

**HALIFAX AND WEST COMMUNITY COUNCIL
MINUTES
December 11, 2019**

PRESENT: Councillor Stephen D. Adams, Chair
Councillor Lindell Smith, Vice Chair
Councillor Shawn Cleary
Councillor Waye Mason
Councillor Russell Walker
Councillor Richard Zurawski

STAFF: Meg MacDougall, Solicitor
Simon Ross-Siegel, Legislative Assistant

The following does not represent a verbatim record of the proceedings of this meeting.

The agenda, reports, supporting documents, and information items circulated are online at halifax.ca.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. and recessed at 6:30 p.m. Community Council reconvened in at 6:35 p.m. Community Council moved into an In Camera (In Private) session at 9:00 and reconvened at 9:05 p.m. Community Council adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chamber, 3rd Floor City Hall, 1841 Argyle Street, Halifax.

1.1 Annual Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The Chair turned over the meeting to the Legislative Assistant.

The Legislative Assistant called for nominations for the position of Chair of Halifax and West Community Council.

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Walker

THAT Councillor Adams be nominated for the position of Chair of Halifax and West Community Council.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Legislative Assistant called three times for any further nominations. There being none, it was:

MOVED by Councillor Zurawski, seconded by Councillor Mason, **that nominations for the position of Chair be closed.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Legislative Assistant declared Adams Chair of Halifax and West Community Council at 6:03 p.m.

Councillor Adams then assumed the Chair. The Chair called for nominations for the position of Vice Chair of Halifax and West Community Council.

MOVED by Councillor Cleary, seconded by Councillor Walker

THAT Councillor Smith be nominated for the position of Vice Chair of Halifax and West Community Council.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Chair called three times for any further nominations. There being none, it was:

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Smith, **that nominations for the position of Vice Chair be closed.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Chair declared Councillor Smith the Vice Chair of Halifax and West Community Council.

1.2 TABLING OF 2019 ANNUAL REPORT

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated November 19, 2019

MOVED by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Walker

THAT Halifax and West Community Council accept the 2019 Halifax and West Community Council Annual Report as presented.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 13, 2019 and December 3, 2019

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Zurawski

THAT the minutes of November 13, 2019 and December 3, 2019 be approved as presented.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Community Council Requested to move item 11.2 Petitions to before Item 10.1.

MOVED by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Mason

THAT the agenda be approved as amended.

Two-third majority vote required.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES – NONE

5. CALL FOR DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTERESTS – NONE

6. MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION – NONE

7. MOTIONS OF RESCISSION – NONE

8. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS

8.1 Approval of 2020 Halifax and West Community Council Meeting Schedule

The following was before Community Council:

- A revised staff recommendation report dated November 5, 2019

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Halifax and West Community Council approve the 2020 meeting schedule.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

9. NOTICES OF TABLED MATTERS – NONE

10. HEARINGS

10.1 Public Hearings

10.1.1 Case 21847: Time Extension to existing Development Agreement for PID 40306730, property adjacent to 1300 Prospect Road, Goodwood

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated September 10, 2019
- A staff presentation titled "Public Hearing for Case 21847"
- Correspondence from Kristi Walker and Heather Richards (Recirculated from November 14, 2018)

Jacqueline Belisle, Planner II, provided Community Council with a presentation on Case 21847: Time Extension to existing Development Agreement for PID 40306730, property adjacent to 1300 Prospect Road, Goodwood.

The Chair invited the Applicant to come forward to address Community Council.

Jack Bryant, Resident of Bedford, Applicant, spoke to Community Council about the proposal under Case 21847.

The Chair opened the public hearing and called for any members of the public wishing to come forward to speak to the matter.

Kristi Walker, a resident of Peters Lake Road, noted that this was the fourth time the speaker has spoken before a Committee or Council of HRM regarding the proposed development. The speaker stated their main concerns relate to the 23.5 meter wetland protective buffer which the speaker believes is insufficient to protect against environmental concerns, and the extension of the term limit for the formation of a development agreement.

The Chair called three (3) times for any further members of the public wishing to come forward to speak on the matter. There being none, it was MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT the public hearing close.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

In response to several questions from Councillors related to comments made during the public hearing, Jacqueline Belisle noted that the original wetland buffer as advertised for the December 12, 2018 public hearing, aligns with RMPS policies and the Land Use By-law (LUB) requirements, and the newly proposed 23.5 meter buffer exceeds minimum municipal requirements. Staff advise the newly proposed 23.5 meter wetland buffer and the associated changes to the development plan remain reasonably consistent with the intent of the MPS. Staff also confirmed for Council that if the proposed four-year extension to the deadline for commencement of development and a five (5) year time extension for development completion were approved by Community Council, the timeline for the proposed development would extend into to 2024.

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Zurawski

THAT Halifax and West Community Council:

- 1. Approve the proposed development agreement, which shall be substantially of the same form as set out in Attachment A; and**
- 2. Require the agreement be signed by the property owner within 120 days, or any extension thereof granted by Council on request of the property owner, from the date of final approval by Council and any other bodies as necessary, including applicable appeal periods, whichever is later; otherwise this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.**

Several Councillors expressed support for the staff recommendation but indicated a desire to shorten the proposed extension to the deadline for commencement of development from four to three years and likewise to shorten the time extension for development completion from five to four years.

MOVED by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Halifax and West Community Council amend the motion to permit a three (3) year extension to the deadline for commencement of a development and a four (4) year time extension for development completion for lands at PID 40306730, Prospect Road, Goodwood.

Following further discussion, Meg MacDougall, Solicitor, stated that the proposed amendment would likely require Case 21847 to return for another public hearing. Following discussion, Councillor Adams withdrew the motion to amend.

The motion now reads:

- 1. Approve the proposed development agreement, which shall be substantially of the same form as set out in Attachment A; and**
- 2. Require the agreement be signed by the property owner within 120 days, or any extension thereof granted by Council on request of the property owner, from the date of final approval by Council and any other bodies as necessary, including applicable appeal periods, whichever is later; otherwise this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Chair thanked Jacqueline Belisle for the presentation.

