

TO: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
FROM: C. McC. Henderson, City Manager  
DATE: March 30, 1971  
SUBJECT: Harbour Drive - Commitments, Advantages and Disadvantages

---

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to outline the history of and the City's commitment to the proposed "controlled access divided roadway" called Harbour Drive. The report also discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the Drive, particularly with regard to the section south of the Cogswell Street Interchange.

COMMITMENTS:

Since 1940, Halifax has experienced steady growth, suburban development, and an increasing shift to auto traffic and a decline in transit. By the early 1960's, suburban shopping centre competition, dormant development downtown, increasing road traffic, and the potential for redevelopment made improved access to the centre a live issue. A number of early reports had suggested a road extending along the Harbour from Fairview to downtown. By 1963, Council had agreed in principle to this concept (probably a four-lane divided and controlled access road), particularly for the section from the MacDonald Bridge to the Ferry Docks. (See Map 1) Some key decisions are outlined below. (Note: See Appendix A for a detailed discussion of the City's commitments.)

<u>June 13, 1963</u>	City Council agreed in principle to roadway between Bridge and Ferry
<u>November, 1964</u>	Draft Terms of Reference approved for the design.
<u>April 29, 1965</u>	Engaged consultants for initial design work.
<u>December 16, 1965</u>	Initial report presented.
<u>January 13, 1966</u>	Alternative staff design for Cogswell Street Interchange approved.
<u>August 22, 1966</u>	"Alternative B" (Staff) adopted by City Council
<u>March 29, 1967</u>	Consultants retained to review and revise adopted design ("B") and to make a preliminary design for the northern section, i.e. from Cornwallis Street to Gerrish Street.

June 15, 1967 Consultants asked to review alignment to preserve historic Water Street buildings.

July 19, 1967 Design for interchange accepted by Council.

September 28, 1967 Staff asked to present proposals for a street reservation along Water Street from Duke Street to Terminal Road

February 29, 1968 Alignments approved in principle but staff-consultant negotiations requested on historic buildings.

March 15, 1968 Alternative proposals presented.

September 26, 1968 Council approved plans and right-of-way reservations for the section from Proctor Street to Gerrish Street.

June 10, 1969 Report presented by engineering consultant on road alignments respecting the historic buildings.

June 19, 1969 Council resolution that grade and line of the Margison Plan be re-affirmed from Court House to Cogswell Interchange - subsequently rescinded.

September 11, 1970 Consultants reports (M.A.P.C.) indicate the need for access to the Core, but recommend against a "freeway" through the downtown area.

PRESENT SITUATION:

Completion of Cogswell Interchange area.

Strong support for the preservation of the historic buildings precinct has been stated and the Call for Proposals is being drafted.

Northerly extension toward bridge designed but not yet started.

No official commitment to final form of northern segment nor to the construction of the South Harbour extension to the Arm Bridge yet exists.

The downtown section, as a single roadway, has not been accepted by Council.

Traffic reports from Staff, however, show the entire route as a major link in the road system and suggest that traffic projections still make it necessary.

ADVANTAGES OF HARBOUR DRIVE:

The need for Harbour Drive has been related to:

- (1) the persistent increase in auto traffic and the decline in transit;
- (2) the growing inadequacy of the present road system to cope with this traffic, a problem which will become more severe as people move even further out and travel times lengthen;
- (3) the necessity for improved auto access to the downtown as a means of preserving and encouraging economic growth and commercial vitality;
- (4) a number of consultants' reports which have projected very large increases in auto traffic over the next twenty years, as well as the construction of one or two additional bridges. These will require good connecting roads to take off their concentrated traffic flows;
- (5) the Harbour Drive alignment is one which (except for the downtown link) can provide a new high capacity road with least cost and minimum disruption to the fabric of the city because of its waterfront location and a lower intensity of development along its right-of-way. Major roads should pass around neighbourhoods, not through them.
- (6) the possibility of actually reducing street acreage, through closure and realignments, if a well designed artery exists (eg. Cogswell Street Interchange - Scotia Square);
- (7) the lack of present capacity on Water Street to handle future proposed development along or near the waterfront and the necessity for fairly extensive property acquisition even for a relatively minor street widening project;
- (8) the possibility of spurring redevelopment along the harbour land (possibly over ten acres) opened up by the Drive and its attendant property acquisition, thus partially defraying the heavy costs (to a large extent for land) of a downtown arterial.

DISADVANTAGES OF HARBOUR DRIVE

These will relate mainly to major traffic facilities in general since a specific design for the entire road has not yet been prepared.

