



# Minutes

## Sign By-law Committee

**Meeting Date:** October 12, 2016  
**Meeting Time:** 9:00 a.m.  
**Location:** Infrastructure and Public Works/Planning and Development Services  
 Committee Room – Second Floor  
**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, except for Michael Seguin. Leslie Lewis attended on behalf of the BIA given the resignation of Gary Nordeman.

Also present was Michael Benner, Director Planning & Development Services, Julia Richards, Applicant and Sharon Long, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services.

- **Approval of the Agenda**

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

THAT the Agenda of October 12, 2016 be approved as circulated, including any items added to the Agenda, as amended, CARRIED.

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

**Joe Halos declared this as he had a conflict with respect to the Cidery Sign.**

- **Previous Minutes**

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

THAT the Sign By-law Review Committee minutes of August 8, 2016, be adopted as circulated, including any revisions to be made, CARRIED.

### B. New and Unfinished Business

#### D.1 New Sign By-law Update

Michael Benner gave an update to the new sign by-law following the October 3, 2016 Committee of The Whole meeting. The report was received by the Committee of the Whole with some recommendations for additional clarification. They would like the Sections of the by-law added to the Definitions section of the by-law. Michael advised that a proportional sign to look at the lettering size would be the Masaba sign on Grey Road 40.

Joe Halos advised that he has been through this by-law a lot and there has been a good amount of public consultation and public meetings. Joe questioned if you are a new business and want to put up a sign, he questions if they will get that. Joe agrees that adding the above noted items will make this by-law more user friendly.

R B Waind advised that he is hoping that once the by-law is adopted and an applicant comes to the town and sees what is there and what the requirements are. R B feels that we have basically touched as many of the issues as we can and suggests that most of the variances that this Committee has been dealing with are now addressed through the new by-law. R B agrees we want a business friendly by-law where we have some control so there is not garbage all over the place and there is some uniformity.

R B Waind suggested that based on some of the comments, with the fine tuning and tweaking, as long as it is covered off in the by-law, there will be buy in from the public. R B agrees that the proportionality signage needs to be dealt with. If you have a huge building and a tiny sign, it will look like it does not belong. Generally speaking businesses tend to be the little store front signs but there are locations where there are standalone buildings etc. R B agrees that a small sign on a large building will have no impact.

Michael Benner advised that these are good comments and likes the idea of proportionality.

Julia Hinds suggests that we have proportionality already in the by-law.

Michael agrees when we deal with facades or awnings and suggests we can use this test for the ground signs.

Julia agrees that a large mall is different.

R B advised that the Thornbury community wants to keep the brand.

Joe feels that half of what we do is variances of some sort and agrees that the Policy sets the middle road but advised that every application is different. Joe confirms that residents should be able to address their local government to deal with these situations.

R B confirmed there has been a large amount of input from the public with respect to this by-law. At the end of the day the bulk of the people were satisfied and this Committee received input from the BIA and the Chamber of Commerce as well as public input.

Michael Benner advised that the revised by-law will come back to the Sign By-law Committee prior to going to Council.

Joe Halos asked Leslie from the BIA for her comments on the sign by-law.

Leslie questioned how things are considered when there is a variance and how it is grouped if it building to building or façade to façade.

R B advised that staff work from the by-law to see what is allowed. If the by-law does not address the content required, or if there is some small aspect that cannot be met for

reasons of construction or preference, it will require a variance to the by-law. R B confirmed that the Committee only makes recommendations to Council.

Joe Halos noted the percentage of trademarking allowed on signage.

Leslie asked if new businesses are directed to the sign by-law or are they given this when they are new to town.

R B thought this was a good idea that it would be worth taking a look at.

Leslie suggested that maybe this is something that the BIA may be able to handle when a new business comes to town.

Joe confirmed that often times it is covered off through the Site Plan approval process.

R B agreed that if there is a new venture in a new location and a new building, it will require site plan review. If it is an existing building, then the current rules will apply.

Michael Benner advised that he just met with a person interested in purchasing the vacant land between Mac's and the new LCBO. At the meeting they were given the zoning by-law and sign by-law. Michael advised this will be a new build and he can design it within the new sign by-law in mind. Michael confirmed that he will be taking over the Site Plan approval process himself.

