

**APPROVED MINUTES FROM SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013 AT 7:00 P.M.**

A special council meeting was held Tuesday, September 17, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. with Mayor Murphy presiding and all Councillors present also Frances Ready, Jim Smith, John Smith, Ray Millman, Shane Gillis, Tom Murphy, Alan Curtis, Darrell Graham, Chris LeClair, Cindy Chant-West Prince Graphic and Eric McCarthy- Journal also staff Susan Wallace-Flynn.

Mayor Murphy called the meeting to order and stated that the meeting was called because of the numerous calls and concerns he was receiving from residents in the general area of the manor and other areas of the town with the question why council does not want the old manor demolished. He said he would not be doing due diligence if he did not bring these concerns back to council. He stated for the attention of everyone here that the manor does not belong to the town. Mayor Murphy said it is owned and controlled by the Province. He also said there are lots of vacant businesses on Main Street for potential developers.

Mayor Murphy said he asked the government to send someone to answer any questions we have about the property. Mayor Murphy introduced Alan Maynard, Director of Public Works and Planning Division. He said he would ask some questions first and then open the floor for each councillor to take a turn if they had any questions.

Mayor Murphy asked the following questions and they were answered by Alan Maynard.

What is the yearly cost for utilities for the old manor?

The yearly costs are as follows:

As a vacant building	Last year of operations (2010-2011)
Heat: \$50,000.00	\$75,000.00
Utilities: \$4,000.00	\$40,000.00
Repairs: \$0.00	\$25,000.00
Snow: \$1,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
Total: \$55,000.00	145,000.00

What is the condition and age of the oil tank, also oil tank for the generator, 3 wells, windows, elevator and shaft, brick, furnace, roof and sprinkler system?

The manor was built in 1967, 40,000 square feet and major renovations in 1997. The condition and age of the oil is 20 years old underground tank, also oil tank for the generator 7-8, 3 wells one is usable, windows replaced in mid 1990s elevator and shaft has been shut down and would need services to put back in use, brick is original, furnace original furnace units shut down will need to be drained if left unheated, one unit is leaking, roof believed to be replaced 20 years ago and sprinkler system would need to be drained if heat is left off for the winter.

What was the life span for the old manor?

The building is considered to be structurally sound. Major upgrades would be required if the building were to continue to be used for another purpose.

With the inverted roof can structural changes be made to the building such as walls removed?

Corridor walls would need to be left in place to carry the roof.

Is there asbestos in the manor and if so, where in the building?

Limited asbestos found in pipe joint, insulation and some floor tiles.

Is there mold in the building?

Some signs of water infiltration on ceiling tiles, some water coming in around kitchen vents.

Was there lead paint used in the building?

We have no specific info on lead paint in the building.

Are there any other environmental concerns the Province is concerned with?

We have no information on any concerns.

Is the Province even interested in maintaining and paying the utilities for the old manor for another year and if so, what would the cost be?

Government has kept the building heated since being closed in 2011. Government is not interested in spending any further dollars on maintenance.

Why did the Province, itself, not renovate the building?

The new manor has met the needs in the area for long term care. Government Departments were asked if they had a use for the building. The next step was a public RFP to non-profit groups in July 2012. In January of this year it was determined that there were no non-profit groups that met the terms of the RFP. It was listed for sale in the paper in January of this year and there was no interest at that time and with nothing left for the building in the spring the heat was shut off and it was ready to demolish. He said after that they received a proponent interested in the property. He said the government had to work with the proponent for the best offer and conditions or decide if it was better to demolish the building and retain the land for their own use.

If the business proposal is accepted and the business person does not fulfill their commitments what recourse would the town have?

Once the property is sold, approval for development is in the hands of the town to be approved. Government's objective is to not incur any further costs once a property is sold. Alan Maynard said the town controls the rezoning of the property.

Mayor Murphy opened the floor to the councillors for questions.

Councillor Duggan asked if the building is salvageable.

Building is sound, fairly extensive cost to develop it.

Councillor Duggan also asked about the conditions of the sale.

Alan Maynard said it is something the government can put in but can't control it. He said the building left derelict has terms but government does not have a lot of interest in that. Alan Maynard said the Government generally not interested in the building after the sale.

Councillor Pottier mentioned the substantial cost to make the building useable again.

Alan Maynard said the heat has been turned off and to resurrect that he does not know if the boiler can be fired back up, complicated system. Government is not interested in spending any more money also sprinkler system to drain or keep on the government is not interested. He said the minimum cost would be 10's of thousands of dollars to bring it to the state to put the lights and heat back on.

Councillor Pottier asked about the demolition cost.

Alan Maynard said approximately. \$100,000.00 to \$150,000.00. He said that the high school in Montague is 3 times the size and the costs came in from \$400,000.00 to \$1.3 million. He said the asbestos in the building is quite identifiable and feels \$150,000.00 but wide range.

Councillor Pottier asked about the furnace and the boiler leaking.

Alan Maynard said the boiler and core are leaking now. All the gaskets have contracted now that the heat has been turned off and may have to spend \$100,000.00 to get the boiler going again. He said it would cost \$55,000.00 just to let it sit.

Councillor Pottier asked if the Government would fix the boiler and remove the asbestos as conditions of the sale.

Alan Maynard said severing property from the parent property is of more interest in the condition of sale than to fix those items.

Councillor Cahill asked does the Government have a set price for the building and would they accept \$1.00?

Alan Maynard said they would not take just \$1.00 and \$1,000.00 would not be accepted. He said need value applied that is true value and interest in the property. He said there is a cost to have the property in your ownership. Someone can make an offer, but it is up to Government whether to accept it or not. He said that once sold the developer can change their mind and Government has to protect itself as well and it has to be a reasonable sale.

