153,000.00;
2. Funding be authorized from Account Number CE042; and
3. Council authorize the funding transfer of \$105,00.00 from CE040 to CE042.

Motion passed.

Award of Tender #88-41 - Sidewalk Renewal

This matter was added to the agenda from the Committee on Works meeting held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman Downey, seconded by Alderman Meagher
that, as recommended by the Committee on Works:

1. Tender #88-41 for sidewalk renewals as follows be awarded to Duron Atlantic Ltd for a total bid price of \$131,316.25 and a total project cost of \$158,000.00;

1. Tower Road E/S - Atlantic to Harrington
Tower Road W/S - Fay's Lane to Pt. Pleasant
2. Greenwood Avenue E/S - Roxton to Inglis
3. South Street N/S - Studley to LeMarchant
University Avenue E/S - Lemarchant to Dalhousie

2. Funding authorized from Account Numbers: CB314, CB286, CB316, CB315, CB311

3. Funding Transfers be approved as follows:

<u>Account #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
From CB311 to CB286	Sidewalk Renewals	\$2,000.00

Motion passed.

1988 Capital Budget - Award of Tenders

This matter was added to the agenda from the Committee on Works meeting held earlier today.

MOVED by Alderman R. Grant, seconded by Alderman Flynn that, as recommended by the Committee on Works, City Council approve staff's request to award tenders for Capital Projects closing between July 26 and August 12, 1988, subject to the conditions outlined in the July 13, 1988 report, as follows:

1. that tender awards are made to the lowest bidder for either individual bid price(s) or the lowest combined price;
2. that tender prices and/or total project costs are within Budget estimates or no more than 10% in excess of Budget estimates; and
3. that the recommended contractor has committed, in his bid, to perform the works within the stipulated scheduled time.

Motion passed.

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

PUBLIC HEARING - Rezoning - R2-C2A - 6422 Chebucto Road

A public hearing into the above matter was held at this time.

Mr. Michael Hanusiak, Development and Planning Department, addressed Council and with the aid of a sketch outlined the application to rezone the property located at 6422 Chebucto Road from R-2, General Residential Zone, to C-2A, Minor Commercial Zone as found in the May 24, 1988 staff report. Mr. Hanusiak indicated that the applicant intends upon converting the existing dwelling internally for use as law offices.

Mr. Hanusiak advised that staff is recommending approval of this application. Mr. Hanusiak went on to advise that should Council approve of this rezoning, the property could be expanded and used for any use permitted under the C-2A zone.

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

Mr. Philip Fraser, 6250 Oxford Street, addressed Council in opposition to the rezoning. Mr. Fraser noted that the staff report refers to sections of Commercial use at the intersections of Oxford and Kline Streets with Chebucto Road. Mr. Fraser indicated that while this appears to be the justification for allowing the rezoning, he did not agree with this position.

Mr. Fraser went on to express concern regarding the hours of operation of a legal office and suggested that a fair amount of evening work would be carried out at the office. Mr. Fraser noted that the back area of the property in question was to be used as a parking lot. Mr. Fraser expressed concern that he would be looking at a parking lot when using his deck and back yard. Mr. Fraser further indicated that snow removal in the proposed parking lot would result in the snow being piled against the fences of the adjacent properties.

Mr. Fraser went on to note that the children of the area used the back of this property as a thoroughfare and suggested that they would continue to do so. Mr. Fraser noted that this situation has the potential for an accident involving one of the children. Mr. Fraser noted that he did not want to lose the privacy he has enjoyed in the past.

Mr. Fraser, providing an example for Council of a commercial use in a residential area, noted that the property adjacent to his home had at one time been a convenience store. Mr. Fraser indicated that recently Wilson Business Supplies has taken over the building and since that time a large truck has been parked in front of that property. Mr. Fraser noted that this

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

truck blocks the view out of his kitchen window. Mr. Fraser further indicated that the owners of the house in which he lives had requested the City to place 'No Parking' signs in front of their property as this same truck had been parking in front of their property. Mr. Fraser noted that this situation had, in effect, denied him the right to park in front of his house. Mr. Fraser also noted that the truck parking in front of his home had created a hazardous situation when backing out of the driveway.

