

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable and upon request

## MINUTES: Sign By-law Review Committee Meeting



**MEETING DATE:** March 17, 2016  
**MEETING TIME:** 9:30 a.m.  
**LOCATION:** Town Hall, Committee Room  
**PREPARED BY:** Sharon Long, Secretary

### A. Call to Order

Chair R. B. Waind called the meeting to order with all Committee members present, except for Gary Nordeman.

Rosemary Gosselin, Roland Gosselin, Vivienne Alpin, John McGee & John Svec were in attendance from the public.

- **Approval of Agenda**

*Moved by: Joe Halos                      Seconded by: Michael Seguin*

*THAT the Agenda of March 17, 2016 be approved as circulated, including any items added to the Agenda, CARRIED*

- **Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and general nature thereof**

- **Previous Minutes**

*Moved by: Michael Seguin              Seconded by: Julia Hinds*

*THAT the Sign By-law Review Committee minutes of January 7, 2016, be adopted as circulated, including any revisions to be made, CARRIED*

### B. Staff Reports, Deputations, Correspondence

#### B.1 PDS.16.35 LCBO Signage

Michael Benner, Director Planning & Development Services went through his staff report and confirmed that the Sign Permit application was received February 2, 2016 from Forward Signs. In the original application they wanted 4 large LCBO with standalone letters, 6 awning signs, 3 block signs with LCBO on them and 1 Thornbury letter sign above the front entrance.

Michael advised that he wrote back to them advising they had 2 options, one being to comply with sign by-law and come back with a reduced application that complied with same and the other option would be to apply for a variance to the sign by-law. They applied for a variance with a reduced number of signs being 4 LCBO down to 2, 6 awning signs with only 2 will have signs, 3 block signs and the Thornbury letter sign to remain.

R B Waind asked Michael if they would conform with existing by-law.

Michael advised no as they are above and beyond the by-law. Michael advised this location does have 2 business frontages so they are permitted 2 fascia signs. 5 being LCBO letter signs, Thornbury sign and LCBO block signs. Michael advised he is looking at awning signs which are addressed differently than sign by-law. Michael went through his resolution to the Staff Report as follows:

All of the proposed signs exceeded the sign by-law in various aspects. To permit five (5) fascia signs whereas Section 4.04(2)(c) of Sign By-law No. 2001-57, as amended, permits one (1) fascia sign per business frontage;

To permit the centre of the fascia signs to be offset from the centre of the building whereas Section 4.04(2)(c) of Sign By-law No. 2001-57, as amended, requires the centre of the fascia signs to be in-line with the centre of the buildings;

To permit a maximum fascia sign height of 2.13 metres whereas Section 4.04(2)(c) of Sign By-law No. 2001-57, as amended, permits a maximum sign height of 0.9 metres;

To permit an Awning Sign Copy height of 19.37 centimetres whereas Section 4.04(4) of Sign By-law No. 2001-57, as amended, permits a maximum sign copy height of 15 centimetres, and;

To permit the Fascia and Awning signs to be illuminated by backlighting whereas Section 3.06(1) of Sign By-law No. 2001-57, as amended, requires all approved signs to be lit by an external source. (By-law 2005-105).

Joe Halos questioned if they would have a case that they have 3 business frontages instead of 2.

Michael advised that he agrees in a way they do have 3 business frontages and will look into this matter.

Michael Seguin questioned if they were looking at 2 awning signs per elevation with one elevation facing north onto Arthur Street and the second elevation looking at Sobey's. Michael asked if they were asking for 2 signs per elevation.

Michael Benner outlined their revised submission for the awning signs. They are putting wine, spirits and beer on one awning per side instead of having one word on each sign.

Michael Benner confirmed that the by-law does not permit back lighting and they are requesting a variance for back lighting. Michael advised that the back lighting will be turned off when they are not open.

R B questioned if there is backlighting on the old Foodland and at Penny's Motel.

Michael Benner confirmed yes there was.

Michael Seguin advised that the new Foodland has lights shining down onto the sign.

Joe confirmed that the big Foodland letters light up as well.

Michael Seguin noted that backlighting is lite from the rear and advised that the new Foodland signs has the goose neck lights to shine on the lettering.

RB questioned if they would have an objection to a goose neck sign.

Michael Benner confirmed they are adamant they need LCBO signs which are back lit.

Rosemary Gosselin asked Michael to describe the negative side of back lighting.

