



VIA EMAIL

June 17, 2015

Planning and Growth Management Committee
c/o Nancy Martins
City Hall, 100 Queen Street West, 10th Floor
Toronto, ON
M5H 2N2

Attention: Ms. Nancy Martins, Administrator

Dear Members of the Committee:

**Re: PG5.13 Electronic and Illuminated Sign Study and Recommendations
for Amendments to Chapter 694
Preliminary Comments on Behalf of Choice Properties Real Estate
Investment Trust (CP REIT)
Toronto, ON**

Our File: CHO/GEN/14-01

We are the planning consultants for Choice Properties Real Estate Investment Trust ('CP REIT') for the proposed changes to the Sign By-law contained within the above-mentioned item to be considered at the Planning and Growth Management Committee on June 18, 2015.

CP REIT is the owner of substantial land holdings within the City of Toronto.

On behalf of CP REIT, we provide the following preliminary comments:

- We are encouraged by the inclusion of draft provisions permitting first party electronic signs within the C-Commercial and E-Employment Sign Districts. However, we have some general concerns, as follows:
 - It is our submission that draft provisions should be included to permit first party electronic signs within the CR-Commercial Residential Sign District, especially since proposed changes to the Sign By-law are contemplated to permit third party electronic wall signs within the CR-Commercial Residential Sign District. Some commercial properties within the CR-Commercial Residential Sign District are suitable candidates for electronic signage given that they have large lots which would allow for electronic signs, especially electronic wall signs, to be located well away from residential properties. We therefore respectfully request that draft provisions be included to permit electronic wall/ground signs within the CR-Commercial Residential Sign District;

- As per draft Sections 694-21C(7)(h) and 694-21C (8)(h)), permitting only one electronic wall or ground sign per premise is considered overly restrictive and reduces the flexibility for the owners/occupants of large sites with multiple frontages. It is our submission that with the inclusion of draft provisions to control light trespass and illumination levels, and require a minimum distance from any Residential Sign District, that this draft provision is unnecessary and should be removed;
- As per draft Sections 694-21C(7)(j) and 694-21C (8)(j)), only permitting the display of electronic copy on the lower 50 percent of the sign face area of an electronic wall or ground sign is overly restrictive, especially given the inclusion of draft provisions to control light trespass and illumination levels, and require a minimum distance from any Residential Sign District. Limiting the display location of sign copy will unreasonably limit the signs exposure/visibility to the public. We respectfully request that this draft provision be removed, or revised to allow for the unrestricted display of copy on the sign face area;
- As per draft Sections 694-21C(7)(m) and 694-21C(8)(m)), only permitting an electronic wall or ground sign on a property with a lot frontage of at least 100 metres is overly restrictive and reduces the flexibility for the owners/occupants of smaller sites. We respectfully request that draft provisions are included to permit a range of sign sizes, based proportionately of the length of the lot frontage (as currently exists in the Sign By-law);
- As per draft Sections 694-21C(7)(n)[1] and 694-21C(8)(n)[1]), only permitting electronic wall or ground signs within a C-Commercial Sign District where the commercial development contains ten or more units is unreasonable. Clarification is requested from Staff as to why “ten” units is considered the appropriate number. It is our submission that with the inclusion of draft provisions to restrict the total number of electronic signs to one (1) per premise, to control light trespass and illumination levels, and require a minimum distance from residential properties, further restricting signage based on the number of units on a property is unnecessary. We therefore respectfully request that this draft provision is removed; and
- Further, there is inconsistency in the wording “10 separate occupancies” in draft Section 694-9H and the wording “10 or more units” in draft Sections 694-21C(7)(n)[1] and 694-21C(8)(n)[1]). Clarification regarding this inconsistency is requested from Staff.
- We are encouraged by the inclusion of draft provisions permitting third party electronic signs within E-Employment, C-Commercial, CR-Commercial Residential and U-Utility Sign Districts. However, we have some general concerns, as follows:
 - As per draft Section 694-25 B(1)(a) and (b), the current permitted sign face area and height for Third Party non-electronic wall signs in a CR-Commercial Residential Sign District are unreasonable reduced. We respectfully request that the current provisions for sign face area and height for third party non-electronic wall signs are maintained;

- As per draft Section 694-25C(2)(d), only permitting an electronic ground sign within the E-Employment Sign District to be located outside the required building setback will unreasonably limit the signs exposure/visibility to the public. We respectfully request that a standard minimum distance from the property line be included instead (e.g. 2.0 m from any property line, as currently exists for first party ground signs in the E-Employment Sign District – see Section 694-21E(3)(e));
- As per draft Section 694-25C(2)(h), permitting only one ground sign or electronic ground sign per premise within the E-Employment Sign District is considered overly restrictive and reduces the flexibility for the owners/occupants of large sites with multiple frontages. It is our submission that some sites are suitable candidates for both electronic and non-electronic ground signs given that they have large lots with multiple frontages, and with inclusion of provisions to control light trespass and illumination levels, and required minimum distances from residential properties and intersections, it is our submission that this provision is unnecessary and should be removed.
- The City's recently adopted recommendation to request the Province to amend Section 110(1) of the City of Toronto Act (i.e. remove "grandfathering" rights for signs and billboards erected lawfully prior to April 2010) could allow the City to apply the proposed draft illumination requirements to all existing lawful signs. Given the traditional nature of some CP REIT signs, it may not be possible to conform to the City's proposed light trespass and illumination levels without significant physical modification and expense to do so. Whilst we remain strongly opposed to the removal of grandfathering rights for existing lawful signs, we respectfully request that as part of any future revision to the Sign By-law, a suitable transition period (i.e. at least 10 years) is included to allow sign owners suitable time to fully comply with the Sign By-law.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments, and we will continue to participate in matters pertaining to the amendment of the Sign By-law. We may provide additional comments as required in the future. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with Staff to discuss our preliminary comments.

Lastly, would you please kindly add the undersigned for notification of any meetings/decisions with respect to this matter. Should you have any questions, or require further information, please do not hesitate to call.

Yours very truly,

ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD.



Dave Hannam, BRP
Senior Planner

Cc. Kathy Kakish, CP REIT (Via Email)