10.1.2 Case 21971: Rezoning and Development Agreement for Child Care Centre at 165 Roxbury Crescent, Halifax

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated October 10, 2019
- A staff presentation titled "Public Hearing for Case 21971"
- Revised Schedule B
- Correspondence from Mark Liang and Ava Liao, Govinda Talluri, Robin Malhotra, Mark Davidson, Christina Hiscock, Yang Ji, Harpreet Kaur Ghangas, Sakshi Massey, Stephanie Shields, Terri-Lynn Tran, Bruce Friis, Junjia Tang, Jie Chen, Rebecca Ruan, Kevin Wong, Xiaoyan Song, Krystal Zhu, Haiyan Wang, Hongyan Zhu, Colleen Keyes and Kevin MacDonald, G. Michalos, Craig Davidson, Jennifer Sullivan, Dorothy A Graham, Joe Mosher, K.J. Gandhi, Audrey Barkhouse, Bonnie MacLean, John and Heather Keough, Peter Hamilton, Dorothy Graham, Patricia Cameron, Krista Andrews, Omeiza Otokunrin, Carole Woodhall, Egzona Vuniqui-Berisha, Patrick and Patricia Hamilton, John Flemming, Uma Ghandi, Jatinder Bali, Jatinder Jassal, Julie Wang, Huiyun Yu (Jasmine), Maggie O'Neill, Hongjie Hu, M. Kohler, Susan Wdowiak MacNeil, John Flemming, Frederick and Elizabeth Lai, Niel Gandhi, Olivia Liu, Lindsay Tennyson, Sheilagh Henry, Glen Harpell, Tian Wu, John Muir, Christine Wall, D'Arcy Poultney, Matt Davison, Yasemin Ugursal, and Jili Liu.
- A petition signed by 211 residents in support of Case 21971

Jennifer Chapman, Planner III, provided Community Council with a presentation on Case 21971: Rezoning and Development Agreement for Child Care Centre at 165 Roxbury Crescent, Halifax. Staff noted that there had been a non-substantial change to the proposed development relating to an extension of a fence as detailed in the Revised Schedule B which was circulated to Community Council. Regarding staff's analysis regarding the risk of a concentration of child care centres, Jennifer Chapman noted that a child care centre located at 65 Scotch Pine Terrace was not included in staff's analysis because it was located 800 meters away by road access and therefore fell outside of staff's use of a 500-meter boundary zone.

Responding to questions from members of Community Council, Jennifer Chapman stated that if the child care service located at 65 Scotch Pine Terrace were included in staff's analysis of a concentration of child care centres, the total number of child care services would accommodate a maximum of 71 children. Several Councillors asked how staff determines how many child-aged persons reside in an area. Jennifer Chapman stated that there is no definition for concentration under the Municipal Planning Strategy, so staff undertakes a subjective interpretation. Regarding the character and fabric of the zone, staff stated that the buildings are largely more established residential in character but noted that buildings along Langbrae Drive have a changing built form and use. Jennifer Chapman stated that the neighborhood, like all of Clayton Park was developed by way of a development agreement to fit within the residential form. Within the parameters of the present application, staff would have to discharge the development

agreement to allow for the rezoning. Jennifer Chapman stated that there is side-street parking on portions of Langbrae Drive, though not in front of the proposed development. Responding to questions regarding potential places of entry and drop-off locations, staff stated that the proposed development would accommodate up to five cars with the construction of a 45 by 22 food parking space. In response to questions from Councillors, Meg MacDougall, Solicitor, expressed the opinion that a motion to reduce the number of child care spaces from 32 to 16 would likely constitute a substantive change and would therefore require a new public hearing. Staff confirmed that traffic engineering staff consider seasonal variations and all-year conditions while considering traffic impacts. Responding to questions regarding restrictive covenants associated with the subject property, Jennifer Chapman stated that staff understands restrictive covenants to be a civil matter and therefore does not take them into consideration during staff's analysis for planning matters.

The Chair invited the Applicant to come forward to address Community Council.

Chrystal Fuller, Principal at Brighter Community Planning, and **Feng Linda Liuo**, Applicant, spoke to Community Council about the proposal under Case 21971. Chrystal Fuller expressed the view that the Applicant has adjusted the site plan a number of times in response to community feedback to ensure the development remains appropriate to the neighbourhood, most recently in agreeing to extend the privacy fencing. The Applicant added that the landscape buffer provides additional separation and ensures that the child care centre will not be disruptive to neighbouring homeowners. The Applicant stated that the neighbourhood has a large early-child population supporting a need for further access to child care services. According to a 2018 study conducted by the Halifax Education Centre, Park West School has about 800 students which is currently over-capacity, and a 2016 census found over 1400 children reside in the area. The Applicant stated that they have 18 children on a waiting list for child care services. The speaker stated that accommodating children is important for growing cities and they need places for children to go in proximity to residential neighbourhoods. Regarding restrictive covenants, the Applicant stated that as these are a civil matter, they understand that staff will not consider these, however the Applicant sought to clarify that it is the Applicant's position that they do not restrict the construction of a child care centre but rather that the development for a child care centre would require the permission of the guarantor. This is a concurrent matter being addressed in a different forum.

Feng Linda Liuo stated that the Applicant has 14 years of experience in the field of child care. The Applicant always sought to provide high quality child care services and believes that with the growing population, there is a need to ensure additional services. The Applicant sought to invest their earnings into providing these services for families in need. The Applicant stated that the proposed location is excellent for walking and thus will reduce traffic, including during rain and poor weather days. The proximity of the proposed location to the residential neighbourhood also supports parents who do not have access to vehicles. The Applicant has worked extensively since 2005 with immigrant families, graduate student-employees, and service providers in providing child care services, and also noted that Immigrant Services Association of Nova Scotia (ISANS) provided a letter in support of the Applicant. They stated they plan to provide new extracurricular pre-primary programs for students at Park West School to supplement community needs for service due to current capacity challenges. The Applicant described an instance where a child in the Applicant's care told their parent that they felt comfortable calling the Applicant's child care centre home. The Applicant stated that they participate in garbage pick-ups and other community support opportunities, and they hope as a new immigrant business to continue to show support for the community. The Applicant said they were grateful to receive support from their community and hopeful that neighbours can work together to give children love and support when they are young. The Applicant stated that they have often taken care of children beyond ordinary hours of business to accommodate parents' emergency needs. The Applicant asked Council to support the Applicant's proposal to enable the Applicant to continue to provide convenient quality child care.