Michael Benner advised that backlighting provides a bit of a visual pollution in the evening as you are approaching the area and see a lot of these signs. This takes away from the character that small businesses are trying to maintain. Back lighting does not impact the dark sky but does tend to disrupt the local character and sleeping of the neighbourhood and is disruptive to wildlife.

R B asked if they are harmful even if they are turned off at night.

Michael Benner advised not if they are turned off but they will close at 9:00 p.m.

R B questioned turning back lite sign off at 9:00 p.m. versus a goose neck sign that is turned on 24 x 7.

Michael advised that with a goose neck you do not get the glowing effect. Michael advised that the amount of light ejecting is less and they are more reflective of the older character of the community for goose neck lights.

R B asked about the illumination measurements.

Michael Seguin asked if the existing LCBO sign is back lite now and advised they also have signage on the street. Michael asked if they already have it are they entitled to it at a new location.

R B asked if we move to having no backlight signs, would the old Foodland sign and the Penny's Motel sign have to comply.

Joe suggested that the current type of LCBO signage would not be grandfathered to the new location.

R B suggested the need for the element of fairness to the business community.

Rosemary Gosselin advised that she is very concerned about maintaining our small town feel. She feels that whatever can be done in that direction because tourism is our major industry. Rosemary feels that if you sell that out, businesses will suffer.

Michael Seguin feels that the LCBO will attract people to the community.

Julia feels that front lighting is a good addition to attract tourism.

Vivienne indicated that no signage is required at all and suggested it is quite evident what the store is.

Julia questioned if they still plan on moving forward with their store if they don't get their applied for signs.

Roland Gosselin advised that it does disturb him when he hears a company say we cannot do it. He does agree that most corporations do have a brand and confirmed that LCBO stores are the same all across Ontario.

Michael Benner confirmed they have revised their application review and applied for several variances to bring this forward. They want:

5 fascia sign – 2 or 3 are permitted

Fascia sign centred on the centre of the building. Some of the signage is on the corner and at the back are not centred as well.

Michael Seguin suggested we look at the downtown core area instead of highway commercial area and noted that no highway commercial has centred signage.

Joe suggested this is not a huge issue with respect to signage.

Michael Benner noted the variance for sizing of fascia signs notes 0.9 metres and advised they are looking at 2.13 metres.

R B Waind asked if this is based on the height of the building.

Michael Benner confirmed that the block signs have been scaled that they fit within the piers of the building.

Julia advised that she likes the canopy signs.

R B commented that they are going to get signs, it is just a matter of how many.

Rosemary Gosselin suggested that they maintain the unique appearance of this village. Rosemary noted that this is what is bringing tourism to our area. She advised there are some beautiful signs on Arthur Street already and advised that Tim Horton's revised their signage when they originally applied. Rosemary suggested that the Committee stick to the current by-law until we have a new good by-law.

R B advised that he feels we have a good by-law already and that the BIA and business community requested changes be made to the current by-law.

Joe Halos feels that we are not unique as we currently have the big block building already which are a benefit to the community. Joe advised that the old Foodland store was small which requires people to go elsewhere. Joe noted that the community has grown and that we need these types of facilities.

Vivienne advised that these stores are only replacement stores.

Julia suggested that we have by-laws in place so that people coming to our area know what they can do.

R B advised that the former Collingwood Township tried to encourage the large box stores go to the east to the large commercial centres like Collingwood. Not appropriate for the unique nature of Thornbury Clarksburg and Collingwood Township.

Julie suggested we have discussion with the community and ask the public what direction they want to go.

R B advised that the BIA and Chamber of Commerce have had input into the by-law.

Julia suggested that the community is bigger than them. Julia advised that the Chamber is split with respect to signage in our community. Julia feels that the old by-law was onerous and hard to manage and is proud to go to the community with our current draft by-law.

Michael Benner advised that he is working on a Community Engagement Strategy that will go to Council and he is hoping to have a number of community engagement opportunities to happen.

Joe advised we have never had a lot of community input in the past.

Vivienne suggested that the community is becoming more aware of what is going on.

Joe agreed but feels that the community has to become involved.

Rosemary suggested that with no newspaper to receive council coverage it was difficult for the community to become involved. Since The Thornbury Paper has come online, she feels community involvement has increased.

Krystal joined the discussion from Forward Signs.