Mr. Fraser went on to note that the staff report did not address what type of buffering was to occur on the property. Mr. Fraser indicated that he had some concerns with the use of the property as a law firm. Mr. Fraser noted that the property could not be much larger than three rooms upstairs and three down. Mr. Fraser suggested that at least four or five rooms would be used as offices. Mr. Fraser further suggested that the firm would outgrow these premises and at that point the property could be sold as a commercial property. Mr. Fraser noted that the nature of the C-2A zone permitted a number of uses on this property. Mr. Fraser noted that the antique store located in the neighbourhood has been there for some time and was not intrusive to the neighbourhood.

Mr. Fraser, referring to the available commercial space on Quinpool Road, indicated that he felt uses such as this should locate in these areas. Mr. Fraser indicated that he did not understand why this rezoning would be permitted in a primarily residential area. Mr. Fraser noted that although the area was designated for commercial use under the Future Land Use Map, the majority of the properties in the area would never become commercial. In closing, Mr. Fraser indicated that he hoped Council would reject this application to rezone.

Mr. Bill Thompson, a solicitor and the applicant, addressed Council noting that he owned a vacant property on Windsor Street which was in an R-2 zone. Mr. Thompson noted that as this property was not designated for commercial use, he had not attempted to rezone this property for a commercial use. Mr. Thompson went on to note that instead of attempting to rezone the property on Windsor Street, he had sought input from city staff as to how best to find a property upon which he could locate his offices. Mr. Thompson indicated that staff had suggested that he review the Municipal Planning Strategy and the Land Use Bylaw and then investigate what properties were available in the City.

Mr. Thompson noted that he had done what staff had suggested and located the property on Chebucto Road. Mr. Thompson noted that this property was designated commercial and, in fact, was zoned commercial from 1950 to 1979. Mr. Thompson noted that his was a small firm with no plans for a major expansion. Mr. Thompson noted that this property would be ideal for the firm.

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

Mr. Thompson went on to advise that he currently had an agreement of purchase and sale for a property on Beech Street as an alternate to this property. Mr. Thompson noted that the Beech Street is already zoned C-2A; however, he did not wish to locate on Beech Street. Mr. Thompson went on to explain that even though the purchase price was the same and the building was in better condition, he did not wish to create a parking problem for the residents of the area. Mr. Thompson noted that the Chebucto Road property provided adequate parking for all the firm's clients and staff. Mr. Thompson noted that there was very little evening work and the operation was generally low key.

In closing, Mr. Thompson indicated that he had followed the appropriate procedure in finding this location, adding that his was a small business and that he could not afford to locate on Quinpool Road or in the downtown area. Mr. Thompson noted that he wanted to fit into the neighbourhood with the least amount of disturbance possible.

There were no further persons present wishing to address Council regarding this matter.

Responding to a question from Alderman Meagher, the City Clerk indicated that two letters had been received in response to the advertisement, as follows:

- Correspondence in opposition to the proposal dated July 15, 1988 from John Mesereau, 2542 Oxford Street.
- Correspondence in opposition to the proposal dated July 15 1988 from Garnet Cooper, 6864 Cook Avenue.

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman Dewell that this matter be forwarded without recommendation to the next regular meeting of Halifax City Council scheduled for Thursday, July 28, 1988.

Motion passed.

Alderman R. Grant leaves the meeting.

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING - 1313 Dresden Row - Modification

This public hearing was adjourned to this date from the Special Council Meeting held on July 6, 1988.

Mr. Michael Hanusiak, Development and Planning Department, addressed Council noting that the members of Council attending the initial public hearing regarding this matter had just barely represented a quorum. Mr. Hanusiak further indicated that the public hearing was adjourned with the intention of

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

resuming the public hearing this evening. Mr. Hanusiak indicated that the difficulty this evening is whether or not the same members of Council are present as were present at the July 6, 1988 public hearing.