- (1) the high cost of major traffic facilities (up to \$10 million/mile for a major 4-6 lane urban arterial downtown, i.e. Harbour Drive), especially as related to other public needs - schools, sewers, etc.

- (2) major freeway-type facilities (north end projected 4-6 lanes, 1991) tend to encourage more auto traffic, to become overloaded, and at a high cost which is a subsidy to commuters. Invariably, roads such as this need to be widened in the future.
- (3) in the downtown section, the loss of valuable urban land would be extensive (including needed parking) and a barrier might be created (or perpetuated) between the retail-office area and the harbour;
- (4) the downtown street network cannot cope with concentrated flows (4-6 lanes at each end) at the turn-off streets;
- (5) the argument that downtown needs vastly improved road access may not be proven - several large cities have both freeway access and declining downtowns;
- (6) the scheme up to now has not considered transit, which appears to offer better prospects for serving commuter traffic in the greatly expanded downtown core being planned for;
- (7) the goal of transportation planning should be to move people, as well as vehicles. Presently, during rush hour, one-half of all persons entering and leaving downtown Halifax are carried by transit. Yet, roadway construction - including Harbour Drive - is inordinately oriented to automobile and truck traffic. Downtown transportation expenditures - the design and construction - should reflect more fairly the large transit component of traffic to and from downtown Halifax.

#### CONCLUSION

Certain facts are important to note in the case of Harbour Drive:

- (1) There has been a general acceptance, built up over a number of years, of the concept of a road around the perimeter of the peninsula from the Fairview Overpass to the downtown area. This concept was later extended to include a section passing through downtown and along the CNR tracks linking up with the proposed North West Arm Bridge and a possible South Harbour crossing
- (2) The Cogswell Street Interchange is a fact seemingly made necessary by the acceptance of the previous concept and construction of Scotia Square.

- (3) A major portion of the designated Harbour Drive route, from Duffus Street to the Fairview Overpass, is now in process of construction as an integral part of the Narrows Bridge approaches. It has been stated that these facilities will ultimately have to be doubled in size, as recognized when the approach roads were approved for construction by Council.
- (4) The most controversial section is that portion through the Central Business District. Penetrating analysis must be undertaken for the Core area as a whole to determine whether the existing street network can cope with projected traffic increases and, if not, what alternatives are available.

There are few facts now available to support either viewpoint. Transportation problems cannot be solved by piecemeal experiments. What is needed is to treat the road system as a system with transit and auto components. There is a need to spell out benefits, costs and alternatives. The minimum need is for an agreed-upon concept of the future urban pattern and a comprehensive regional transportation study (as by Canadian British Engineering).<sup>1</sup> Without this investment, the possibilities for error and waste are multiplied many times over.

---

<sup>1</sup> A word of caution: the transportation study process has some distinct limitations. The transportation study basically uses forecasted population, employment, land use and other data for a target year in order to project and assign traffic volumes over an existing and a proposed road network. It can be used to evaluate the capacity of present roads and to test proposed new streets, bridges and other improvements. The process, for example, will be used to estimate the number of lanes which may be required for Harbour Drive and the need for an extension of it to the Arm Bridge.

However, the present transportation study will not test alternative road networks, and, of great importance, it will not evaluate alternative means of moving people (for example, computerized traffic lights, one-way streets, transit, etc.) A number of separate computer runs would have to be made just to deal at least superficially with these alternative means.

Furthermore, as with all models and attempts to forecast future conditions and needs, there are the inherent problems of faulty data and wavering validity of assumptions the more one projects beyond the present time. The present transportation study process is no exception. Full recognition must be given not only to the utility of transportation analysis - but as well, to its limitations.

It seems, then, that Council has several options:

- (1) Postponement of all discussion on the matter pending completion of the Metropolitan Transportation Study. This is not recommended for the reasons immediately above. Under the best circumstances, the study will probably not be available before late summer.
- (2) Some preliminary discussion might take place if and when an interim study is approved and completed on the Arm Bridge and approach roads.
- (3) The complexity of the subject makes it difficult to analyse pros and cons in a short position paper. If Council wishes to discuss the matter in advance of completion of the Canadian British Engineering studies, a night could be set aside for informal discussion with appropriate staff members. Council at least would be informed of the facts as they now exist, and opposing viewpoints on specific matters raised by Aldermen could be set forth.

Respectfully submitted,



C. McC. Henderson  
City Manager

GCP/jt  
Attach.