Michael Benner advised that the Committee is discussing the variances brought to the Committee and noted there were residents in attendance for discussions also.

R B Waind asked Krystal how difficult it would be to convert the existing signs to goose neck sign as opposed to back lighting.

Krystal advised that she did review Michael's report and confirmed that the LCBO has a certain brand image they would like to adhere to. Krystal confirmed that goose neck lighting does not fit into their branding.

R B Waind that LCBO is not going to change the brand and go with a goose neck type of lighting.

Julia asked Krystal if she knew of any LCBO locations that do not have back lighting?

Krystal does not believe there are any locations with goose neck lighting. Krystal agreed to bring the details to the attention of the LCBO and ask how they would like to handle this request.

R B Waind suggested that Krystal that possibly providing goose neck lighting might go a long way for community buy in. R B advised that the Sign By-law Review Committee went to Creemore which is a local municipality and advised that TD Canada Trust does not have their traditional TD signage but rather have installed a very expensive and attractive TD sign.

Krystal advised that she will talk to LCBO with respect to this signage.

Michael Seguin asked Krystal if she was aware of the old LCBO building sign had back lighting.

Krystal advised that she is not aware of what type of lighting the old store had.

Julia asked why it would matter what type of signage they had as they are now in a new location.

Michael Benner detailed the lettering size for awning size where they can go to 15 cm and are asking for 19 cm. Michael advised they are looking to put wine, spirits and beer on one awning so they are requesting slightly larger lettering.

Julia personally likes the first proposed lettering for the awning.

Michael Benner advised that the original proposal was to have LCBO lettering on the centre awning and then have wine, spirits and beer lettering on each end.

Michael Seguin questioned they would then be looking at 6 awnings.

R B asked Michael Benner if they might have 3 frontages given the location of the building and confirmed the need to hear back from them about goose neck lighting.

Vivienne advised that Krystal confirmed this would not be their brand.

R B advised their brand is beige with green lettering and suggested that gold would set it off.

**Moved by: Joe Halos**

**Seconded by: Julia Hinds**

**THAT the Sign By-law Review Committee receive staff report PDS.16.35  
"LCBO Signage" for information purposes, and**

**THAT the Sign By-law Review Committee deny the variance request for the  
LCBO signage at 105 Arthur Street West as printed, CARRIED**

Michael Benner outlined the Thornbury sign on the LCBO building.

Michael Seguin talked about the Thornbury lettering on the Foodland store and asked if they are larger than the by-law suggests. Michael questioned if all Foodland signs were approved by the Town.

Michael Benner advised that the murals were approved under the Site Plan Approval process as opposed to the Sign By-law and advised this was part of the original design.

R B is not sure what the need for the Thornbury sign is.

Michael Seguin asked if it complied with the by-law.

Rosemary suggested that perhaps they have to tell people where they are due to all the signage in that area.

Krystal suggested she can remove the Thornbury lettering from the store if that would help.

R B questioned if a revised application comes back to this committee or does it go directly to Committee of The Whole.

Michael Benner suggested it go to Committee of The Whole.

R B Waind asked the Committee what they wanted to do with this variance request. R B suggested that Krystal work with Michael Benner with respect to this variance request. R B questioned if Michael brings back a report to this Committee or directly to Committee of The Whole.

Joe Halos suggested that timing is important and to bring it back to this committee would drag out the process. Joe agreed with taking this directly to Committee of The Whole.

**Moved by: Michael Seguin**

**Seconded by: Joe Halos**

**THAT the Sign By-law Committee direct staff to bring report directly back  
to the Committee of The Whole with recommendations to move the sign  
permit application of LCBO at 105 Arthur Street West forward in a timely  
manner based on input at the Sign By-law Committee meeting of March 17,  
2016, CARRIED**

Krystal agreed that she will work with the Town on this variance application to move it forward in a timely fashion.

### **C. Public Meetings**

N/A

Under the authority of the *Municipal Act, 2001* and in accordance with Ontario's *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (MFIPPA), The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains wishes to inform the public that all information including opinions, presentations, reports and documentation provided for or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record. This information may be posted on the Town's website and or/ made available to the public upon request.

### **D. New and Unfinished Business**

N/A

### **E. Adjournment**

***Moved by: Joe Halos                      Seconded by: Julia Hinds***

***THAT this Sign By-law Review Committee meeting does now adjourn at 11:00 a.m. to meet again at the call of the Chair.***