Mr. Hanusiak advised that, in an attempt to resolve this situation, staff was prepared to give their original presentation; the developer was prepared to discuss only his original proposal; and the individuals who made a presentation at the July 6, 1988 public hearing were present this evening to give their submissions once more. Mr. Hanusiak noted, therefore, that in essence Council was to consider this matter in its entirety this evening.

Mr. Hanusiak, with the aid of a sketch, outlined the application for a modification pursuant to Section 15 of the Land Use Bylaw to permit construction of a single family dwelling at 1313 Dresden Row as found in the June 1, 1988 staff report.

Mr. Hanusiak noted that although the property was deficient in most respects, virtually every property in the neighbourhood was severely deficient. Mr. Hanusiak indicated that, this being the situation, staff was prepared to exercise a certain amount of leniency in regard to this application. Mr. Hanusiak further advised that the vacant property could be renovated and reverted back to the previous store use, suggesting that this would not be in keeping with the neighbourhood.

Mr. Hanusiak went on to note that the proposal was acceptable to staff with the proviso that the building be altered to increase the rear yard to 20 feet and reduce the lot coverage to 55 percent. Mr. Hanusiak noted that this could be achieved by eliminating the dining room area from the proposal.

Alderman D. Grant asked whether the proposal was in keeping with the streetscape of Dresden Row and what, if any, control Council has in relation to the design of the building.

Mr. Hanusiak indicated that the houses in the area are very old and very similar in their designs and facades. Mr. Hanusiak noted that the proposal was certainly divorced from that streetscape. Mr. Hanusiak indicated that while the proposal did not vary greatly in overall size, the treatment of the facade of the building was quite different.

Mr. Hanusiak indicated that in terms of the facade he felt that Council was in a position to demand modifications to the facade. Mr. Hanusiak went on to note, however, that should Council desire a significant change to the volume and design of the building, a further public hearing would be required.

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

Mr. Paul LaRose, residing at 5621 Morris Street, addressed Council, advising that his house abuts the subject property immediately to the south. Because his lot was subdivided many years ago, Mr. LaRose noted that it was only 45 feet deep which, he indicated, results in having only a 12 foot rear yard that is used as a driveway. Mr. LaRose went on to advise that, three or four years ago, Council approved a motion for a variance to allow him to construct a sun deck above his driveway which he noted has given him a suitable outdoor area. Mr. LaRose advised that there was a three foot space between his deck and the existing building on the property in question.

Mr. LaRose noted that building had at one time been used as a store and is now vacant. He emphasized that the proposal requires several variances in order to be approved, adding that staff supports the proposal subject to, in his understanding, two conditions, one being a 20 foot rear yard and a suitable design acceptable to Council.

Mr. LaRose noted that the project (although being submitted for contract approval because it is on its own lot) is part of a much larger project which covers approximately one-third of the southern portion of this block. He indicated that five properties are presently being renovated on Morris Street and that these projects are being carried out as of right. Mr. LaRose went on to note that one of the properties involved had been a single family dwelling since 1981 and the developer has been able to put seven units in this house. Mr. LaRose noted that this type of development represented a significant change to the population density of the area, suggesting that there should have been a requirement by Council to consider the redevelopment of the block in its entirety.

Mr. LaRose went on to note that to approve a variance on the south side of the lot would eliminate the current three foot space between his and the subject property. Mr. LaRose noted that this was neither desirable or necessary as it would merely allow for a wider driveway on the north side of the project. Mr. LaRose indicated that the current driveway was adequate for all vehicular traffic. Mr. LaRose went on to note that the elimination of the three feet would cause him great difficulty as his own driveway was quite narrow and his car door literally swung into this three feet space when the door was open.

Mr. LaRose went on to express concern with respect to the proposed height of the structure. He suggested that the proposed structure would be so high that it would create a tunnel effect when he was on his deck. Mr. LaRose indicated that to permit the development of a building on a lot that was marginally 1/4 the size of a standard lot represented, in his opinion, poor development and worse planning.

