

Sign Industry Workshop

Consultation Summary
Prepared: May 5, 2015

Introduction

On April 20, 2015 from 6pm to 8pm, the City of Toronto hosted a Sign Industry Workshop at the North York Memorial Hall with stakeholders from the First Party and Third Party sign industries. The workshop was held to provide information about proposed by-law amendments to Chapter 694 of the Municipal Code as it relates to Electronic and Illuminated signs, foster conversations amongst stakeholders and City staff, and gather feedback from participants.

Background

The Sign By-law Unit in Toronto Building has proposed amendments to the sign bylaw, Chapter 694 of the Municipal Code as it related to Electronic and Illuminated signs. These amendments were proposed after consultation with industry leaders, stakeholders, and the public in 2013 and 2014. The Sign By-law Unit presented the proposed amendments to the Planning and Growth Management Committee on April 20, 2014. At that meeting, the Planning and Growth Committee passed a motion to "convene an industry workshop to collect feedback and review the recommendations for amendments to Chapter 694 of the Municipal Code." The recommendations for amendments included:

- Reduced maximum brightness levels between sunset and sunrise to 40%
- Reduced allowable light trespass levels by more than 50%
- Establishing separate sign types for all signs displaying electronic copy
- Permit illuminated and non-electronic (alpha-numeric characters changed manually) readograph components for signs for institutional uses in Residential Sign Districts
- Reduced hours of illumination from 11pm to 9pm for signs located in Residential Sign Districts and all signs within 30m of Residential Sign Districts
- No Third Party Electronic signs in CR, C, E, and U Sign Districts
- Expanded public notice reach and expanded consultation

The Sign Industry Workshop was held in response.

Workshop Format

The Sign Industry Workshop was designed by the Public Consultation Unit (PCU) to encourage collaboration and discussion amongst participants, focussing primarily on the seven by-law amendments suggested by the Planning and Growth Committee.

The Workshop was organized around table discussions, a consultation method that the PCU uses for many City projects, particularly when the goal is to solicit feedback from participants on specific issues. Small group discussions, led by City staff facilitators, allowed participants to engage in dialogue with each other at the table and become aware of other issues and opinions. This format has been used by the City on a number of high profile projects, recently including the Richmond-Adelaide Cycle Track Study, the Long Term Waste Strategy, the Toronto Poverty Reduction Strategy, and the Taxicab Industry Review Consultations.

The previous 16 consultation events relating to the proposed amendments have followed a town hall structure. A desire for a more interactive format led the Sign By-law Unit to request the services of the Public Consultation Unit.

After welcoming remarks, the Sign Industry Workshop began with a brief presentation by the Sign By-law Unit to provide information about the proposed amendments, and ensure participants were aware of the history of the project. After the presentation, the floor was opened up for questions. Participants were also notified that if there was interest, there could be an opportunity for all Workshop participants to reconvene after the group conversations and report back on key points of discussion. Receiving no questions or comments, participants were invited to move into small group discussions around three tables, each facilitated by a City staff member.

Overview

Each participant was given a Workbook to help guide conversations. The Workbooks contained seven questions, one prompting discussion of each of the seven proposed amendments. There was also additional space in the Workbook for any additional comments from participants. The role of the table facilitator was to record the group's comments, and to help the discussions remain focussed on the proposed amendments.

Subject Matter Experts from Toronto Building were also available during the table discussions to answer questions and respond to comments.

Stakeholders were asked to submit written comments at the end of the Workshop, or send comments to the project team via email by April 27th, 2015.

Stakeholders engaged in focussed conversations, asked important questions, and provided valuable comments during the Workshop. Many stakeholders also submitted comments via email in the week following the Workshop.

Communications

- The Sign By-law Unit identified stakeholders as representatives of the sign industry who regularly submit applications, and who have been actively involved in past consultations and conversations regarding the proposed amendments
- Invitations to the Sign Industry Workshop were sent to stakeholders via email on April 2, 2015 by the Public Consultation Unit
- Invitations were extended to Councillors by the Sign By-law Unit
- The PCU sent reminder emails on April 13, 2015 to those stakeholders who had not responded to the initial invitation
- 12 stakeholders confirmed via email that they would be attending the Workshop
- Following the Workshop, the presentation and Workbook were sent to all stakeholders who were invited (including those who did not attend) via email on April 22, 2015. This email also encouraged stakeholders to submit comments via email by April 27, 2015

Comment Submissions Received

- 16 stakeholders signed in at the Workshop
- Seven written submissions were received during the comment period via email
- Questions and comments documented through group discussions at the Workshop were also collected and incorporated into the summary of stakeholder feedback