**Moved by: Joe Halos**

**Seconded by: Julia Hinds**

THAT the Sign By-law Committee recommend that Council authorize that staff revise the Sign By-law as discussed at the Sign By-law Review Committee meeting on October 12, 2016; and

THAT Council authorize that the revised Sign By-law go back to the Sign By-law Review Committee for approval, CARRIED

## **C. Staff Reports, Deputations, Correspondence**

---

### **C.1 PDS.16.121 – Thornbury Cidery, 90 King Street Sign By-law Variance**

Joe Halos vacated the meeting and did not participate in discussion.

Michael Benner presented the staff report to the Committee with respect to the Thornbury Cidery variance. Michael confirmed that the ground sign complies with the by-law.

Julia Richards from Thornbury Cidery advised that the signs are made out of tin but have a wood background. Julia confirmed they are not internally lit so it complies with the by-law. Julia noted that the large Thornbury sign is already on the building.

Michael advised that the By-law does say you are allowed on sign per exterior face of the building and confirmed the cidery lands are two parcels.

Michael noted that the variance request is for the projecting signs which will face Arthur Street. The variance speaks to the idea of two signs as opposed to one and the projection of the sign is more than the by-law permits.

R B Waind noted that it is not unlike a residential dwelling unit having two accesses on a street where they are limited to the size of the frontage. R B suggested that the size of this building is huge and smaller signs would not be seen. If it were located in the downtown area, businesses could have access this building on Bruce Street. R B suggested that given the circumstances, two signs makes perfect sense and proportionality these signs will look good.

Julia Hinds questioned why they would have two signs instead of one.

Julia from Thornbury Cidery suggested that a smaller sign will not show up and you would not see the address on the sign. You will be able to make out the logo when it is the size as indicated.

R B read the comments received from a ratepayer with respect to this variance. R B suggested that the same group did indicate that some tweaking would be required.

R B suggested we bear in mind what is the impact on the by-law on the municipality by allowing the variances. R B suggested that under circumstances, it is better to have a little bigger sign rather than a smaller one. R B agreed he is prepared to recommend that Council approve it.

Julia Hinds suggested that proportionally she agrees with the size of the signage on this large building and suggested that balance makes sense.

Julia noted that the Thornbury Cidery is a huge building.

R B suggested that at one time, this building was the cornerstone of Thornbury and the business community.

Leslie suggested that beautification of signage can enhance the building. This is a form of advertising.

Michael Benner confirmed that this building is the anchor from a Planning perspective and suggested it defines you are now in the Town of Thornbury. Michael advised that future plans for this building are amazing and suggested this building will be a show piece for Thornbury.

Julia suggested it is good advertising for Thornbury for suggested it will drive the market for all of Thornbury.

Julia from the Cidery advised they are a growing business and the building will showcase exactly what we are. Julia advised that extra signage will be important.

R B advised that he is happy to see something happening with this building and looks forward to this building becoming a show case in Thornbury.

Julia suggested that she felt Rosemary Gosselin was upset with bright and large signs. Julia suggested this signage is more in keeping with downtown Thornbury.

R B advised that you could have the same building in another location and there could be 10 businesses in the building all wanting signs. R B agrees with approving this variance.

B.1 PDS.16.121 – Thornbury Cidery, 90 King Street Sign By-law Variance

Moved by: Julia Hinds                      Seconded by: R. B. Waind

THAT the Sign By-law Review Committee receive Staff Report PDS.16.121 “Thornbury Cidery, 90 King Street Sign By-law Variance.

AND THAT Council approve the Thornbury Cidery Sign Bylaw variance request as follows:

To permit two (2) projecting signs extending 1.397 metres from the Arthur Street wall face whereas Section 4.05(3) and Section 4.05(3)(a)(3) of Sign By-law No. 2001-57, as amended, permit a maximum of one sign per building frontage and a maximum projection of 1.0 metre for projecting signs, CARRIED.

**D. 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.

**E. Adjournment**

---

Moved by: Julia Hinds                      Seconded by: R. B. Waind

THAT this Sign By-law Review Committee meeting does now adjourn at 9:50 a.m. to meet again at the Call of the Chair.