# HARBOUR DRIVE

Fig.1

HISTORY OF HARBOUR DRIVE - HALIFAX, N. S. <sup>1</sup>

1. SUMMARY

1.1. Increasing Road Traffic, 1945-63:

Since 1945 Halifax has experienced continuing growth, widespread suburban development and a rising level of auto ownership. By the early 1960's falling transit patronage, bridge construction, plans for urban renewal, and an increasing number of jobs in downtown offices and along the harbour led to plans for improved road access to and through the peninsula. One such scheme was Harbour Drive, a plan to link the Fairview Overpass to Downtown along the harbour, with later extensions to the proposed Northwest Arm Bridge. (The most important factor was the need for downtown access particularly for the redevelopment area)

1.2. Harbour Drive, Phase I, 1963:

By 1963 a staff report had outlined the concept and it appeared that City Council had agreed in principle to such a route. Downtown redevelopment projects made improved access along Cogswell Street essential, as well as an upgraded road link between the ferry docks and the A. L. MacDonald Bridge. The latter section, including the Cogswell Interchange, was planned in some detail and City Council agreed in principle (June 13, 1963) to proceed with this segment of Harbour Drive.

1.3. Cogswell Street Interchange:

Terms of Reference for the design of the section were approved November 26, 1964 and a consultant's report (De Leuw, Cather) was presented for discussion on December 16, 1965. After staff criticism, these plans were altered and a final design for the Cogswell Street Interchange was accepted by City Council on July 19, 1967 as a key section of the Scotia Square project. During 1968-69 construction proceeded and a lengthy debate ensued on the historical buildings along Upper Water Street, resulting in some changes in the alignment plans.

1.4. Present Situation 1971:

In all these years, Council has often affirmed the propositions that (1) the historical buildings should be saved, if at all possible, and that (2) a limited access freeway should not go through downtown. To date, only one segment of Harbour Drive has been accepted in principle, one major interchange built, and one additional section likely and designed (Proctor-Gerrish). Recent consultants' reports recommend against a downtown freeway and all other portions of Harbour Drive are still in limbo, except that in the north end, major improvements exist in the form of approaches to the Narrows Bridge. The present staff view is for Harbour Drive to be a major arterial boulevarded street.

---

<sup>1</sup> This report is based on reading of Council minutes and other documents: it is intended to reflect official commitments to Harbour Drive.



## 2. THE BACKGROUND TO HARBOUR DRIVE (1920-1963)

### 2.1. Increasing Road Traffic:

The street systems of most older Canadian cities are relics of the horse and buggy era. The automobile generally became an item of mass consumption during the 1920's (Halifax Pop. 60,000). This, however, was followed by a depression and a war when there was neither concern nor funds for improving urban transportation. By 1945 (Halifax Area, Pop. 100,000) a backlog of almost 20 years' accumulated obsolescence had built up. Unfortunately, this backlog was not the only claim on public funds - other utilities and institutions were in a similar position, not least the housing market.

To make matters worse, postwar prosperity brought with it an extended building boom, low density suburban living and the full impact of the automobile age. It has been stated that a city's character and a city's transportation system are inextricably related, a change in one having a direct effect upon the other. It is sometimes hard to appreciate the great impact which the changes of the last 25 years have had upon our cities, or to cope with them.

### 2.2. Transit:

In 1945 the bus companies of the area (Pop. 100,000) carried almost 40 million passengers. By 1965 (Pop. 200,000) this had declined to 16 million, though the decline had begun to slow down somewhat by 1960. Coincident with this was a rapid increase in the number of automobiles. Some 67 percent of the area's households had cars by 1961, and today there is about one car for every 3 persons in the metropolitan area.

### 2.3. Early Traffic Plans 1945-1950:

As early as 1945 the Master Plan for the City of Halifax recommended considerable improvements to arterial traffic routes leading downtown, as well as major interchanges in the Fairview and Armdale areas. There was to be a widening of Upper Water Street and comprehensive treatment of the waterfront as well. Also proposed was the long awaited harbour bridge (whose location had been decided in 1933 by the Dominion Government) and a bridge across the Northwest Arm. Similar proposals were reiterated in the City of Halifax 10 Year Development Plan (1950), with the emphasis on bridges and downtown streets.

### 2.4. New Traffic Facilities, 1950's:

By 1955 the A. L. MacDonald Bridge had been opened, the first direct road link between Halifax and Dartmouth. Also constructed during the 1950's were the Fairview Overpass and the Armdale Rotary. By the late 1950's, as well, a freeway, the Bicentennial Drive was completed up to the old city limits at

Dutch Village Road. Dartmouth's population grew by one-quarter in the five years following completion of the MacDonald Bridge so that additional access was a lively possibility. The most likely sites were at the Narrows, on the north end of the peninsula (mentioned in the 1945 City Plan) and perhaps at the south end of downtown, near George's Island, providing a link to one end of Dartmouth's Circumferential Highway.

