

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 9. Proposed New Sign By-law and Amendments to Current Sign and Canopy By-law

- *(Councillor Hubert enquires about large signs on buildings Downtown, is that covered by the old by-law or is that covered under the new one because there is a percentage);* Mr. P. Kokkoros, Deputy Chief Building Official, responds that the percentages that limit the size of signs are still staying in the current by-law as well as the new by-law and there was an amendment made to the current by-law that provided a time frame or time limit as to when specific signs could be up until; considering that that time frame has now lapsed, it is not considered in the new by-law; indicating that you have your five or ten percent ratio and that is it; *(Councillor van Holst enquires about the speed with which it takes to get an application through, does the new Sign By-law improve that because that is a big concern.);* Mr. P. Kokkoros, Deputy Chief Building Official, responds that although the by-law does provide a regulatory framework in terms of size of signs, location of signs, number of signs, staff has acknowledged that, through the plain language and the implementation of the by-law, the understanding of the by-law, both from applicants and from staff, will definitely result in improvement and, in addition to that, they are also looking into internal processes that they can streamline and improve on their customer service delivery with respect to sign permit issuance; *(Councillor Park identifies that part of the direction that Council gave was to talk with Business Improvement Areas and two gave really great feedback and she is curious what happened with the Argyle Business Improvement Area, if they were consulted.);* Mr. P. Kokkoros, Deputy Chief Building Official, responds that with respect to the Argyle Business Improvement Area, the Executive of the Business Improvement Area was invited to a meeting and was unable to attend the meeting and did not reschedule.
- Nicholas, Pattison Outdoor Advertising – indicating that they recently met with staff to discuss the proposed Sign By-law; reiterating four main points to the Committee; expressing appreciation that digital is being proposed without a variance in the future; however, they have concern with that as there is no minimum setback criteria from another digital billboard; referring the Committee to other municipalities such as Toronto where they have a minimum setback criteria of 500 metres between billboards of a digital nature because, at the moment, the one that is proposed is 100 metres from another billboard; requesting a definition or expansion between the two created in the future; stating that he does not want to commit the Committee to 500 metres by any means, that is for the Committee to decide, but he would like to see that if possible; asking that they look at the available streets west of Adelaide Street; identifying that for the last forty plus years the only available locations that were deemed Industrial/Commercial and therefore super billboard signage were east of Adelaide Street; indicating that, by that same nature, recently the development has headed north towards Masonville, towards Byron and so forth and by those same terms has not met the expansion criteria in terms of listed streets available on Schedule “G” or proposed on Schedule “E”; noting that staff were receptive to that and, as far as they can tell, they will be looking at that in the future, which they appreciate; explaining that this is important to them as they have had numerous clients who have approached them looking to advertise through local businesses and it is simply because of the available locations for billboard signage and they are not able to meet their demands or service them in any way; recommending that staff look at the lottery system; realizing that it has not really been used in the past because they have never met the cap but they would like to see it put into effect so that any new builds would be subject to the lottery system; pointing out that any time they remove one of their existing old signs that is fairly unsightly, they would like to have that registered as a transplant in the sense that that would no longer be essentially cancelling that permit and they could take that unsightly billboard and place it in the more appropriate location that meets with the current by-laws; noting that, at the moment, they have billboards that are stacked three high, they are made of I-beams and they are back to back and they understand that they are not necessarily nice to look at and they would like to, in the long term, mitigate some of those concerns and the complaints that the Councillors receive; requesting a reexamination of the purpose

of the cap so that they understand why it was put in place but given its current criteria and purpose they do not see it as being fully necessary; advising that one of the reasons why that is, they have been working with staff to provide staff with a full list of all of their sites so they can effectively decide how many billboards there are in the city, but in many ways it is a two-fold restriction in the sense that Schedule “G” or Schedule “E” as proposed should be enough to limit where billboards cannot be placed; explaining that the reason they are saying that is that the streets that have been proposed, why are we limiting locations that have been pre-approved by the City a second time, they should be outwardly permitted in their opinion; Mr. E. Ling, Development Policy Coordinator, responds that there are a number of considerations with where billboards can go in this City, first and foremost there is a population cap based on the City’s total population divided by thirteen hundred which gives you the total number of billboards you are permitted to have in the City; on top of that there are setback conditions with respect to residential locations, setback conditions with regards to other billboards as well as Schedule “G” which puts a bunch of lines on a map and says that billboards can go here; identifying that in their meetings with the industry they have discussed that they are going to review that in the intercessional period between this meeting and the next one to see if they need all of those different limitations or not and what the purpose of all of them is and was and will be in the future; hopefully, through this, they will be able to come up with some sort of a new conclusion with regards to the concerns of the industry.

