



Minutes

Sign By-law Committee

Meeting Date: November 7, 2016
Meeting Time: 9:00 a.m.
Location: Council Chambers
Prepared by Sharon Long, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services

A. Call to Order

Chair R B Waind called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with all members present. Chair R B Waind welcomed Kathryn Brown who is now representing the BIA on this committee.

Also present were Michael Benner, Director Planning & Development Services, Candis McDonnell, Applicant, Sharon Long, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services, Vivienne Alper & Rosemary Gosselin.

- **Approval of the Agenda**

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

THAT the Agenda of November 7, 2016 be approved as circulated, including any items added to the Agenda, CARRIED

- **Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and general nature thereof** – Joe Halos advised that he will not be voting on the minutes of October 12, 2016 as he Declared Pecuniary Interest with respect to the staff report dealt with at that meeting.

- **Previous Minutes**

Moved by: Julia Hinds **Seconded by:** Kathryn Brown

THAT the Sign By-law Review Committee minutes of October 12, 2016, be adopted as circulated, including any revisions to be made, CARRIED

B. Staff Reports, Deputations, Correspondence

B.1 PDS.16.136 – Niche Living, 45 Bruce Street South, Sign By-law Variance

Michael Benner presented his staff report with respect to this application. Michael advised that the location of the building is very close to the road. The sign variance is required for the 3 metre setback from the ground sign. A setback of 2.1 metres would be impossible to meet. The setback is on both Louisa & Bruce Street frontages.

Michael advised that Section 4.04.3 of the existing sign by-law addresses ground signs within the commercial core area of Thornbury. Section 4.04.3a indicates a 3 metre

setback from the property line. The setback is less than 2 metres from the property so will require a variance from that section.

Another area is the size of the sign itself. It is just slightly bigger than the required 2 square metres and with the framing makes it 2.2 metres.

R B Waind questioned if it meets the criteria of the new sign by-law if it were in effect today.

Michael Benner advised that Section 4.11 of the new by-law deals with ground signs which is still maintaining the 2 square metre area in the new sign by-law so it would still require a variance. Michael advised that the sign does not impact the character of the street itself. The variances are minor in nature and conform to the character of the street. The sign is very tasteful done and will fit on Bruce Street quite well.

R B questioned Candis why this happened.

Candis McDonnell advised that she wanted to make the biggest sign that is allowed at The Sign Shop. She did not realize until she came in to get a permit that the framing would make her sign too large. The location is the only place where she can put a sign where it would be secure and safe.

Joe Halos asked Candis if she used a local sign contractor and were they aware of the size of the sign requirement.

Candis advised that she did use a local sign contractor and confirmed she was not trying to go over the required size as noted in the by-law.

Joe suggested that was important for local providers to try to comply with the size of the sign. Joe asked Candis about locating the sign on the corner of the building as ReMax has a sign directly behind there also.

Candis advised that the previous sign located on the sign of the building blew down due to the wind in this location. Candis confirmed that she did send ReMax a note explaining her proposed sign location. Candis confirmed that most people think she is the ReMax building and suggests they move their sign to the far end of their building.

Joe advised that our by-law does not address how closely the ground sign can be located to another sign. Joe confirmed with Candis that currently only one side of the sign has lettering on it. Joe asked Candis if Norm Bauer addressed how he would relocate his sign on his property.

Candis advised his only comment was that you would not see his sign.

Julia Hinds asked Candis if the sign could fit on the side of the building.

Candis advised that where it is located, you can see the sign from all angles. Candis confirmed that she has signs in the window and that she is just trying to keep it simple and clean so that it looks like part of the building.

Rosemary suggested we insert a strong comment about variances into the by-law and advised that we are again asked to compromise. She suggested that we can always find a rationale to compromise our by-laws and asked if we are going to stick to the plan or

not? Rosemary suggested that she finds it shocking that business owners are not aware of the by-laws and suggested that we should be charging more for a variance so we can ensure the signs comply in the first place.

R B suggested some tweaking for size of building etc. R B advised that every application has to be decided on their own merits. R B hopes the BIA or Chamber try to make sure the public, the business community and the sign providers are provided with a copy of the by-law. R B suggests this sign is a tasteful sign and feels impact is negligible.

Vivienne Alper advised that she considers this sign to be very tasteful. She expressed concern with the sign maker doing it larger than it should have been and suggested he should rectify this at his expense. Vivienne suggested that every time we create a variance we create a precedence.