2.5. Harbour Drive Concept, 1950's:

With access points to the peninsula being improved for road traffic and a possible system of bridge links shaping up, it was inevitable that more attention be given to improving roads within the peninsula and to linking some of these facilities. One of the early considerations was the establishment of a Harbour Drive, a limited access traffic route from downtown Halifax to the Fairview Overpass.

One study, Halifax Metropolitan Area Report (Canadian British Engineering, September 1956) was prepared for local and provincial authorities on the extension of public services to the rapidly growing suburbs of Halifax. The section on roads, although restricting itself to areas outside the peninsula, did recommend the eventual construction of a bridge over the Northwest Arm, linking with South Street. Their map of a proposed main highway system for the area did show a major road extending along the Halifax side of the Arm, past the proposed bridge, and curving toward the CNR Station. Another major road extended along Bedford Basin from Fairview, around the Narrows and at least as far as the A. L. MacDonald Bridge, though it is not labelled as Harbour Drive nor is any indication given of its width.

2.6. Redevelopment Proposals, 1955-60:

The following year, A Redevelopment Study of Halifax, N. S. (Prof. Gordon Stephenson, 1957) was published by the City setting out proposals for urban renewal which were to involve the assistance of C.M.H.C. Part of this report recommended traffic improvements on the edge of what was to be called the Central Redevelopment Area. The Cogswell Street Extension and an interchange at Barrington Street were major features suggested. The latter street was to be improved as the main approach from the A. L. MacDonald Bridge and was to be extended as a major through and level route from the northwest boundary of the peninsula (Fairview) to the City centre. Water Street was to become the most important access route to the central area and harbour when adequately connected to Barrington and Cogswell Streets. In fact, as early as 1958, City Council decided to acquire the fronts of a number of properties on the east side of Water Street as part of such a future road widening plan.

Also recommended in the Stephenson study was redevelopment on the waterfront near the ferry docks. This became the Waterfront Redevelopment Area, a proposed civic complex on the Harbour front which had been recommended in various forms in earlier studies (eg. the 1945 Master Plan). This development was approved in principle by City Council in 1960.

3. HARBOUR DRIVE: THE CONCEPT FORMED AND INITIAL REPORTS  
1961 - 1963

3.1. Early Reports, 1961-63:

By the early 1960's the concept of Harbour Drive as a major arterial route and with a fixed right-of-way had surfaced. A 1963 Staff report stated that four independent planning consultants (un-named) employed by the City in 1961 had concurred in their recommendations on this point, supporting the need for such a facility. On the other hand, an (unsigned) planning reassessment of the 1945 Master Plan proposals for roads, dated February, 1961, failed to mention Harbour Drive and stated that Robie Street would become the main approach to the proposed Arm Bridge.

Meanwhile, a series of engineering studies (Whitman, Ben and Associates; Fenco; H. H. Pratley) carried out between 1960 and 1964, projected greatly increased traffic volumes into the peninsula over the next 20 - 30 years and established costs for the various bridge proposals and other major road facilities.

3.2. City Council 1961 - 1963:

By 1962, plans had been made for the civic complex east of the proposed Harbour Drive as well as proposals for a major commercial complex (Cornwallis Centre, later Scotia Square) on the Central Redevelopment Area, north of Duke Street. Furthermore, long range plans for improving the Halifax approach to the A. L. MacDonald Bridge (City Manager's Report, City Council Meeting, November 15, 1962) were to consist of an improved approach along Chebucto Road - North Street, and Barrington Street (Harbour Drive) as well as associated intersection work. This was the main factor in boosting the plans for Harbour Drive. Major alteration to the street network has been part of the scheme for the Redevelopment Area from the beginning.

By 1963, therefore, a Staff report on Harbour Drive (May 31, 1963) could state that City Council, in dealing with the consultants' reports and specific projects, "have agreed in principle to the establishment of such a route (i.e. Harbour Drive)."

3.3. Harbour Drive, Standards and Priorities, 1963:

In 1963 the proposed Drive was seen by staff as a considerably widened right-of-way following Water and Barrington Streets for much of the route and extending along the waterfront from the CNR Station to the Fairview Overpass. Direct access to it was

to be limited wherever possible and the ideal right-of-way was to be, if possible, 100 feet to provide for a four-lane divided highway. South of Cornwallis Street, however, it was expected that this would be reduced to a 50 foot roadway within a 70 foot minimum right-of-way to provide an undivided four lane road (presently 60 feet).

First priority was to be given to the section from the Ferry Docks to the MacDonald Bridge, next to the downtown section, and finally to the northern section. It was expected that this facility, as developed would be adequate for 10 - 20 years, at which time "much more expensive solutions may be required." The proposed rights-of-way were indicated on Plan No. SS-10-15719.