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

Mr. LaRose noted that the impact on his and the neighbouring properties was significant, made more so by the development of a sun deck on the roof of the south part of the property. Mr. LaRose noted that the sun deck would be an incredible intrusion on the privacy of his property. Mr. LaRose noted that the floor of the deck would be about six or eight feet above the railing of his deck and hard against the property line. Mr. LaRose went on to note that the deck occupants would be looking directly into his bedroom window.

Mr. LaRose indicated that there were numerous objections to this application, advising that he felt this was another case of the City and neighbouring property owners being asked to help out a developer who has paid too much for a tiny piece of property. Mr. LaRose noted that the developer, having paid too much for the property, was now forced to overdevelop the property to recover his capital land costs.

In conclusion, Mr. LaRose requested that Council give serious consideration to his concerns particularly in relation to the sun deck and the variance on the south side of the project.

Mr. David Gunn, residing at 5619 Morris Street, addressed Council and advised that the proposed building will be situated at the rear or north boundary and part of the west boundary of his property. Mr. Gunn noted that presently the former convenience store was located on these boundaries. Mr. Gunn went on to note that the existing building is 12 feet high and suggested that the lot in question was too small to allow for a larger building. Mr. Gunn noted that a larger structure would have an adverse affect on the value of his property.

Mr. Gunn went on to note that the proposed development would form a corner approximately 30 feet high on his rear yard, emphasizing that this would impact severely upon the enjoyment of his yard. Mr. Gunn noted that the proposal to have a deck on the south side of the dwelling would destroy the privacy he and his family now enjoy from that particular direction.

Mr. Gunn indicated that should Council agree to allow the development, it would have to approve six variances out of seven to City bylaw requirements. Mr. Gunn indicated that in this situation one could only ask why the City had bylaws if variances could be so easily acquired. Mr. Gunn indicated that he believed development should be encouraged; however, he felt that these same developers should be required to consider the rights of existing residents. Mr. Gunn indicated that he had to protect the equity he had in his property and suggested that another individual's priority should not take precedent over his. Mr. Gunn suggested that in order to keep the downtown vibrant, residents should be

encouraged to buy properties for single family use. Mr. Gunn went on to note that allowing rental developments did not encourage the purchase of single family use properties in the downtown.

Mr. Wilfred Moore, representing the applicant, addressed Council indicating that his client had purchased the subject property in October of 1987. Mr. Moore went on to note that, shortly after the purchase, his client had offered to sell the property to the previous two speakers. Mr. Moore noted that the gentlemen in question had turned down this opportunity.

Mr. Moore noted that his client had then approached staff regarding development of the property. Mr. Moore noted that, with the encouragement and creativity of City staff, his client had hit upon a proposal for a three-bedroom, single family residence for the site.

Referring to the comments made regarding the three foot wide strip separating this and the adjacent property, Mr. Moore noted that this strip of property was owned by his client. Mr. Moore went on to note that the adjacent property owner has 100 percent coverage of his own lot.

Mr. Moore indicated that his client also had rights in relation to their property. Mr. Moore noted that his client owned other properties in the area and was spending significant investment dollars in rehabilitating these properties. Mr. Moore indicated that he was of the opinion that this rehabilitation of properties was good for the area and was being carried out within the limits of the Zoning Bylaw for the City. Mr. Moore distributed to members of Council letters from six other neighbours supporting the proposal. Mr. Moore noted that there were also two letters on file supporting the proposal.

Mr. Moore, referring to the proposal, indicated that he felt his client was doing the right thing for the neighbourhood in developing a single family dwelling and was also attempting to be sensitive to the abutters. Mr. Moore further pointed out that it was interesting to note that the proposed deck and rear yard would provide more open space than the twenty foot rear yard sought by staff. Mr. Moore noted that his client was not unwilling to change the facade of the proposal. Mr. Moore went on to note that his client has developed a number of other properties in the City and, in his opinion, had developed quality projects. Mr. Moore noted that his client was, in fact, agreeable to conferring with staff regarding the facade of the proposal and was willing to do what was necessary to ensure the facade was in keeping with the neighbourhood. Mr. Moore noted that the modified rendering of the project submitted with his written presentation depicted what the project would look like if the concerns raised by staff were addressed as they suggested.