R B again suggested that every application has to be decided at their own merits.

Joe thanked Vivienne and Rosemary for their comments. Joe spoke to cost issues and advised that all services we provide, people come in and we pay for the costs. Joe advised that we cannot charge more to stop people from requesting things from their municipal government. Joe advised there is a fees development review and thinks the sign by-law variance fee is being looked at through this process. Joe confirmed this is not something we can adjust up or down on the whims of the community. Joe advised that in some respects he agrees with Vivienne and agrees there is a need to make sign makers be accountable.

Candis advised that it is a wind alley up Bruce Street and this is the reason her sign will be secure and so specific and built in. Candis advised that the sign has cost her \$850.00 without the costs for a contractor put it in the ground. To cut the sign from the bottom would weaken the integrity of the steel. Candis advised that she supported a local business and advised she is not here to try to take advantage of anyone. People simply need to know who she is and where she is.

Joe questioned not having another sign on the building. Joe confirmed that the sign face complies with the size but the frame does not which the sign guy did not make.

Candis advised that she wanted to put her sign in a safe location and that is why she chose to locate it where it is.

Michael Seguin advised his first concern was looking at the blocking off of the ReMax sign and questioned if we notified the adjacent owners with respect to this variance.

Candis agrees with this but suggested that due to the building sloping down, there is no retaining wall. Candis confirmed she tried to address everything with him and suggested that with 60 metre frontage she is very close to him.

Michael Benner confirmed that we usually do not circulate to neighbouring properties. Michael advised he would like to do the sign by-law through the new zoning by-law and to treat it as a true minor variance to a zoning by-law. This way it provides more formality and the 120 metre circulation.

R B that the zoning by-law is under the Planning Act and would have to be circulated to residents within 120 metres so they are aware of what is going on. Incorporate this within the recommendations of the new sign by-law or something to run with for consideration. The Committee of Adjustment under the municipality is also going to have this aspect as part of its mandate rather than having two separate committees.

Kathryn Brown suggested we ask the neighbor now instead of dealing with it later on.

R B confirmed that the sign is permitted.

Michael Benner advised that the existing sign by-law is under the Municipal Act and they are handled as a building permit. When you apply for a permit, there is no requirement to notify neighboring properties. The variance process has been evolving over the past few months. Michael advised there is also a transition to moving the sign by-law from the building department to the planning department to administer the by-law. Michael advised that Candis has made it clear that Norm is well aware of this sign and the implications on his sign. Michael suggested that moving forward, if we get more variances prior to the by-law being approved, a piece for the administration needs to be looked at.

R B advised that one criteria under the minor variance is visual impact etc.

Candis advised that when she purchased the building from the previous owner, there were two signs on Louisa and one sign on Bruce Street which had been previously approved.

Michael Seguin questioned Candis if this sign is erected or installed that she has no intention of installing a fascia sign on Bruce Street.

Candis advised that this is the only sign that will be needed and feels this to be the best location.

Michael Seguin asked if Candis is not allowed to have a fascia sign.

Candis advised she wants to keep it simple and have this sign installed as she feels this is all that is needed.

Vivienne felt that if ReMax does not want their sign there, somebody is going to have to be there to get the signs out given the small lot it is located on. Vivienne advised that the Niche sign is the only sign on one side and feels it is sensible to do signage on both sides.

Candis questioned asked Richard about signage on both sides. Candis advised she has been watching the traffic flow and agreed to keep the sign on the one side.

Joe advised that we do set the by-law and we do set the rule and thinks this variance is reasonable. The size is very minor and will not be noticed and there is no lighting.

Julia suggested this sign sticks out and it is projecting. Julia questioned if it can be turned around and be more flush with the building. Julia asked if there are changes, will the sign be more money.

Candis advised that the steel frame has been made and advised that either way she will have to pay for it.

Michael Seguin expressed concern with the adjacent owner and noted the need to talk to him because this is blocking his sign. Michael would feel more comfortable approving this variance if we knew the neighbor was okay with it.

R B advised that this is not a requirement right now and noted the owner is aware of it and we are only making a recommendation to Council. He can speak to it at that time. R B advised that he does not have the same concern.

Michael Seguin suggested the neighbor should be notified about the sign before going to Council.

R B confirmed that notice requirements will be added into the new sign by-law when it is approved.