3.4. The Need for Harbour Drive, 1963:

The Staff report thus concluded that Harbour Drive was both essential and an urgent priority, particularly for the link between the MacDonald Bridge and the Ferry Docks. Four reasons were suggested as persuasive:

(1) An improved Drive along this section could appreciably improve the existing traffic flow and could provide for the added capacity that would be required as a result of the persistent increase in the use of automobiles;

(2) Immediate action on this section would become even more urgent as a result of development activities in the area;

(3) These schemes could not be properly completed without a clear statement of position by the City as to the routing and width of Harbour Drive; and

(4) If the projects are completed without this clear discipline, the City could well find it impossible financially to achieve the route at a later date by reason of heavy new investments in sites and structures. The basic reasoning remained, however, to provide access to downtown to make redevelopment viable.

4. HARBOUR DRIVE: STUDY PHASE 1964-1965

4.1. Bridge Study, 1964:

Further staff reports were discussed by Council in 1964 as a result of the Halifax Area Bridge Study (H.H.L. Pratley, 1963). Construction of additional bridges would involve further expenditure on linkage and access roads, for which assistance from higher levels of government would be requested. A supplement to this study (1964) estimated that a bridge at George's Island, one across the Northwest Arm, and an extension of Harbour Drive to link the two, could cost \$48 million. Bridge approaches at the projected Narrows location would, however, provide much of the northern portion of Harbour Drive, with some subsidy from other governments.

4.2. Downtown Development Plan (Roads), 1964:

In June, 1964, Staff presented the Central Business District, Draft Development Plan to complement the plans for the Redevelopment Area. This report also recommended a downtown traffic circulation system including Harbour Drive, to be designed to carry up to 3,000 vehicles per hour by 1984, and a pedestrian area on Barrington Street and George Street. The plan indicated Harbour Drive as an at grade facility in the Duke Street to Morris Street section of the downtown area. Duke Street, Sackville Street and Morris Street were to be the only intersecting streets and would be signalized. A wide right of way would provide flexibility for downtown redevelopment.

Eventually, Harbour Drive was to become a limited access road with the gradual redevelopment of its frontages. South of Prince Street considerable property clearance would be required so that ultimately an elevated structure was to be considered where access to waterfront industries must be preserved.

The distributor road system was to consist of the existing streets, although considerable widening would be necessary in some cases (or one-way streets). The main western access would be from Cogswell Street and Sackville Street. The south end of the CBD would be served from Morris Street and Inglis Street. The distributor road system in total would carry up to 5,000 vehicles per hour.

The report did not expect, however, that a limited access Harbour Drive could be achieved within the next 20 years (i.e. to 1984).

4.3. City Council: Urban Renewal and Harbour Drive, 1965:

Council eventually approved draft Terms of Reference for the design of Harbour Drive and on November 26, 1964 unanimously approved a resolution closely linking the City's urban renewal programme, and the viability of the C.B.D. with both the construction of an improved traffic artery to the downtown area and with improved connections to the A. L. MacDonald Bridge and Cogswell Street, "such improved traffic artery to be known as Harbour Drive." The Mayor was authorized to negotiate with CMHC for assistance in the design and construction, under the provisions of the National Housing Act, of the aforesaid Harbour Drive, including related connective links. A consultant was then to be appointed to prepare preliminary designs and cost estimates for Harbour Drive as part of the approved urban renewal schemes.

4.4. Harbour Drive, Call for Bids, 1965:

An initial letter inviting bids on the functional design for Phase I of Harbour Drive was sent by the City Manager to several consultants on March 29, 1965. Phase I consisted of that segment from Prince Street at Water Street to the junction of Barrington Street with Devonshire Avenue. Although the Terms of Reference

for the consultants stated that "while the total length of Harbour Drive will eventually have to be implemented to create adequate traffic circulation within the Halifax peninsula," it was decided to proceed with Phase I only, at that time. Actually, no binding commitment had yet been made by City Council for extension beyond Phase I, although acceptance of the several reports mentioned above implied approval of the total concept, in principle at least, as suggested in the 1963 Staff report. This was part of agreements with Scotia Square and City of Halifax - CMHC partnership.

#### 4.5. Harbour Drive, Terms of Reference, 1965:

It may be useful to stress several points mentioned in the Terms of Reference:

First, under Detailed Design Considerations, Sect. A (Prince to George), it was noted that "because of the existing development on the frontages of this section, it is obvious that Harbour Drive at this point will not in fact be constructed as a limited access highway." Harbour Drive was thus seen as a concept, a goal to work toward, taking into account pre-existing development and allowing flexibility for future upgrading to its ultimate position, a limited access, high speed freeway.