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

Mr. Moore indicated that the abutting neighbours, excepting the two previous speakers, support the proposal, and emphasized that his client felt he was doing the right thing for the property. Under these circumstances, Mr. Moore requested that Council grant approval for the project in order that construction might begin.

Mr. Wilfred Keefe addressed Council indicating that his property was located immediately to the north of the subject property. Mr. Keefe indicated that he was concerned that if Council does not allow this proposal, the owners will be forced to refurbish the building and rent it as a convenience store. Mr. Keefe indicated that there were plenty of convenience stores in the area at the present time, adding that he would like to see the convenience store use removed from the property.

Mr. Lyndon Watkins, a resident of Schmidville, acknowledged that this was a difficult matter upon which to make a decision. Mr. Watkins indicated that he felt Council must consider the rights of both property owners as well as the wider concerns of society. Mr. Watkins noted that the abutting property owners must naturally have Council's greater concern; however, the heritage of the Schmidville area must also be considered.

Mr. Watkins indicated that he felt the situation was somewhat exaggerated initially when staff insisted that the lot coverage be less than what was proposed by the developer. Mr. Watkins indicated that he felt that staff's position at the present time regarding lot coverage was more sensible considering that many of the buildings in the area do not conform to the City's Bylaw. Mr. Watkins noted that there were houses in the immediate area which have only three feet of backyard, indicating that, in his opinion, this gave Council the opportunity to find a compromise between the needs of the area and the needs of the abutters.

Mr. Watkins advised that the proposal before Council today was a desirable proposal when one considered the alternative use of the property. Mr. Watkins noted that to have the property refurbished for use as a convenience store was frightening, adding that such a use would be totally incompatible with the area.

Mr. Watkins indicated that in attempting to find a satisfactory solution to the matter, Council does have the opportunity to alter the configuration of the building somewhat. Mr. Watkins indicated that he did not agree that the proposal does not conform to or was not sympathetic to the other properties in the area. Mr. Watkins noted that the gables and the angular style of the building was very complimentary to the other homes in the

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

area, emphasizing that appropriate exterior detailing would result in the proposal being very satisfactory.

Mr. Watkins indicated that he shared the concerns expressed by the abutting property owners regarding the mass of the proposal. Mr. Watkins indicated, however, that this situation was not unusual in the area. Mr. Watkins further noted that Council has not considered the impact of the loss of landscaping in the inner core of the block for use as a parking lot, adding that he had hoped Council would give this situation some consideration. In closing, Mr. Watkins recommended that Council accept the proposal; however, he suggested that Council should seek some compromise in addressing the legitimate concerns expressed by the abutting property owners.

There were no further persons present wishing to address Council with regard to this matter.

The following correspondence has been received in relation to this matter:

- A form letter signed by the following residents of the area in favor for the application, with attached drawings of the proposal, which was submitted this evening by Mr. Wilfred Moore, representing the applicant. The letter was signed by: Carol Rhodenzer, 1316 Dresden Row; Howard B. Stillman Sr., 1310 Dresden Row; Trudy Lawien, 1320 Dresden Row; Holly Fairn, 5639 Morris Street; Elaine Nixon, 1336 Dresden Row; Reginald Horne, 957 Young Street.

MOVED by Alderman Downey, seconded by Alderman Cromwell
that this matter be forwarded without recommendation to the next
regular meeting of Halifax City Council to be held on Thursday,
July 28, 1988.

Motion passed.

MINOR VARIANCE RE: Appeal of Variance Approval - 6288 North
Street

A public hearing into the above matter was held at this time.

Mr. Michael Hanusiak, Development and Planning Department, with the aid of a sketch, outlined the application for a minor variance of the lot area requirement at 6288 North Street. Mr. Hanusiak indicated that this variance was being requested to permit the conversion of the existing family dwelling to a duplex.

Mr. Hanusiak noted that the application had been reviewed and approval granted by the Development Officer. Mr. Hanusiak noted that subsequently an appeal of the minor variance approval was received on June 6, 1988.