Responding to questions from Councillors regarding the reasons for the request for 32 child care spots, the Applicant stated that they had previously considered a request for 50 child care spots but voluntarily reduced the number to 32. Based on an assessment of revenues, the Applicant believes that this number effectively covers operating costs while providing minimal disruption to neighbours. The Applicant added that a previous traffic study suggested that the area could accommodate up to 50 child care spots without impeding the local traffic. The Applicant stated that they operate two other child care

centres close to the subject property which have a combined total of 40 child care spots. The Applicant has done some internal renovations at the subject site but has as of present performed no external renovations beyond the construction of a privacy fence. There are currently 4 children attending child care at the subject property.

The Chair opened the public hearing and called for any members of the public wishing to come forward to speak to the matter.

Glenn Anderson, a resident residing on the other side of the park from the proposed development, spoke in opposition of the expansion of the child care centre. The speaker previously attended the Public Information Meeting and listened to neighbours concerns regarding neighbourhood safety and the effect of the proposed development to their neighbourhood. The speaker stated that they believe that many who support the application do so as friends and customers of the Applicant and that their support is tendered irrespective of neighbourhood concerns. The speaker stated that they were surprised to hear that planning staff was not concerned about the restrictive covenants. While the staff report notes that the status of the restrictive covenants is an ongoing concern, the speaker disputed the staff report's claim to have confirmed with the guarantor that child care centre use is acceptable within this area. The speaker stated that approving the development would through increased noise and sound impact neighbours' enjoyment of their properties. Residents purchased their properties on the expectation that neighbours would use their properties as single family homes, and the speaker urged Council to respect this desire and vote against the proposed development.

Joe Mosher, a resident of Roxbury Crescent, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker raised concerns related to pedestrian safety including the width of Langbrae Drive and the speed of traffic traveling through it which the speaker characterized as having evolved over the last ten years to an unsafe degree. The speaker stated that the increase in students attending Park West School and the use of the area as a thoroughfare to Highway 102 have also contributed to unsafe driving in the area. The speaker added that new development in Rockingham South was adding additional strain on existing traffic infrastructure. Based on these concerns, the speaker believed that it was not responsible to allow for more child care services in the area. The speaker stated that they were speaking for proactive safety, with the intention of looking ahead and preventing a future traffic collision with a child. The speaker stated that if something were to happen to one of those children, they did not think that they could as community look parents in the eye and say even though there were some risks, the community still thought it was a reasonable decision to allow child care centre to be built in the area.

John Keough, a resident of Roxbury Crescent, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker stated that they had previously voiced objection to the proposed development at the public information meeting. The speaker stated that they raised their family at Roxbury Crescent and that it was important to the speaker to see that the covenants were respected because they felt that they protected them from commercial developments. The speaker objected to the proposal's large parking pad which would require paving virtually the entire front lawn and which would not be consistent with built form in the area. The speaker objected to the staff's use of the area boundary in considering existing child care services in the area despite having shown a larger area map at the public information meeting. The speaker stated that using a smaller sample area shows less child care centres and suggests a lower concentration than actually exists. The speaker also relayed information from a neighbour who stated that they signed a petition in support of the proposed development based on a misunderstanding of the wording of the question posed. The speaker stated that there are currently several commercial child care centres close to the neighbourhood to service families, and that the speaker resides next to a small-scale child care provider.

Colleen Keyes, a resident of Roxbury Crescent, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker noted that they had previously submitted a letter outlining their concerns. The speaker highlighted two concerns relating to added density and concentration in the area and concerns regarding the spreading of hours of operation for the child care centre. Regarding the first concern, the speaker stated that in the absence of a clear definition of a concentration of child care centres it falls to Council to make a determination. The speaker suggested that in considering this question Council should not ask whether as a matter of public policy there should be more child care centres in the municipality, but instead

whether there is a concentration of child care centres in an area. The speaker stated that when they attended the public information meeting for this proposed development, staff provided a heat map showing the proximity of child care centres in the Halifax West area, though staff today has limited their review to discussing child care centres within the boundary area. The Applicant stated that it seemed unfair to restrict an evaluation of a concentration of child care centres to the boundary area. The speaker noted that the Applicant confirmed that they are operating two other child care centres close to the subject site. The speaker stated that the effect of the Applicant's practice decentralizes commercial enterprise by taking up private home dwellings. Regarding concerns relating to spreading hours of operation, the speaker disputed the Applicant's claim that this will spread departures and arrivals. The speaker said that people generally commute when they need to and most people work similar hours. The community's reality is that residents know pickups happen during school hours, and neighbours experience serious congestion during these times.

K.J. Gandhi, a resident of Clayton Park West, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker stated that the proposal would have negative impact on the speaker's community which the speaker identified as largely consisting of members in their 60s and who are retired or planning to retire. The speaker said that the proposed development is too big and not suitable to the area, and that it was a development for the financial benefit of the Applicant alone. Regarding restrictive covenants, the speaker disputed characterizations that the guarantor has approved the operation of a child care centre and described correspondence submitted to Council in which the guarantor stated that they have not approved the operation of a child care centre. The speaker stated that the proposed development and staff's report provide no information regarding the construction or use of pedestrian crossings in order to ensure the protection of children in a traffic-heavy area. The speaker noted that there had been several near misses on the street adjacent to the proposed child care centre. The speaker stated that the Applicant operates two other child care centres and stated that many residents of Scotch Pine Terrace had relocated due to aggressive and rude interactions with clients of the child care centre located on this street. The speaker stated that residents know there is a higher potential of traffic that will come with this child care centre. The speaker said that staff had irrationally concluded that three parking spaces would be enough to accommodate child care centre clients at the proposed site, and that there appeared to be insufficient space for even two cars to park without major alterations to the property.