Moved by: Joe Halos Seconded by: Julia Hinds

THAT the Sign By-law Review Committee receive Staff Report PDS.16.136, Niche Living, 45 Bruce Street South, Sign By-law Variance; and

THAT Council approve the Niche Living Sign By-law variance request as follows:

To permit one (1) ground within the 3 metre setback from the property line whereas Section 4.04(3a) of Sign By-law No. 2001-57, as amended, requires a minimum 3 metre setback from the property line for ground signs;

To permit a maximum sign area of 2.2 square metres whereas Section 4.04(2a) of Sign By-law No 2001-57, as amended, requires a maximum sign area of 2.0 metres, CARRIED

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 or 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

D.1 New Sign By-law Update

Michael Benner detailed the changes to the new sign by-law and advised that the final revisions have come about through the public, Council and staff.

Michael advised that if he looks at this as a by-law under the Planning Act, the minimum public notice required under the Municipal Act is 20 days. Michael has circulated this to Sign By-law Committee and members of the public who have provided comments on the sign by-law.

Michael Benner suggested we go through the by-law today which will give the committee the chance to provide further comments. Michael advised that prior to taking this By-law to Committee of The Whole, he will provide the Committee with a review of all comments received and how they impact the by-law.

R B advised that in his opinion this version captures what we are trying to do in the purpose of the by-law. R B feels the purpose is going to allow some flexibility in the best interests of the business community and the Town as a whole in moving forward. R B does not agree with a by-law so cast in stone that it cannot be changed.

Michael Benner indicated there is a lot happening in this complex by-law. Michael detailed the changes that he had previously made to the by-law and the Committee was provided with a track change version of the By-law to follow through.

Michael confirmed he added Section numbers into the definitions section of the by-law.

Michael highlighted the illuminated section of the by-law.

Michael explained the changes made to the special events sign requested by Blue Mountain Resorts. Blue Mountain Resorts advised their concern was most of their events are for profit.

Michael Seguin referred to the pylon sign in excess of 3.5 metres which leads him to the ground sign which has a different height than a pylon sign.

Michael Benner advised you are allowed a ground sign at 2.5 metres currently. A pylon sign is permitted to 3.5 metres which is 1 metre higher. Michael has checked surrounding municipalities and their pylon signs are much higher. Michael questioned if the intent of the sign by-law is not to permit pylon signs from the by-law.

Vivienne noted that she understands about pylon signs not be in excess of 3.5 metres in height. She wanted to make the Committee aware that the public would rather have them removed from the by-law entirely.

Michael noted pylon signs are not permitted in excess of 2.5 metres.

Rosemary asked if we have looked at the Meaford by-law where pylon signs are not permitted.

R B questioned Rosemary how do they deal with gas stations.

Michael advised that under the new by-law, they would not be permitted.

R B advised that he is not aware of the discussion at Council with respect to the pylon signs.

Joe suggested that we have ground signs and we talked about pylon signs. Joe has no problem with removing the pylon sign all together.

Michael agreed.

R B questioned if the sign was less than 3.5 metres, a pylon sign would be permitted.

Michael Benner advised that the sign by-law is silent where this would be allowed.

Joe thinks we should remove 3.1 (19).

Michael Benner suggested we only leave in pylon signs.

Michael Seguin asked if they are going to be treated like ground signs. Michael noted the problem is pylon sign is a ground sign but is more than a ground sign. There can be reverse lighting and multiple signs within a pylon sign.

R B suggested we eliminate pylon signs but suggested we still want some of the aspects of a pylon signs being a sense to expand the permitted uses in an expanded ground sign permission. They might be found in a ground sign, save and except the height.

Michael Seguin feels that if we take this out, we would never approve another Ultramar sign. Michael suggested that if we take this out the onus is on the planning department when a request comes in to say no as he feels this would be a major variance. Michael questioned how does that impact the development and will we be seen that we are open for business or not?

Kathryn feels that we are open for business but we not want to drive through our streets and see illuminated signs on every corner.

Michael Benner advised that the only place that you would have potential for an illuminated sign would be in an industrial/institutional setting. A pylon sign can only be 3.5 metres tall. The only difference between a short ground sign and a pylon sign is the light. Section 3.6 was confusing. Section 4.94 is the only section that speaks to lighting but refers you back to Section 3.6.

R B asked the Committee how they wish to deal with this matter.