Mrs. Marie Crosby, an adjacent property owner and the appellant, addressed Council indicating that she did not have major difficulties with the proposal. Mrs. Crosby expressed concern that she had not been notified of the proposal prior to the approval of the project by the Development Officer. Mrs. Crosby indicated that a number of single family dwellings in the area have been converted to multiple units. Mr. Crosby noted that she was concerned that the area was losing its value due to these conversions.

Responding to Mrs. Crosby's concern regarding prior notification, Mr. Hanusiak advised that, in the case of a Minor Variance, notification is forwarded to the abutting property owners only after approval has been given by the Development Officer. Mr. Hanusiak noted that this notification is forwarded by certified mail and, therefore, if the individual is not at home to sign for the letter, they do not receive it immediately. Mr. Hanusiak further advised that after an appeal has been received, the appellant receives notification of the day and time of the public hearing concerning the appeal.

After a further short discussion, Mr. Gerard Dugas, the applicant, addressed Council and reviewed the steps he had taken in relation to the application for the minor variance. Mr. Dugas noted that the property was zoned R-2 and at the time he purchased the property he had assumed that this zoning allowed for a two family dwelling. Mr. Dugas noted that after ascertaining that this was not the case, he had applied for a minor variance to permit the conversion to a duplex.

Mr. Dugas went on to note that the house required a great deal of repair to the roof, the back section and to the rear shed. Mr. Dugas noted that he had applied for the appropriate permits and carried out the necessary work. Mr. Dugas indicated that after applying for the variance, he had contacted the neighbours to seek their approval of the variance. Mr. Dugas noted that he had received both the written and verbal approval of the neighbours on both sides and to the rear of his property.

Mr. Dugas further indicated that City staff had advised him that the letters notifying of the approval of the variance had been forwarded and work on the conversion must cease for 15 to 18 days. Mr. Dugas noted that work relating to the conversion had stopped although there was still work being carried out in relation to the necessary repairs to the property. Mr. Dugas

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

noted that after receiving the appeal, he had met with Mrs. Crosby to discuss her concerns. Mr. Dugas noted that he understood her concerns to relate to a possible devaluation of her property and to the number of tenants that would be living in his building.

Mr. Dugas indicated that he felt the work he has done to the building will enhance rather than devalue Mr. Crosby's property. Mr. Dugas went on to note that the building would contain a one bedroom apartment and a two bedroom apartment. Mr. Dugas noted that quality work and materials had been used to renovate this house and suggested that Mrs. Crosby would have no difficulty with the tenants living in the house.

In closing, Mr. Dugas noted that North Street was one of the busiest streets in the City and that multiple family dwellings were common on North Street. Mr. Dugas indicated that he had complied with all the regulations and had obtained all the appropriate permits in relation to this matter.

Alderman Meagher addressed the matter indicating that he would be proposing that Council uphold the appeal and overturn the Development Officer's decision. Alderman Meagher expressed concern that the difficulty involved the size of the lot. Alderman Meagher suggested that if Halifax was to have an inner city which was acceptable to residents, then adherence to the regulations must be required.

Alderman Meagher went on to note that North Street was extremely busy and parking was permitted on only one side of the street. He also noted that many residents now park on their lawns and that the area in general was over populated. Alderman Meagher went on to note that the developer will not know how many people are living in his building, and suggested that if each of the units has more than one car, a problem with parking will result.

MOVED by Alderman Meagher, seconded by Alderman Cromwell that the appeal be granted and the decision of the Development Officer overturned.

The motion was put and lost.

MOVED by Alderman Flynn, seconded by Alderman Leiper that the appeal be denied and the decision of the Development Officer upheld.

The motion was put and passed.

Public Hearing
July 20, 1988

MINOR VARIANCE RE: Appeal of Variance Approval - 5280-82
South Street

Consideration of this matter was deferred, during the setting of the agenda, to the Special meeting of City Council to be held on **Wednesday, August 17, 1988.**

MINOR VARIANCE RE: Appeal of Variance Refusal - 1526 Lilac
Street

Consideration of this matter was deferred, during the setting of the agenda, to the Special meeting of City Council to be held on **Wednesday, August 17, 1988.**

6:25 p.m. The meeting adjourned.