- Steve Wallowich, Senior Director Real Estate, Out Front Media – advising that he was not sure of the forum of the meeting today; requesting greater stakeholder contribution to the Sign By-law; noting that he has been in the outdoor media business for too long; understanding the interpretation of the Sign By-laws is sometimes quite complex and he is confused about the methodology of the by-law as they are not necessarily looking to change the direction that staff wants to go, they just want a better understanding of it; thinking that the City of London has changed dramatically and those changes should be reflected in the new Sign By-law; thinking that there is an opportunity to work with the industry to have some areas where you may not deem signs appropriate removed but perhaps with the ability to have signs located in other areas where it may be more appropriate now; indicating that he has not had any consultation with staff, really, regarding the Sign By-law so he is not aware of any prior meetings and conversations that have taken place with respect to the by-law; pointing out that as one of North America’s leading industry members, they would certainly appreciate a greater opportunity to have a conversation with respect to the by-law; Mr. P. Kokkoros, Deputy Chief Building Official, responds that an invitation was sent to Out Front Media to attend the meeting, there was a scheduling conflict, thinking there was a Sign Convention that made it unable for representatives to attend the meeting; however, this is still an open process, we do not stop here, as previously mentioned there is still a second public participation meeting coming up most likely before the end of the year; we would be happy to work with the gentleman and hear the concerns and consider them.
- Tom McClenaghan, 220 Baseline Road East – advising that he is associated with Friends of the Coves Subwatershed Inc.; commending the Councillors on a recent award that they received from Ontario Nature with respect to the commitment to protecting Environmentally Significant Areas (ESA); expressing congratulations; indicating that he is intensely proud of a city that wins an award like that and it speaks on its own; making a couple of comments relative to several things that are under way; stating that Friends of the Coves has a commitment as well to the Coves ESA and there is currently a substantial trail being created between the Alma Gateway and Cove Road; pointing out that the Friends of the Coves are totally funding it and there will be continued trails expansion right through until the end of the year; noting that this will also be funded by Friends of the Coves; reiterating that they have a commitment as well; stating that they are committed to clean ups, committee to tree planting and, generally speaking, improving this particular ESA; wondering where he is going, it is fairly simple, enquiring as to why would we allow billboards within the boundaries of an ESA; responding that it is probably because they have been there since before the ESA was created; however, his question to the Committee would be are they appropriate now; advising that he says not, this is a wilderness area and is greatly enjoyed by the people in South London; however, billboards are not appropriate within the boundaries of an ESA; pointing out that the Coves, because

of its peculiar location in the heart of the city has these in two places; expressing pleasure at seeing the inclusion of the heritage areas; noting that he lives close to a heritage area; pointing out that on his many occasions coming Downtown he comes to the corner of Wortley Road and Stanley Street; noting that some members of the Committee may have been there as well; advising that when you stop you look ahead and you see six billboards; wanting the Committee to know that he is tired of looking at them; advising that it is time that they left us; indicating that this is right on the border between the Downtown Heritage Area and the Wortley Village Heritage Area; pointing out that it is no longer appropriate; hoping that these two problems might be addressed by this particular by-law; Mr. E. Ling, Development Policy Coordinator, responds that they did speak to Mr. McClenaghan during the process as well as heard from the City's Parks Planning staff, who had recommended that in their expanded areas on the new Schedule "E" that they truncate the lines that they had drawn on the map to exclude all ESA's, all lands that are designated environmentally significant; relating to those billboards that are already there or do exist within the ESA, he would look to the colleagues in the stands from Pattison and Out Front to see if the priority for removal and replacement of signs might focus on existing signs in ESA's and that could be their target; reiterating that maybe that is something that they are definitely amenable to is the discussion of not introducing new ESA lands into billboard areas and also with the potential of removing existing signs within ESA's; *(Councillor Squire indicates that it is a point of view, that he sees the signs all of the time.)*; Mr. McClenaghan responds that they do not add anything; stating that he does not believe the temporary signs should be placed in ESA's either.