Secondly, it was proposed by the City that "as a temporary measure pending the extension of Harbour Drive to the Ocean Terminals, Hollis Street should form a pair with Water Street as a one-way circulation system."

Thirdly, it was clearly expressed that "the design should endeavour to reduce to the very minimum the effect of Harbour Drive as a barrier between the Waterfront and the rest of the C. B. D."

Finally, it was recognized that the proposed alignment on Upper Water Street north of Duke Street "necessitates the removal of portions of buildings which are considered to be of historic and architectural value" and was suggested that the consultants "consider an alternative alignment for this portion of Harbour Drive which would make possible the retention of the old buildings without reducing the effectiveness of Harbour Drive as a major artery."

#### 4.6. Consultant's Report, 1965:

City Council, at its April 29, 1965 meeting, engaged the services of DeLeuw, Cather & Co. Ltd. as consultants to prepare an engineering report on Phase I, Harbour Drive. A Functional Planning Report for Harbour Drive (November, 1965) was submitted to the City and tabled at the meeting of City Council on December 16, 1965. Construction costs for Phase I, including complex interchanges at Cogswell Street, the A. L. MacDonald Bridge, and Devonshire Avenue, were estimated at \$9.5 million. The report recommended Harbour Drive as a full access control facility with a basic 4 lanes and 90 foot right-of-way, with potential expansion to 6 lanes through the use of a 35 foot building set-back along the route.

A map labelled Operational Plan showed Harbour Drive extending along the CNR line to the proposed Northwest Arm Bridge near Robie Street. A third Harbour Bridge was shown with a small interchange at Lower Water Street and Morris Street. Robie Street was shown as a major arterial connecting Harbour Drive in the north end with the Arm Bridge. These sections were all conceptual and tentative, however, as the firm was responsible for the design only of Phase I.

5. HARBOUR DRIVE, PHASE I: DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION, 1965-69

5.1. Staff Reaction to DeLeuw, Cather Report, 1965:

Initial staff comments (Memo to Mayor and Town Planning Board, from City Manager, December 7, 1965) stressed certain conflicts between the report and the Terms of Reference. For example, the Director of Planning in a letter to the Consultant (August 10, 1965) had alluded to the presumed absence of major planning considerations (e.g. the lasting effects of the Drive on existing and future development) amidst the technical details. He also felt that the impact of the Drive on nearby access routes, residential or commercial, should be carefully considered since "the efficient and free movement of traffic between the bridgehead and the C.B.D." were not the only criteria to be considered.

Other comments by Staff on the final report related to the substantial amount of land shown for the Drive and for distributor road functions in the Waterfront Redevelopment Area (George Street to Buckingham Street). The Terms of Reference (Sect. B.P.3) had "stressed that it is important to retain as much land as possible between Harbour Drive and the Waterfront to permit development of this area to full capacity." Also, the Consultants' plan for a Waterfront Distributor involved the necessity to make adequate connections across Harbour Drive to the C.B.D. network, and even new streets to provide circulation links around the perimeter of the C.B.D. and the core. As Staff noted, "the streets and their connection to the Waterfront distributor would necessarily involve clearance of expensive central area buildings."

5.2. Staff, Alternative Designs, 1965-66:

During the month of December, 1965, Staff continued examination of the report. Early action was required on that section designated as the Cogswell Street Interchange because of its key role in plans for the Central Redevelopment Area for which the Call for Proposals was then under way. It was felt that the Consultants' plans for the Cogswell Street connection were too elaborate and required too much land within the Redevelopment Area, thus severely interfering with its development potential. Accordingly, Staff prepared an alternative design for the section of Harbour Drive adjacent to the Redevelopment Area

between Cornwallis Street and Buckingham Street (Drawing No. P300/46). It required fewer traffic devices, less land, and could be phased to reduce the initial cost. On January 13, 1966, Council approved this alternative plan.

Later in the summer, (City Council Meeting, August 22, 1966) the Development Officer stated that Staff had attempted to design a four-lane arterial street divided by a 7 foot median which was considered to be sufficient to accommodate the future traffic needs for the area, providing for a free flow of approximately 1500 vehicles/lane/hour. Some concern was expressed in Council over the difference between this four-lane capacity and the six lanes considered necessary by DeLeuw, Cather, as well as over the provision of pedestrian crossings. It was finally moved that surveys required to verify the preliminary functional design be proceeded with immediately and, secondly, that a submission be prepared to CMHC seeking formal cost sharing arrangements on all of the properties required to implement the chosen traffic scheme.