Uma Gandhi, a resident of Clayton Park West, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker reiterated concerns related to traffic, safety, landscape issues and parking, and stated that approval would result in major impacts to the area. The speaker stated that the issues outlined have not been mitigated by the Applicant's proposed changes. The speaker stated that their front and backyard are regularly trampled upon by customers of the Applicant and raised concerns about garbage from the Applicant's child care centre.

Marcia Kohler, a resident of Thackery Close, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker attended the public information meeting and stated that many of those in attendance did not reside in the Clayton Park West area. Regarding the restrictive covenants, the speaker stated that they were aware of these when they purchased their property and understand that they add to the purchase price of homes because they provide protection for neighbours against changes to the built form of the neighbourhood. The speaker stated that they previously sought child care services from small-scale providers who advertised by word-of-mouth and expressed concern that allowing a commercial child care centre to open would impact their ability to operate. The speaker added that the Little Picasso Art Centre, a child care service located on Langbrae Drive, pays a commercial tax rate and that it would be unfair to treat the Applicant's business differently.

John Flemming, a resident of Roxbury Crescent, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker stated that they were proud to own the first lot developed in the subdivision. The speaker stated that they had previously spoken with many Councillors regarding this issue. The speaker said that the existing subdivision was never supposed to allow for a child care centre or any other commercial development. The speaker recognized that there were ongoing legal issues with a decision with the guarantor but added that the speaker has spoken with the guarantor who stands opposed to the proposed development. The speaker questioned, if staff and Council do not take the restrictive covenants into consideration, why staff nevertheless included a representation regarding the guarantor's position in the

staff report for this matter. The speaker raised concerns regarding the existing traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians. The speaker stated that Roxbury Crescent is regularly used as a drop-off location for children attending Park West School and noted that there is incomplete sidewalk installation to safely allow young children to use this location to attend a child care centre. The speaker stated that their three children attend small home-based child care centres, and that larger commercial operations should be located in proper commercial zoned locations. The speaker stated that the current application is not a proper land use for the area.

Wilf Peveril, a resident, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker reiterated previous comments regarding noise, neighbourhood disruption and increased traffic. The speaker stated that the residential neighbourhood was not the proper place for a commercial business, and that the proposed parking lot would be inconsistent with the local character of adjacent residential buildings. The speaker expressed concern that the proposed development, if approved, would require the removal of a municipal tree from the neighbourhood.

Audrey Peveril, a resident of Turnmill Drive, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker outlined several concerns including an increase of traffic on Turnmill Drive. The speaker stated that there is quite a bit of speeding around Park West School and that children frequently walk to and from Turnmill Park while going to school and between lunch hour. There are no signs suggesting there is a playground and no speed reduction measures, and the speaker stated that this was an accident waiting to happen. The speaker stated that adding a commercial child care centre to the area would add to the existing traffic stress. The speaker expressed concerns that approving the proposed development would set a precedent which would allow commercial businesses to locate to areas within dedicated residential areas. The speaker said that they were concerned about a loss of the sense of community goodwill and stated that they were aware of negative comments from residents of Scotch Pine Terrace with respect to another Child care centre operated by the Applicant.

John Sullivan, a resident, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker reiterated previous comments regarding the restrictive covenants. The speaker stated that the Applicant purchased the property knowing the rules but had declined to seek opportunities to locate their business in a commercial zone and instead had tried to change their property's zoning to the detriment of other neighbours. The speaker stated that they felt that the proposed development was inappropriate to the speaker's neighbourhood.

Sue Dickson, a resident, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker stated that they walk frequently with their dogs past the subject property and said that they regularly see drivers perform U-turns, driving in a dangerous manner, and violating the no-parking restrictions. The speaker raised concerns about difficulty for pedestrians and vehicles to see one another across the pedestrian bump-out, as well as a lack of sidewalks on one side of Roxbury Crescent. The speaker said that they were almost hit by a vehicle while moving through the crosswalk while being assisted by a crossing guard. The speaker stated that they did not believe it was likely that the child care centre's clients were likely to come from the neighbourhood and stated that they believed that if the current traffic and safety problems occur while it can accommodate 8 children, allowing the child care centre to expand to 32 children would only exacerbate the problems.

Carole Woodhall, a resident of Spryfield, spoke in favour of the proposed development. The speaker stated that their neighbourhood has restrictive covenants and neighbours have recognized that these have changed over time. The speaker recognized that many speakers had spoken passionately regarding traffic and pedestrian safety concerns, but the speaker expressed these are issues everywhere in the municipality and that responsibility for these problems should not be placed solely on the Applicant's proposed child care centre expansion. The speaker said that they are close to a family who has a child that attends the Applicant's child care centre and have found it is one of a small number of good child care centres for their needs. The Applicant stated that while many have expressed their opposition to a commercial child care centre in the neighbourhood, it is an unfortunate reality that in Nova Scotia there are very few affordable for-profit child care centres, and families make due with the best they can of a patchwork of services. The speaker expressed that they believe it is unlikely that parents will drop their

children off at the same time because many parents work irregular hours and therefore traffic concerns would be mitigated by the child care centre's proposed regular hours.

Marissa Dimick, a resident, spoke in favour of the proposed development. The speaker noted that they are a parent with children attending Park West Elementary School who also uses the Applicant's child care services. The speaker stated that lots of people who use the Applicant's child care service are on a waiting list to attend Park West School, which is currently over-capacity. The speaker has seen people go around cars waiting to turn left and almost hit children, and strongly agrees that things need to be done to make it safer for pedestrians. However, the present application is a separate matter and traffic concerns relating to Park West should not be considered a reason to deny the present application. The speaker stated that their family does not have options for children in the neighbourhood. The speaker said that they have looked at other options and they were not available or viable. The speaker struggled to find part-time care options and works with other parents in the neighbourhood to find appropriate options for their children. The speaker stated that they do not believe the child care centre will lead to a significant increase in traffic because many parents, like the speaker, pick up their children during off-hours and earlier than Park West's schedule, helping to spread pick-up times across the afternoon. The speaker stated that their community is only getting bigger, and when residents can find places to put their kids, that strengthens the community. It does not defeat it.