Joe asked can an illuminated ground sign have other businesses advertised on it. Joe thinks ground signs are only for one business.

Michael Benner read the definition of a ground sign.

R B feels it is not for multiple uses.

Joe suggested we can make this what we want and the onus would be on the developer coming forward. Joe feels that lighting is the issue and not wanted on signs and agrees with the height also. Businesses may want this in the future and feels that if they want something outside of the by-law in the future there should be no problem.

Vivienne asked the Committee for a definition of industrial and institutional.

R B suggested it will be a zone.

Vivienne asked do not want illuminated signs. Vivienne feels that if you allow ground signs there will be problems. She suggested this is part of the Community Design Guidelines. Vivienne feels that internally light ground signs are something we would rather not see here. She feels the lighting at Ultramar is over the top and disagrees with adding more.

Rosemary read a definition from a magazine and suggested we should be thinking of climate change and things like that.

Michael Benner advised that the only place in the entire by-law where we would see fascia signs would be in the industrial and institutional designations. Michael advised that ground signs are not internally lite.

Vivienne questioned if they could be externally lite.

Joe asked what about street lighting. Joe feels that everything changes and signs are no different. The model which is LED internally lite sign looks nice and questioned if we would have a lot of people coming to seek variances from that. Joe feels that taking pylon signs out will not hurt us at all and developers will asked if we are open for business.

Michael Benner suggested that this discussion provides some direction.

Michael talked about Section 3.7 – size of letters. Michael included a chart which details the size of letters given the distance from the road

Julia asked if you are greater than 20 metres why this is less.

Vivienne asked if this section applied to projecting signs.

Michael Benner advised that with projecting signs, the size of the sign itself limits the information.

Michael Benner advised that he has added recreational ski facility in an attempt to recognize mostly Blue Mountain Resorts ski village. Michael advised their zone was not recognized in the by-law.

R B advised that the area which is the toe of the slope was a compromise with the NEC in the past.

Michael Benner outlined the change that was made in Section 4.9 dealing with fascia signs.

Rosemary asked if banner signs are allowed on Bruce Street and advised that she has a problem with banners being permitted.

R B asked Rosemary what about the business community thoughts here.

Julia suggested that more people are wanting the banner signs.

R B suggested it is not encouraging to the business community to eliminate this.

Rosemary advised that people are dying to do business in this community.

R B suggested that we do not want to regulate them out of coming here.

Rosemary strongly suggested that we do not want them on Bruce Street.

Joe feels that retailers and people in business want everything they can get.

Joe advised that the old by-law does not have commercial there. Section 4.11(1) talks about home based businesses and ground signs and Section 4.11(3)b) talks about ground signs in the commercial core area. Joe feels that what was written and what was proposed are not the same.

Kathryn feels that by not allowing businesses to have them it not being fair to everybody.

Rosemary suggested that many of our signage by-laws apply to industrial and institutional designations and that commercial was just added.

Kathryn feels that maybe it is the type of banner signs we allow.

Vivienne feels that the Foodland and LCBO –banner signs are distracting.

R B asked the Committee if we strike banners from the by-law and forward same to Council for a decision.

Rosemary suggests we add a time period for a banner sign.

Michael Benner read the definition for number of days & times allowed per year. Section 4.2 c) reads that the town cannot hang banner signs on a pole.

R B suggested that we move forward with this Section written as is and let Council deal with this issue.

Michael Seguin noted that the proprietor is to notify town for 21 days and asked what control we would have.

Michael Benner advised they would have to get a sign permit.

Julia feels if they have to pay for a permit then it would become more of an enforcement issue.

Michael Benner agreed.

Michael Seguin asked if this should be added in the by-law.

Michael Benner advised it is currently in the administration section.

Julia questioned the ground signs in the rural area having a setback of 7.5 metres from the property line. Julie advised that going down Grey Road 2 there are apple orchards that have signs on the fences which are much closer.

Michael Benner agreed that closer to the road might work better.

R B agrees with moving them closer to the road in the rural area. The committee concurred with this change.

Michael Seguin questioned the special events or events section. Michael advised that Community Services handle these types of events and asked if there something in there that speaks to special events signage not requiring permits. Michael asked where we draw the line.

R B asked the Committee what they wish to do. Committee agreed with moving it forward to Council.

Michael Seguin suggested we take out the last portion of this and leave it in for Council discussion.

R B agrees with this change. The Committee concurred that we move forward with banner signs.