A final design, "Alternative B" (Alternative A was similar but prepared by Halifax Developments for Scotia Square) was adopted August 22, 1966 and formed the terms of reference for consultants (A. D. Margison and Associates) who were retained March 29, 1967 to review the design features of the adopted scheme and to make revisions while retaining the basic geometric design. A preliminary design was also made of the northerly extension of Harbour Drive from Cornwallis Street to the vicinity of Gerrish Street. Estimated cost of Phase I (Cogswell) was \$5.8 million and Phase II (Proctor-Gerrish) was \$3.1 million.

### 5.3. Cogswell Street Interchange, 1967:

By this time, A. D. Margison and Associates Ltd. had been given the contract to design and supervise construction of the Cogswell Street Interchange. At a meeting of City Council on June 15, 1967, Margison were instructed as well to review the approved alignment south of the interchange in an effort to preserve the historic buildings on Upper Water Street. It was concluded that it was not possible to save both the Morse's Tea House and the Water Street buildings. Also to be removed would be some of the 19th century buildings along Granville Street if the Water Street buildings were not removed. The cost of acquisition and demolition was estimated to be over \$2 million (road alignment, another \$1.3 million). A report on alternative designs and access routes was submitted and a design for the Interchange was accepted by City Council on July 19, 1967. This was a key part of the now renamed Scotia Square Project for which construction had begun in late 1966. The City agreed with CMHC on the acquisition of properties and construction of services to a total of \$11.1 million for Scotia Square and the Interchange.



5.4. Bridges, 1967:

The year 1967 also saw the completion of another bridge report, Feasibility Study - Harbour Bridges and the Northwest Arm Bridge (Pratley and Dorton). The City was particularly concerned with the costs involved, such as for the bridge approaches (City Council Meetings: June 29, 1967, September 28, 1967)

5.5. Harbour Drive, Right-of-Way, 1967:

In the latter meeting, Harbour Drive was considered again, in relation to the location of the new Court House, which would be affected by any roadway exceeding 80 feet. It was further stated that Staff would request Council approval for a 70 foot road width from Duke Street south to Terminal Road but that this was considered to be a bare minimum. It was moved that Staff present to City Council proposals for a street reservation for this section of Harbour Drive up to a maximum width of 80 feet.

5.6. Historic Buildings, 1968:

The year 1968 saw further discussion on road alignments between the Cogswell Interchange and Prince Street, and the question of historic buildings along the route. City Council meeting of February 29, 1968 considered again the proposed modification of the alignment of Harbour Drive south of the Interchange. It was moved that Plan No. TT8-17193 be approved to try to save the historic buildings on the east side of Water Street by aligning Harbour Drive in accordance with the said plans.

5.7. Court House, 1968:

Also considered were matters relating to the exact location of the Court House site, along the eastern boundary of the Drive. The architects had assumed a 98 foot allowance for a future 6 lane divided highway. Much discussion preceded the conditional decision to make a land reservation for the ultimate construction of a six lane roadway, while presently maintaining the principle of a one-way pair connection to the Interchange.

5.8. Water Street Alignment, Historic Buildings, 1968:

A major point of dispute was whether the Cogswell Interchange should initially connect to a one-way pair system (Hollis Street - Water Street) with right-of-way through historic buildings on the east side of Water Street or, alternatively, through the block containing the Morse's Tea building. The latter route was considered easier in the long run for conversion of a one-way street into a six lane divided highway.

A staff report (March 14, 1968) went into considerable detail on the question of the Water Street route and its properties (see also the 1967 A. D. Margison report on the relative merits of the two basic connections). The effect of alternate routes on the historic buildings and the value of same were discussed at length. It was pointed out in the Staff report that, as early as 1958, the City had acquired properties along the east side of Water Street, probably because of possible residual land for disposal. It appeared that the historical nature of the buildings was not really recognized until the 1960's, at which time City Council set up a Civic Advisory Committee for the Preservation of Historical Buildings

5.9. Water Street Link, Alternative Views, 1968:

Those most concerned with traffic still were of the opinion that the best connection to the Interchange from the south would be by means of a limited access road requiring a 165 foot right-of-way. Next best would be a six lane divided highway with a 130 foot reservation. A letter from Margison & Associates (March, 1968) argued that the proposed alignments favored by City Council committed the future planning concept of a southern extension of Harbour Drive to the status of a divided roadway with a succession of at-grade intersections. They, however, reiterated that the City should provide in the long run for a high calibre freeway facility. Nevertheless, on March 15, 1968, City Engineering displayed plans showing the alternative proposals for the alignment of Harbour Drive and its connection to the Interchange, as instructed by City Council.