Kevin MacDonald, a resident of Roxbury Crescent, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker purchased the property in 2002 with full knowledge of the restrictive covenants attached to their property. The speaker has performed work and repairs to satisfy requirements arising from the restrictive covenants and stated that it is important to them as a resident that the restrictive covenants are honoured. The speaker stated that they were not certain how many neighbours are in the vicinity of the child care centre. They raised concerns regarding activities at the Applicant's other child care centres and safety concerns relating to traffic. The speaker stated that the proximity of the child care centre to a school makes it the wrong place for a child care centre due to the likelihood of exacerbating traffic and other issues.

Audrey Barkhouse, a resident, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker stated that they were the previous owner and builder of the subject property. The speaker reiterated previously expressed concerns regarding traffic and congestion in the area and pedestrian safety for children. The speaker stated that there is no sidewalk in front of the subject property and that in the winter snowbanks prevent vehicles from seeing emerging vehicle and pedestrians coming out of the driveway from the subject property. The speaker stated that Langbrae Drive is a busy "almost four-lane" street due to its width and that the proposed development's proximity to a crosswalk will raise the likelihood of a pedestrian collision. The speaker stated that they understand that the Applicant owns and operates other child care centres in the area.

Terri-Lynn Tran, a resident, spoke in support of the proposed development. The speaker stated that they are the parent of child who attends Park West School and noted that it appeared to the speaker that several of the comments this evening reflect neighborhood concerns that are broader in scope than the child care centre alone. The speaker expressed that they believe the Applicant should not be denied an opportunity to pursue their proposed expansion based on current traffic challenges which are mainly related to other circumstances. The speaker stated that the Applicant's child care centre is a good child care centre.

Egzona Vuniqi-Berisha, a resident Remington Court, spoke in support of the proposed development. The speaker stated that the moment they announced their pregnancy, colleagues told them to get on a waitlist for child care centres in their area because of the serious competition for spaces. Later, the speaker had to drive their child to a child care centre located in Downtown Halifax due to the shortage of options within the speaker's community. The speaker said that after a long wait and search, the speaker secured a location in one of the Applicant's child care centres, for which the speaker is very grateful for the excellent service. During one occasion during a snow storm, the speaker's commute from Downtown Halifax was seriously challenged due to weather related road clearance and congestion. However, the Applicant provided after-hours care for the speaker's child. The speaker stated that this incident expressed why close-to-home in-community child care options are essential to growing families. The

speaker stated that these types of child care options are a value to future buyers and would raise property values. The speaker stated that everyone cares for their children, and the speaker supports this child care centre so that their child can one day walk across the street to the child care centre. The speaker stated that their maternity was very stressful, and the speaker strongly believes that the safest place for their child is close to home. The Applicant has performed an excellent job helping the Applicant through a challenging time for their family and their son will be a student of Park West soon. The speaker can easily picture their son safely crossing the road with a crosswalk guard and going to school.

Yanrei Li, a resident, spoke in support of the proposed development. The speaker stated that they have two daughters, one of whom attends Rockingham Elementary School, and another who attends one of the Applicant's child care centres. The speaker stated that the child care centre is safe and gave their daughter opportunities to practice useful skills and build confidence. For example, recently the speaker's daughter played piano for a concert. The speaker stated that they were very thankful for the child care centre. The speaker stated that they are a realtor, and they know that access to services such as schools, libraries, and local child care centres are a value to new residents which increases the value of the properties.

Xinian Kahn, a student at Nova Scotia Community College, noted that the speaker's teacher highly recommended the Applicant's child care centre due to good recommendations from other parents and the multi-cultural aspects of the programming, community and support. The speaker spoke in support for the Applicant's proposal. The speaker was recently very excited to hear the Minister of Education give an announcement on Thursday in their classroom that government is adding spaces for early-childhood education because there are huge needs for families and children in Canada. The speaker stated that Halifax and Nova Scotia need to do their part to provide for this need. Regarding traffic concerns, the speaker stated that these were related to broad trends in the area and should not be considered to be the child care centre's fault. As a five-year-old boy's mother, the speaker stated that it is important to ensure children can grow and live in a safe environment. Risk is everywhere not because of specific things, but rather due to a failure to integrate communal needs with the built environment. The speaker stated that they were thrilled when they learned that the Applicant was opening a child care centre in their area.

Klavdia Gonovosky, a resident, spoke in support of the proposed development. The speaker's family immigrated to Canada four years ago and has known the Applicant for more than four years. The speaker's family lived in Fairfax. The speaker found the Applicant's child care services to be very safe, good and has never heard complaints regarding the quality of service or inconvenience to others. The speaker stated that the Applicant's child care services were particularly convenient and necessary for parents who require part-time child care services to accommodate part-time work schedules.

Laura Chen, a new resident of Clayton Park, spoke in support of the Applicant's proposal. The speaker supported a safe and friendly community with large space to grow and stated that it was their current understanding that children often have to wait as long as a year to secure space in child care. They stated that the Applicant's proposal meets their needs and that the Applicant is an experienced operator who has been accompanying groups of children and providing services to many members of the speaker's community. The speaker said the Applicant is constantly investing in improving their facilities and has invested as much as \$70,000 toward the current proposed expansion. The speaker said that the Applicant tries their best to meet the unique needs of the parents of the children in their care and also has striven to do things for the greater community.