DEPUTY MAYOR J. ALBERT WALKER
ACTING CHAIRMAN

E. A. KERR
CITY CLERK

/sh

HEADLINES FOR CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
of 07/20/88

Recommendations - Tax Concessions and Grants Committee - Buskers 495
Halifax Hall - Teas 496
Award of Tender #88-20 - Paving Renewal Elgin Street 496
Award of Tender #88-41 - Sidewalk Renewal 496
1988 Capital Budget - Award of Tenders 497
PUBLIC HEARING: Rezoning - R2-C2A - 6422 Chebucto Road 498
ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING - 1313 Dresden Row - Modification 500
MINOR VARIANCE RE: Appeal of Variance Approval - 6288 North Street 506
MINOR VARIANCE RE: Appeal of Variance Approval - 5280-88 South Street 509

**CITY COUNCIL
M I N U T E S**

Council Chamber
City Hall
Halifax, Nova Scotia
July 28, 1988
8:00 p.m.

A regular meeting of Halifax City Council was held at this time.

PRESENT: His Worship Mayor Ron Wallace, Chairman; Deputy Mayor J. Albert Walker; and Aldermen Deborah Grant, Cromwell, Downey, Meagher, O'Malley, Dewell, Richard Grant, Jeffrey, Leiper, and Flynn.

ALSO PRESENT: City Manager; Mr. W. Anstey, representing the City Solicitor; Ms. Karen Swim, Acting City Clerk; and other members of City staff.

The meeting was called to order with Alderman Moira Leiper leading Council in the recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

His Worship noted with sadness the recent passing of Mr. Marcel Gatien, Chairman of the City's Planning Advisory Committee, adding that a donation in his memory on behalf of members of City Council had been made to Hope Cottage.

MINUTES

Minutes of the regular meeting of City Council held on July 14, 1988 and of the special meeting of City Council held on July 20, 1988 were approved on a motion by Alderman Flynn, seconded by Alderman Leiper.

APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS, ADDITIONS & DELETIONS

At the request of the Acting City Clerk, Council agreed to add:

- 20.1 Renovest Realty Limited: Development and Building Permits for 5397-99 Victoria Road
- 20.2 Award of Tender No. 88-51: Sidewalk Renewals
- 20.3 Revenue and Expenditure Statement
- 20.4 Voting Delegates - U.N.S.M. Annual Conference

Council
July 28, 1988

- 20.5 Exhibition Park Race Track (Alderman Jeffrey)
- 20.6 Sewer and Water Installation: Barclay Avenue (Tender No. 88-07) and Woodcrest Avenue (Tender No. 88-09)
- 20.7 Report from PAC: Amendment to MPS - 588 Bedford Highway (DATE FOR PUBLIC HEARING)
- 20.8 Amendments to Ordinance Number 116, the Taxi Ordinance
- 20.9 Deputy Traffic Authority - New Appointment
- 5.3 Advisory Design Panel (His Worship Mayor Wallace)

At the request of Alderman Richard Grant, Council agreed to add:

- 20.10 Concert on the Hill - Carver Balloon

At the request of Alderman Meagher, Council agreed to add:

- 20.11 Future Land Use Map - Chebucto Road (Oxford to Beech Street)

MOVED by Alderman R. Grant, seconded by Alderman Leiper that the agenda, as amended, be accepted.

Motion passed.

His Worship referred with pleasure to the presence in the public gallery of members of the City's Natal Day Committee, noting, in particular, Co-chairmen John Bulley and Doug Mitchell. Mayor Wallace expressed appreciation on behalf of Halifax City Council to the committee for their hard work over the last several months, and wished them every success with this weekend's Natal Day festivities.

His Worship then introduced Eddie "the Eagle" Edwards, Grand Marshal for the 1988 Halifax Natal Day Parade. Mr. Edwards addressed Council, thanking the organizing committee (and Coca Cola) for the opportunity to visit Halifax and to take part in the upcoming events.