5.10. Harbour Drive Northbound, Second Stage, 1968:

Following a Staff report on Harbour Drive northbound, (City Manager to Committee on Works, September 17, 1968) City Council on September 26, 1968 moved that the following be approved:

- (1) Plans and right-of-way reservations for Harbour Drive between Proctor and Gerrish;
- (2) A presentation to CMHC for financial assistance.

On October 31, 1968, a Federal Government report, entitled, The Halifax Waterfront, A feasibility Study, was published on the subject of the Water Street Historic Buildings as a subject of national historic importance. The suggestion was made that the buildings could be rehabilitated (with Federal assistance 50%) economically and even profitably.

On June 10, 1969, a report was presented (via the Civic Advisory Committee - Historic Buildings) by Paul Wendt Ltd. on engineering problems associated with the Water Street buildings. Several road alignments were suggested which would involve a minimum of expense and demolition, but could still allow an extension of facilities in the future.

5.11. City Council Comments, 1969:

Despite the plethora of reports and depositions on the subject, some City Council members were still expressing doubts during 1969 either of the wisdom of a main artery through the centre of the City or of the destruction of historic buildings for such a road. The imminent opening of the Narrows Bridge suggested future additional expenditures on approach roads and threatened heavier traffic along the harbour from the northern sector.

5.12. Water Street Alignments, 1969:

On June 19, 1969, City Council passed a resolution "that the grade and line of the Margison Plan be reaffirmed from the Court House to the Cogswell Interchange." On July 31, a motion was made to rescind this, but was rejected after some debate over the growing need for the improved roadway, countered by doubts as to whether the City could ever build highways sufficient to move traffic freely at peak hours.

||  
passed (6-4)

A verbal report was given to City Council by a representative of A. D. Margison on July 31, 1969. It was noted that there were still some problems along Upper Water Street because of grades and the obstruction effect to pedestrians of the road near Morse's Tea. The very limited route available for trucks was also noted. The mayor earlier had stated that the City Council ought to accept the kind of design which would permit the historic buildings to stay, even though, in the initial period, this would result in a bottleneck.

The report contended that the Hollis Street - Water Street one-way connections would be the southerly extension of Harbour Drive until further decisions were made as to its southerly extension. Each of these routes was proposed to have a design speed of 40 mph with three lanes for moving traffic, as well as a system of traffic signalization. These roadways would have a practical capacity of about 600 vehicles/lane/hour (1800 vehicles/hour for 3 lanes). The plan to provide only 2 lanes on Upper Water Street north of Duke Street would reduce this capacity to 1200 vehicles/hour, which did not reflect the introduction of the Scotia Square development, the Court House, or the proposed Barrington Street Mall.

6. HARBOUR DRIVE: 1970 STATUS

6.1. Present Situation:

The present status of Harbour Drive is as follows: the Cogswell Interchange open, an alignment through Upper Water Street which left the historic buildings intact, and a "temporary" one-way street system southward along the harbour. As to proposals for the second stage (Proctor Street to Gerrish Street), constructed budgets and high interest rates have delayed further work in the near future. Two other developments are worthy of note.

6.2. Federal Assistance, 1970:

A new factor in local decision-making processes has been the designation of Halifax as a city eligible for D.R.E.E. funds. It appeared that Harbour Drive had high priority in this scheme as a result of Federal-Provincial negotiations. The City, however, had other priorities, as the Mayor stated to City Council on April 16, 1970 after a visit to Ottawa. In his discussions with Federal officials, he said that Harbour Drive was "the last priority", after sewers, schools, housing and so on. In any case, the City could not afford its share of Harbour Drive and preferred the money to be diverted to schools and sewers mainly. The Mayor felt that it was impossible to tear down lower income housing for an expressway and then not provide sewers to service open land necessary for housing construction, and that even bus bays should come ahead of expressways.

6.3. Regional Planning Reports, 1970:

Another important event was the preparation of several consultants' reports on port, industrial and urban development in Metro Halifax. This was done under the auspices of the Provincial Government and the Metropolitan Area Planning Committee. Gerald Davis and John Kneiling each prepared a report on future development of the urban core of Halifax. Both recommended against a freeway facility traversing the downtown area (though without supporting documentation) and stressed that the link between the C.B.D. should remain the focus of pedestrian and transit movement and that parking facilities could be provided at either end of the C.B.D. for drivers to transfer to downtown transit.

These reports were presented to City Council on September 11, 1970 in summary form by Maurice Lloyd, with other officials present, as part of the regional planning proposals. There appeared to be little criticism at the time of these proposals, including the brief references to Harbour Drive.