A resident spoke in support of the Applicant's proposal. The speaker stated that they live in the community and do not own a car. Their children come to the child care centre at 7:35 a.m. in the morning with the speaker by foot. The speaker then walks with their school aged children to school and then to the Lacewood bus terminal. The speaker stated that the proposed child care centre would help local residents who do not have cars access child care services in a manner convenient to them. Regarding previously expressed comments that the proposed development would increase noise in the area, the speaker said that by the same logic schools should not exist in or adjacent to residential communities, so noise levels alone should not be a reason to deny the present application. The speaker stated that if neighbours work together, most concerns can be addressed. The speaker said that they are looking for a

child care centre in their community which is near to them and accessible by foot, and therefore they support the Applicant's proposal.

Krista Andrews, a resident, spoke in support of the Applicant's proposal. The speaker stated that they work in the "Toddler Room" at the Applicant's Aster Court child care centre. The speaker stated that safety is very important to the speaker as an educator and for the Applicant. The speaker stated that the Applicant provided very conveniently located child care centres built in safe residential neighbourhoods to ensure walk-able and accessible service for residents of the community. Making residents and children walk long distances away from schools is a risk to their safety which exposes them to added traffic and icy conditions in the winter sometimes for thirty minutes in each direction. Many parents do not have cars, or only have one which makes the Applicant's services particularly convenient for parents to make one trip to school and the child care centre where they have children attending both locations.

Peter Maley, a 17-year resident of Roxbury Crescent, stated that they are a senior resident speaking against the proposed development. The speaker reiterated previous statements regarding space and size of the proposed expansion. The speaker believed that a commercial business capable of accommodating up to 40 children is not appropriate for a residential zone. The speaker agreed that residents need child care centre spots in Halifax and noted that the speaker had scrambled to secure child care options and were lucky to receive care at Wedgewood's Little School within a five-minute drive from the speaker's residence. The speaker reiterated previously expressed concerns regarding increased traffic. The speaker stated they were unsure how the present application received a positive recommendation and advanced to the stage of a public hearing.

Jasmine, a new teacher working at future stars, noted that they walk daily to their work place. The speaker walks through Turnmill Park and said that when it snows, it is a long walk around due to ice cover. On December 3rd, the speaker took two children for a walk through the park. The surface was shinny, and by the time they got through, a boy had fallen and taken the speaker down with them. The speaker often thinks about the safety of children walking to school, and as a mother who has a son who studied at Park West supports the proposed child care centre expansion in order to provide relief to parents and children. The speaker stated that they believe the proximity of the school and child care centre will reduce trips and loading times. The speaker stated they would be grateful to see the application approved.

Tian Wu, a new resident to Halifax, noted that they had moved to Halifax in 2015 and as a newcomer wished to speak in support of the proposed development. As a newcomer, the speaker had found it difficult to find employment opportunities, however they had been fortunate to work with the Applicant. The speaker stated that due to the large number of families coming to live in Clayton Park, they believe new child care centres will benefit the community. The speaker reiterated that the Applicant has more than 10 years experience running child care services, and the speaker hoped that the city would approve the proposed development.

Brenda Davidson, a resident of Scotch Pine Terrace, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker spoke to concerns expressed by residents of Scotch Pine Terrace adjacent to one of the Applicant's child care centre centres. Residents said that the reality of their daily lives has changed dramatically with increases in traffic, and residents have had to call 311 numerous times to address parking infractions. The speaker stated that residents said while the locations are licenced to serve 24 children they believe there are more being served at these locations, and they also believe that tenants live upstairs from the child care centre. Residents said that parents are constantly turning in their driveway and that their cars have been hit. Residents said that customers had used profanity and made rude signs while they were outside with their children. Residents said that noise levels have increased, and residents' feelings have changed from friendliness to those of anger and frustration. The speaker stated that many residents have moved from the area due to their unwillingness to live beside the child care centre.

Craig Davidson, a 20-year resident of Roxbury Crescent, spoke against the proposed development. The speaker resides across the street from the proposed site. The speakers stated that there is already a concentration of child care centres within a sixteen-kilometer radius of the development and added that

the Applicant owns and operates four child care centres within this range. The speaker stated that they understand that several other child care centre providers suggested they are not currently at full capacity. The speaker stated that they believed that if the proposed development is approved neighbours will experience similar frustration to those expressed by the previous speaker. The speaker stated that they have never heard a complaint about child care centres that operate in commercial zones, however they have heard many complaints about the child care centre operating at 165 Roxbury. The speaker stated that there is a mutually beneficial solution for the Applicant and neighbours if the Applicant would instead seek to locate their business in an appropriate commercial space. The speaker expressed that they believe the proximity of the child care centre to the school will bring an increase in traffic and environmental costs from driving and idling.

A resident spoke in favour of the proposed development. The speaker stated that the location is convenient for parents because it is close to an elementary school which allows many parents with two children to make one trip instead of two. The speaker reiterated previously expressed supportive comments regarding increased children's safety and support for increased Child care options for new families with children attending Park West School.

Chrystal Fuller responded to some of the questions that were raised during the public hearing, and thanked members of public for the conversation. They noted that the history of the Land Use Bylaw and communities with single-detached home use is premised on certain uses being integrated into community while keeping other uses separated. The Land Use Bylaw talks about specialized housing uses which include child care centres, and schools. The Applicant said that these uses are intended to be close to where people live in order to create complete communities. The Applicant stated that the Integrated Mobility Plan also speaks eloquently in favour of ensuring these uses are within walking distance of residents. The Applicant said that the proposed development's intensity is appropriate in this instance. They noted that the traffic study showed that the infrastructure could accommodate up to 50 additional child care spots, but the Applicant has voluntarily reduced the number to 32. The Applicant said that this was not to discount traffic safety issues in the area, but they noted that schools generally cause traffic twice a day and this is an expected pattern of activity. The Applicant stated that the proposed child care centre expansion is consistent with what the planning documents envision, which is an intent to create complete communities. The Applicant stated that talk about the commercial nature of the business, as other speakers had mentioned, is the result of a lack of coordinated service to provide universal non-profit child care services in Canada. However, the Applicant maintained that their proposal is key to providing deeply needed essential service.