Julia suggested that we take special events out of the section of signs not requiring permits and move forward with permits being required.

Michael Seguin questioned any sign other than a special event and asked what we are trying to capture other than a special event.

Michael Benner there are not many special events signage and suggested retailers could install special events sign which advertise 2 for 1 sale and they would not need to get a permit to allow this.

R B suggested that it could be a special event to the store owner and not necessarily to the town.

Michael Benner indicated that special events still require a permit.

Industrial/Institutional signs – changes to lighting. One sign per store front. Each occupant would have a sign over their store frontage.

Projecting signs can project 1.2 metres instead of 1 metre.

Michael Seguin questioned moving forward will we be challenged on this. Michael advised that the past 2 variances challenged us on this aspect. Overhanging signs are the thing of the future in the downtown area and thinks we should allow 1.5 metres and that we prohibit anything larger than that.

R B prefers to see this at 1.5 as well

Vivienne thinks we should restrict it to 1 metre along Bruce Street and suggests that some of the signs are too low.

Michael Benner will check the height limit.

Michael Seguin noted as another alternative could be the projection will be dependent on the height of the sign. Michael suggests a graph be inserted in this section similar to the graph provided with respect to size of lettering.

R B feels that if all signs were the same height, you would only see the first one. R B suggested allowing some flexibility for the business community.

Julia suggested we leave it at 1.2 and deal with them when they come to us.

R B suggested it makes more sense to have it built in up front which means we will deal with less variances.

Michael Seguin advised that he has looked at some of those signs. Michael advised the Parlour is projecting out to 1.5 metres which is not an issue for the downtown area. If we leave it 1.2 metres, we will be continually dealing with this issue.

R B suggests we set an upset limit.

Vivienne questions The Parlour sign being out 1.5 metres.

Joe suggests that 1.5 metre is what we should go to.

R B agrees that an upset limit is not uncommon and businesses do not have to go to the limits.

Rosemary said a business wants the biggest possible sign. She would rather we leave it at 1.2. Rosemary suggested that Joe is saying the business community has one set of interests and public has another set of interests and she does not agree with are separate. Rosemary agrees with telling the guy next door what you are doing.

Vivienne suggested this process was to involve the community. Vivienne advised that there is nobody on this committee who represents the community.

R B disagrees and feels that there has been a lot of community comments that the committee has dealt with in this by-law. R B confirmed that he is the public member on this committee with Julia being appointed by the Chamber of Commerce and Kathryn being appointed by the BIA.

Vivienne suggested that at this point they are not being listened to.

Michael Benner advised that the sign area is not changing in the commercial area being $\frac{3}{4}$ of a square metre. It depends on how far up the building it can go.

R B feels that if we leave it at 1.2 or move it to 1.5, this does not increase the size of the sign.

Joe agreed with changing it to read 1.5 metres

R B agrees with this.

Rosemary asked Michael Benner how the 1.5 metres meet with planning projections on Bruce Street.

Michael Benner advised that 1.5 metres will work. Michael advised there are instances where the architecture required them to get past the cornice so they could hang their sign. To get a 0.75 square face into a 1 metre projection to the wall does not leave you much room. Michael advised that 1.2 metres is still pretty tight.

R B agrees that 1.5 metres would be the maximum limit.

Michael Benner – agrees with 1.5 metres and suggests we increase the height in this section. Increase this to a higher limit of 2.75 metres high and 1.5 metres out from the building.

Michael Seguin noted the shapes & sizes of the buildings that are currently there. Michael feels that the height may vary on each building.

R B suggests this may be more of a safety factor.

Julia suggests that the sign does not need to be from the top and they could go half way.

R B agrees with the limits of 2.75 metres and 1.5 metres out.

Rosemary asked Michael Benner if we could access each historic building on the main street and come to some specifications for each one.

R B advised that would be a lot of work for the height requirements.

Michael Seguin suggested we increase the 2.75 metre to 3 metres.

R B feels the community will appreciate lower rather than higher.

Kathryn agrees that 2.75 metres should work and feels 3 metres will be too high.

Michael Benner agrees with 2.75 metres.

R B asked the Committee what they wanted to do with this section.

Michael Benner agrees with 2.75 metres up at 1.5 metres out.

Michael Benner noted Section 5.1 determination of legal non-conforming signs and suggested the date will be considered to be this when we pass the new by-law. Draft written to insert date that the by-law will be passed.

