

Re SB 2.1.4  
SB 2.2.4

Gus Galanis - Sign Variance Committee, 27th July mtg: re File TP-10-00001/2 IBMS File # 10-188846 & 66, property 1581-1589 The Queensway

From: "John Faiczak" <jfaiczak@aea.on.ca>

To: <sbc@toronto.ca>

Date: 7/26/2010 4:39 PM

Subject: Sign Variance Committee, 27th July mtg: re File TP-10-00001/2 IBMS File # 10-188846 & 66, property 1581-1589 The Queensway

Dear committee members.

From: John Faiczak, property owner at 1600 The Queensway.

Please consider the following regarding this application for Variance.

A) Re: Architectural consistency or consistency with Development of property

The Variance is not consistent with either of these, especially the Development of the property and the immediate building properties.

Does the application start the process of providing a green light to others in the area to also seek approval on such exaggerated Variance??

B) RE: Consistency with other features or properties within 120 meters?

Absolutely Not!

This Building is the only one in the area, ..... already with a roof sign!

C) RE: Will not alter the essential character of the area

Yes, It will promote this type of secondary income stream at the expense of the area property owners ,,,, and the safety of Highway users ... see issues below

D) RE: Will Not adversely affect Public safety

Public safety will be affected!!!!

At 17 meters ( close to 55 feet), compared to the required 400 meters ( more than 1300 feet) separation

between highway and signage, a serious violation of this requirement is requested.

The separation will be reduced by approx 88%. WOW!

The Area of proposed sign is over 200% greater than the requirement

The height of the proposed sign is over 110% greater than the requirement

Both of these items create a much greater distraction to highway users.

*With Respect, this committee has a responsibility to have approval of the highway Authority for this Very Substantial variance.*

*Would the city be Liable for this variance should a citizen claim that the signage was A key factor of distraction in the accident.*

E) RE: Is the sign, in the opinion of the committee, not contrary to the Public interest?

I trust you will agree that this variance is entirely contrary to Public interest

Thank you for your attention to these comments.

I trust you will make a reasonable and responsible decision.

Best regards John Faiczak, P.Eng