The Chair called three (3) times for any further members of the public wishing to come forward to speak on the matter. There being none, it was MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT the public hearing close.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

At the request of members of Community Council, Jennifer Chapman addressed some of the questions that were raised during the public hearing. With regards to the proposed construction of a parking lot and the possible displacement of a tree, staff stated that if the tree is on municipal property policy would require the developer to replace it.

Meg MacDougall, Solicitor, explained that in order to consider possible amendments to a proposed development agreement, Council must first approve proposed amendments to the Halifax Mainland Use By-law.

MOVED by Councillor Zurawski, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Halifax and West Community Council adopt the amendment to Map ZM-1 of the Halifax Mainland Land Use By-law as set out in Attachment A of this report.

Councillor Zurawski noted several concerns with the proposed development. The reasons for rejecting the proposed amendment to Map ZM-1 of the Halifax Mainland Land Use By-law noted by Community Council members included:

- Concerns that the rezoning would lead to a concentration of child care centres within the neighbourhood around the site;
- Concerns regarding the increased intensity of traffic along Roxbury Crescent and Langbrae Drive, along with pedestrian safety concerns; and
- Concerns that the rezoning would permit changes to the external appearance of the building, related to the erection of six-foot fences and the construction of a large parking area in the front of the property that would be inconsistent with the scale and character of the neighbourhood, and more intense than the adjoining existing single-unit detached dwellings at Roxbury Crescent and Langbrae Drive;

MOTION PUT AND DEFEATED.

The Chair thanked Jennifer Chapman for the presentation.

10.1.3 Case 22314: Application by Jason Wong, to rezone lands at 3850 Robie Street, Halifax from the R-2 (General Residential) zone to the R-2A (General Residential Conversion) zone

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated September 17, 2019
- A memorandum from the Chair of the Halifax Peninsula Planning Advisory Committee, dated August 30, 2019
- A staff presentation titled "Public Hearing for Case 22314"

Carl Purvis, Planning Applications Manager, provided Community Council with a presentation on Case 22314: Application by Jason Wong, to rezone lands at 3850 Robie Street, Halifax from the R-2 (General Residential) zone to the R-2A (General Residential Conversion) zone.

The Chair invited the Applicant to come forward to address Community Council.

Wilson Wong, the brother of the Applicant, spoke to Community Council about the proposal under Case 22314. They provided a brief history of their involvement with the property. The Applicant purchased the property with their brother. The previous building owner had unsuccessfully applied to rezone the property from R-2 to an R-2A zone. As new property owners, the Applicant and the speaker removed the stoves to bring the building into compliance. Now the Applicant is bringing the current application in the hopes of leasing units in the building for long-term rentals. Responding to questions from members of Community Council, the speaker stated that they do not intend to lease the building for short-term rentals and believe that long-term rentals are better for the building based on its capacity and configuration as well as for tenant safety.

The Chair opened the public hearing and called for any members of the public wishing to come forward to speak to the matter. The Chair called three (3) times for any members of the public wishing to come forward to speak on the matter. There being none, it was MOVED by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Mason

THAT the public hearing close.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Mason

THAT Halifax and West Community Council adopt the amendment to Map ZM-1 of the Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-law, as set out in Attachment A of this report.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Chair thanked Carl Purvis for the presentation.

10.2 Variance Hearings

10.2.1 Case 21833: Appeal of Variance Refusal – 1423 Henry Street, Halifax

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated November 14, 2019
- A staff presentation titled “Public Hearing for Case 21833”
- An appellant presentation
- Correspondence submitted by Clark Wilkins

Sean Audas, Principal Planner & Development Officer, provided Community Council with a presentation on Case 21833: Appeal of Variance Refusal – 1423 Henry Street, Halifax to allow the conversion of a single unit dwelling to a four-unit apartment building by constructing a third storey and rear addition on a property zoned R-2 (General Residential) under the Halifax Peninsula Land Use By-Law, Peninsula Centre Secondary Area. The increases to the lot frontage and lot area in the Appellant’s proposal were felt to be much larger than the By-Law ordinarily permits.

The Solicitor reviewed the rules of procedure for variance hearings and the Chair invited the Appellant(s) to come forward and address Community Council.

Clark Wilkins, Appellant and property owner, spoke to Community Council about their variance appeal. They noted that the subject property is the fourth property on Henry Street for which the Appellant is aware in which a similar variance has been sought, and a variance was granted in the three previous matters. The Appellant stated that they owned two properties to the right of the subject property and currently own another property to the left of the subject property. All were granted variances under similar criteria and share similar lot sizes. The Appellant stated that they were unaware why the proposed variance was being refused in this case, though they understood that it may relate to changes to the Land Use By-law related to the implementation of the Centre Plan. The appellant submitted that there is no functional difference between the previous variances granted and the present variance requested and submitted that the proposed built-form will improve the quality of the streetscape and add much needed-housing for students.

The Chair called for anyone in the notification area wishing to address Community Council on this matter. No speakers addressed Community Council.

At the request of members of Community Council, Sean Audas addressed some of the questions that were raised during the variance hearing. The first two properties for which a variance was sought were granted in part due to the lack of resident opposition and also due to the close to derelict state of the properties at the time the variance was sought it was concluded to be a benefit to the municipality. The variance request for the third property was granted and appealed by a local resident though the owner and appellant resolved the matter before a hearing. Following the third variance, staff began to consider whether similar variances were general to the area or suggested a change to the land use policy. Furthermore, changes to the variance officer’s assessment criteria as well as a hardship test contributed to staff’s decision to deny the variance.

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Halifax and West Community Council allow the appeal.

Councillors discussed the variance in the context of similar variances granted on Henry Street, recent changes to the South End and Peninsula Centre Detailed Plan areas and the implementation of the Centre Plan. Councillors also considered the desire to support gentle density in the area and debated whether the variance was general to the area, taking notice of the proximity to lands zoned for commercial and institutional uses.

MOTION PUT AND DEFEATED. (Development Officer's decision upheld.)

The Chair thanked Sean Audas for the presentation.

11. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

11.1 Correspondence

The Legislative Assistant noted that the Municipal Clerk's Office received correspondence relating to item(s) 10.1.1, 10.1.2, and 10.2.1, and further general correspondence from Neil Ritchie. This correspondence was circulated to members of Community Council.

For a detailed list of correspondence received, refer to the specific item.

11.2 Petitions

The Legislative Assistant submitted a Petition received by the Clerk's Office with 28 signatures from residents of the 30 Goldbloom Drive in opposition to the proposal set out in Case 22539.

The Legislative Assistant submitted a Petition received by the Clerk's Office with 221 signatures from residents in support of the proposal set out in Case 21971.

11.3 Presentations – None

12. INFORMATION ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD – NONE

13. REPORTS

13.1 STAFF

13.1.1 Adoption Process for Centre Plan (Package B) – Amendments to Halifax Peninsula Planning Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated November 4, 2019

MOVED by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Halifax and West Community Council adopt amendments to the terms of reference of the Halifax Peninsula Planning Advisory Committee, as set out within Attachment B of this report.

Councillor Mason suggested an amendment to increase the term for the appointment of Councillors appointed to Halifax Peninsula Planning Advisory Committee from one to two years.

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Attachment A section 2 Appointment be amended to change the term of appointment for Councillor from 1 to 2 years.

MOTION TO AMEND PUT AND PASSED.

The motion now reads:

THAT Halifax and West Community Council adopt amendments to the terms of reference of the Halifax Peninsula Planning Advisory Committee with an amendment to Attachment A section 2 Appointment changing the term of appointment for Councillor from 1 to 2 years, as set out within Attachment B of this report.

AMENDED MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13.1.2 Case 22436: Non-substantive amendments to an existing development agreement for 5885 Spring Garden Road, Halifax

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated November 20, 2019
- A memorandum from the Chair of the Halifax Peninsula Planning Advisory Committee, dated November 29, 2019

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Walker

THAT Halifax and West Community Council give Notice of Motion to consider the proposed amending development agreement, as set out in Attachment A of this report, to allow non-substantive amendments to an existing development agreement modifying parking requirements and extending the completion date for the building construction.

Several Councillors discussed an interest in reducing the time restriction for the five years extension of the completion date to three years from the original date of registration. In response to questions regarding the effect of reducing the length of the time restriction, Carl Purvis, Planning Applications Manager, stated that while the proposed changes would not require a new public hearing, the proposed changes to the development agreement must be consistent with policy, and existing policy provides no direction to support reducing the length of the time restriction. The original development agreement was approved prior to the implementation of the Centre Plan, which restricts time restriction on development agreement extensions to two years. Following discussion, Council declined to reduce the time restriction.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13.1.3 Clayton Park Business Improvement District

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff recommendation report dated November 1, 2019

MOVED by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Zurawski

THAT Halifax and West Community Council:

- 1. Approve, for the purposes of conducting an area rate vote and public meeting pursuant to By-law B-700, the proposed Clayton Park Business Improvement District area rate, minimum levy, and maximum levy; and**
- 2. Approve, for the purposes of conducting an area rate vote and public meeting pursuant to By-law B-700, the proposed Clayton Park Business Improvement District boundaries.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13.1.4 Case 20774 Development Agreement Correction, Multiple Unit Residential Development, Wellington Street, Halifax

The following was before Community Council:

- A staff supplemental recommendation report dated November 26, 2019
- A staff recommendation report dated April 11, 2019
- A memorandum from the Chair of the Halifax Peninsula Planning Advisory Committee, dated June 25, 2018

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Halifax and West Community Council:

- 1. Correct, by resolution, the development agreement approved by Halifax and West Community Council on August 6, 2019 for 1110, 1116, 1120, 1122, 1126A/1126B/1126C and 1130/1132, Wellington Street, Halifax by deleting section 3.4.7 and replacing it with the following:**

3.4.7 The streetwall shall be setback from the streetline a minimum of 1.5 metres and a maximum of 4.5 metres.

2. Require the development agreement, including the correction noted in recommendation number 1, be signed by the property owner within 120 days from December 11, 2019 or any extension thereof granted by Council on request of the property owner, from the date of final approval by Council and any other bodies as necessary, including applicable appeal periods, whichever is later, otherwise this approval will be void and obligations arising hereunder shall be at an end.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

13.2 BOARDS AND COMMITTEES – NONE

13.3 MEMBERS OF COMMUNITY COUNCIL – NONE

14. MOTIONS – NONE

15. IN CAMERA (IN PRIVATE)

15.1 PERSONNEL MATTER – Private and Confidential Report

MOVED by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Mason

THAT Halifax and West Community Council:

1. Approve the direction with respect to the Personnel Matter as discussed In Camera (In Private) and;
2. That the private and confidential staff report dated December 3, 2019 not be released to the public.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

15.2 PERSONNEL MATTER – Private and Confidential Report

MOVED by Councillor Mason, seconded by Councillor Cleary

THAT Halifax and West Community Council:

1. Approve the direction with respect to the Personnel Matter as discussed In Camera (In Private) and;
2. That the private and confidential staff report dated December 3, 2019 not be released to the public.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

15.3 PERSONNEL MATTER – Private and Confidential Report

MOVED by Councillor Cleary, seconded by Councillor Walker

THAT Halifax and West Community Council:

1. Approve the direction with respect to the Personnel Matter as discussed In Camera (In Private) and;
2. That the private and confidential staff report dated December 4, 2019 not be released to the public.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

15.4 PERSONNEL MATTER – Private and Confidential Report

MOVED by Councillor Cleary, seconded by Councillor Walker

THAT Halifax and West Community Council:

- 1. Approve the direction with respect to the Personnel Matter as discussed In Camera (In Private) and;**
- 2. That the private and confidential staff report dated December 5, 2019 not be released to the public.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

16. ADDED ITEMS – NONE

17. NOTICES OF MOTION – NONE

18. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Chair called three (3) times for any members of the public wishing to address Community Council; there were none.

19. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- January 21, 2020;
- February 18, 2020

20. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Simon Ross-Siegel
Legislative Assistant