R B suggested we change erected to approved and insert the date the by-law is passed.

Michael Benner suggested that Section 7 is where we would plug in notice to neighbouring properties.

R B agreed that we have a provision that we provide notice under the Planning Act which is 120 metres. R B noted the Committee of Adjustment makes a decision on applications and forwards notification to Council as opposed to this Committee only making recommendations to Council with Council having the final decision.

Michael Benner suggested this maybe requires a staff report to Committee of The Whole.

Joe asked if we have that choice to determine if this by-law is under the Municipal Act or the Planning Act.

R B suggested it is not different than the Committee of Adjustment dealing with fence variances. Planning Act has notice provisions on each and every application.

Michael Benner advised that this by-law would form part of the Zoning by-law so it would fall under the Planning Act where it would be subject to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board.

R B suggested this is a natural fit.

Rosemary asked if a sign question ever come up before the Ontario Municipal Board.

Michael Benner suggested that way it would be similar to a minor variance.

R B suggested that people would have to think twice for a decision to be made by the Ontario Municipal Board. R B agrees that it does not matter what this Committee does with a variance application, the final decision is made by Council.

R B noted there has been some talk about having the Committee of Adjustment deal with the Sign By-law but suggested it would be 2 years down the road. R B suggested we imbed the notice provisions into this by-law.

Rosemary suggested we cross reference signage guidelines along with the Community Design Guidelines.

Michael Benner suggested that when we look at colour and materials signs are made of, this could be looked at also. Michael advised that as new businesses are approved for the town, they go through a Site Plan Control review process. Previously the Site Plan Approval process did not look at signage. Michael confirmed that with any future new development happening in the Town, they will have to comply with the Sign By-law and this document will be handed to them through the preconsultation process with the Town.

R B advised that this Committee is looking for uniformity with sign by-law control and regulation. R B suggested the new sign by-law will be clearer and better suited to the business community.

Rosemary advised that when Jim Dymont gave the workshop, he recommended a process for existing signs to be removed to adhere to the new by-law.

R B advised that there are provisions for this already in the by-law.

Vivienne asked if we looked at the design aspect for signs on the main street in Huntsville.

Michael Benner advised that the Community Improve Plan prepared by has never been enacted yet and dates back a number of year. Michael confirmed that the façade improvement plans will include signage. Michael advised that some places provide grant money for this type of thing or offer ladder type of increase from residential taxes to business taxes to allow for improvements to signage and buildings.

R B advised that the Property Standards By-law will also kick in. This document could deal with this type of signage also.

Michael advised that Vivienne and Rose have provided comments to him with respect to the Sign By-law and these comments will be forwarded to the Committee. Michael is still awaiting further comments from the LCBO & Blue Mountain Resorts. Michael advised he will address comments received in a report back to the Committee. If the comments are easily addressed, this Committee can recommend approval of the By-law to Council.

R B agrees that we are at a point where we can move forward.

Michael advised that since we changed the by-law once again, he has forwarded the revised document out to the public for 20 days to provide comment. Michael suggests a meeting of this Committee to deal with the changes being made and hopefully forward the recommended document to Committee of The Whole on December 5, 2016.

R B asked if the comments from the public are fine tuning or are there major items for this Committee to deal with.

Vivienne thanked the Committee for their hard work on this Sign By-law document.

R B asked the committee for further comments on the document.

Michael Seguin suggested we look at the criteria with regard to what is minor in nature and what is not.

R B advised that the Planning Act sets out what is minor and what is major.

Michael Seguin suggested we look at the criteria now for what is minor or major now.

R B suggested we rely on the expertise of staff to deal with these issues and suggested this Committee receive very detailed staff reports from Michael with respect to variances.

Michael Benner suggests we look at a variance to the sign by-law the same as a variance to the zoning by-law. Michael confirmed there are four tests under the Planning Act being the Official Plan, general intent of the sign by-law, meet the local character of the community and any financial aspects of the municipality. The report will look more like a minor variance report under the Planning Act.

R B thinks the process Michael is suggesting makes sense.

Michael Seguin thinks this will give more feedback to the public.

E. Adjournment

Moved by: Julia Hinds

Seconded by: Kathryn Brown

THAT this Sign By-law Review Committee meeting does now adjourn at 11:55 a.m. to meet again November 24, 2016 at 1:00 p.m., Town Hall or at the Call of the Chair.