Councillor Gallant said she had the same question about cost.

Councillor Campbell said a developer after tonight would not be interested. **Councillor Campbell asked when the last proposal was on the table.** He said it played into the hands of the Mayor who sent a letter from council, without a motion, off to government. Councillor Campbell said council made a

motion to send a letter off to government and as far as he knew it was never sent. Alan Maynard said anyone interested in buying the property would get the same information such as cost to operate and the asbestos reports. He said when they put the RPF out they identified the asbestos , size of building, zoning, and tell people of any issues with the property. Councillor Campbell said he felt blindsided by a Government official telling them all about the manor. Councillor Campbell said that two letters were sent out without council's approval. Councillor Dunn said her questions were already answered. She said any business plans, environmental concerns, lead paint, asbestos, furnace concerns were well outlined. **Councillor Dunn asked if that was part of the business plan from the developer.** Alan Maynard said he was not here to report on what is on the table. Councillor Dunn said the developer would submit a business plan. Alan Maynard said it was purely a purchase and sale agreement with a few conditions of sale such as to sever off the property. Alan Maynard said not every offer is accepted. **Councillor Dunn said it is a long process and can take months. She asked if there was anything holding up this process now?** Alan Maynard said government was in the midst of making the decision on the building and was told Alberton was interested, but not sure if it was holding up the process. **Councillor Dunn asked if the two letters sent affected the sale.** Alan Maynard said no, but hard for him to say information is disclosed. He said anything coming to Government would be part of decision making for executive council. Councillor Dunn said it would have been nice to have had a meeting months ago before the first letter were sent out regarding the pros and cons versus developing it and that it was hard to make an educated decision, but she was happy that Alan Maynard came to talk to council.

Councillor Pottier asked regarding the business plan and if a non-profit or private business person be required to submit a business plan. Alan Maynard said a business plan is not required and that in time the building could be anything.

Councillor Dunn asked if the property is demolished what is Government's stance. Alan Maynard said at this time a vacant piece of property, but it is next to the new manor and he is not sure if it would be for sale and thought for now they would be retaining the property. Councillor Dunn said the bids for tearing down Montague School are from \$340,000.00 to \$1.3 million. **Councillor Dunn asked if government would sell or develop the prime piece of property.**

Alan Maynard said it will be retained by Government. Councillor Dunn said she could not imagine Government would sell it if it wasn't good for the community or sell it to someone who does not have the money.

Councillor Cahill asked if that was taken into consideration when old school in Summerside was sold. He said that in Summerside council's hands are tied and that the Government would not want to see a derelict building left in front of that beautiful new manor. Councillor Dunn said it would fall under our bylaws. Councillor Cahill said you could not get blood from a stone and with figures of \$145,000.00 just to maintain it. Councillor Pottier said the town had a number of abandoned buildings and it was a lot of work to deal with homes and would be a momentous task to deal with a building of this size.

Mayor Murphy thanked Alan Maynard for coming to the meeting to answer our questions.

Mayor Murphy said he has met with individuals and entrepreneurs who have expressed interest in developing in town and said he must point out that he has always been in favor of progress and development, such as the Coop new hardware and building supplies, the Holland College building, George MacNeill's Enterprises and business, new sidewalks, new town hall and maintenance building, our new subdivision and sale of lots. He said that once the manor leaves the hands of the Province and goes to private sector the Province will not be responsible for the demolition. Mayor Murphy said you don't have to look any further than Summerside for a prime example. He said that Prince County

Vocational School in Summerside was purchased by a prominent business person and now seven years later it is still there and an eye sore with graffiti and broken windows.

The motion was made by Councillor Gallant, seconded by Councillor Cahill and carried to rescind the motion made at the September 9, 2013 council meeting that a letter be sent to Premier Robert Ghiz, Minister of Transportation Robert Vessey and MLA Pat Murphy supporting the manor to be developed if there is someone interested to purchase it within one year and if the sale cannot be concluded within one year restate that it be torn down.

Councillors Cahill, Gallant and Pottier voted yes, Councillors Duggan, Dunn and Campbell voted no and Mayor Murphy broke the tie by voting yes for the motion.

Councillor Duggan said there was no discussion on the motions. Councillor Gallant said she felt blindsided at the September 9th meeting and didn't have enough information. Councillor Dunn said if the letter had been put in the boxes but she only found out before meeting.

The motion was made by Councillor Gallant, seconded by Councillor Cahill and carried to send a letter to Premier Robert Ghiz, Minister of Transportation Robert Vessey and MLA Pat Murphy to demolish Maplewood Manor as soon as possible.

Councillors Cahill, Gallant and Pottier voted yes, Councillor Duggan, Dunn and Campbell voted no and Mayor Murphy broke the tie by voting yes for the motion.

Mayor Murphy asked Councillor Dunn if she had the proposal. Mayor Murphy asked if anyone received any proposals. Councillor Cahill said the people he has talked to want the manor demolished.

Councillor Pottier said it should not be development at any cost and he heard it would be a storage building without utilities. Councillor Pottier said if someone knows something they should speak up if there is a potential developer. Councillor Cahill said he was here to protect the interests of the town. Mayor Murphy said the town has no money to demolish it and if the property was severed and if the rezoning request was not looked at favorably it would leave the owner with a property he could not do anything with. Councillor Duggan said we should write a letter to Government to ask to see the proposal and get council to approval it.

Councillor Dunn said we should ask the developer to come in. Councillor Cahill asked if she knew who the developer was. Councillor Dunn said the business developer gave her a call and also one other councillor. Councillor Duggan said he also called him and asked him if he knew of a letter that was sent before. Councillor Duggan said he did not want to release the name.

The motion was made by Councillor Cahill, seconded by Councillor Pottier and carried to adjourn the meeting.