Summary of Stakeholder Feedback: Received During Workshop

Name	Question #1 Brightness levels: Will a 40% reduction in brightness levels impact the use or value of signs in any way?	Question #2 Light trespass: Will a 50% reduction in light trespass impact the use or value of signs in any way?	Question #3 Separate sign types: Will separate sign types for all signs displaying electronic copy help to clarify the by-law and the sign variance application process?
Table 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all signs can be dimmed. • Cost is prohibitive; would have to change fluorescent lights to LED. • Some light sources cannot be dimmed • Brightness has to be in conjunction with dimmer in order to comply with the bylaw. There is a cost factor associated with this. • 500 to 300 nits is still acceptable, but some areas with high ambient light levels like Dundas Square would be too light. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How do you test it? ○ Use foot candles instead of nits to get accurate results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a lux measurement. Where is the measurement being taken from? • The bigger the sign, the further the distance the measurement should be taken from. • Depends where it's being tested could be in compliance or not. Cannot be as objective. • There's a concern that a larger sign may not be in compliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The more flexibility the bylaw provides, the better. • When the bylaw is revised, changes would be highlighted; one document to show what's changed. This would provide for better transparency. • It's such a complex document that having another layer would not make a difference. • There seems to be massive restrictions.
Table 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern re: 40% light reduction will have a detrimental effect on industry generating revenue. 		
Name	Question #4 Institutional uses: What concerns, if any, do you have with allowing illuminated/non-electronic readograph signs in R Sign Districts?	Question #5 Hours of illumination: How will reduced hours of illumination from 11pm to 9pm impact the uses of signs in R Sign Districts, if at all?	Question #6 Third Party Electronic Signs: Are Third Party Electronic Signs appropriate outside of the DS-SSD (Dundas Square Special Sign District), and GG-SSD (Gardiner Gateway Special Sign District)?

Table 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table is generally supportive of this • From an industry perspective, these illuminated/non-electronic readograph signs are replacing the interchangeable signs. • Energy bills are going down and/or staying the same. • Not seeing any problems with theft of letters. • No need to have someone out in the cold changing letters. • Keep with static text with movement and dimming appropriately. • Concern with longer hold times i.e 1.0 minute for first party and 10 seconds for third party. What is the rationale for this? • Cannot communicate too much information in a longer hold time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many commercial uses operate past 9pm. • If it appears as though a sign is not illuminated, could be devastating to a business. • If we have a reduction in brightness levels, why would this be necessary? • The City is asking for too much. • Reduced hours can have an adverse effect on businesses. • Gets darker earlier during the winter, so would not be able to see signs • Important to protect customers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should be allowed elsewhere if they meet requirements. • Only allowing them in two sign districts would be overly restrictive. • Studies have shown that they do not cause accidents. • Should allow them in areas like Yonge & Eglinton, which has high development • The City makes money off of it, so why not explore options. • Have a pilot project to test this out.
Table 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third party industry does not have signs in R sign districts. Picture beside this question in the Workbook shows third party billboard sign; not representative for the sign type in question. 	
Name	Question #7 Public notice: What are the best ways to inform the public and involve them in sign variance applications?	Additional Comments	
Table 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify those that would be most affected and/or impacted by the variance application (instead of blanket distribution) • Distance used could be elongated, instead of radial • Take into account cross-sections. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to determine who best to notify i.e. owner of property or tenant 	
Table 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants have issues with the process; process is not comprehensive, focus of the meeting is wrong. • Meeting is supposed to be a workshop but meeting is just like another consultation seeking comments/feedback. • Meeting has nothing to do with Councillor's motion. Meeting should have Councillors attending and members of the public and industry; more of a 'collaboration' to 'tweak' the bylaw. • Question: who wanted the reduction of third party wall signs? Answer: Staff (Sign Bylaw Unit) wanted the reduction of third party wall signs b/c of direction from Council as well as information gathered from members of the public. • Question: what is the weight being placed on the feedback (forms and comments) received from this meeting? Answer: all comments will be forwarded, as received, in a report prepared by the Consultant Group back to Council. • Question: what is the next step in the process? Answer: see above answer. • Discussion on electronic signs: approval needs 'political variance'. Councillor buy-in is necessary. Councillor must write motion. • Industry representatives want to have a 'real' workshop meeting and are available to do so anytime, even on short notice. • Amendment process change (to yearly reporting) – industry did not get to comment on this change.
Table 3		<p>Variance application/process concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed up the sign variance process • What and how will the changes be off the web? ie how will changes be accommodated on the City's website? • How will S.110 change the variance process? • Do not complicate the (variance) process any further! <p>The definitions of what the sign types are should be specific and clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify definition of static copy = nothing moves/letters • Photos new medium? • Graphics? • Static image?

Summary of Stakeholder Feedback: Received Via Email

Name	Question #1 Brightness levels: Will a 40% reduction in brightness levels impact the use or value of signs in any way?	Question #2 Light trespass: Will a 50% reduction in light trespass impact the use or value of signs in any way?	Question #3 Separate sign types: Will separate sign types for all signs displaying electronic copy help to clarify the by-law and the sign variance application process?
<p>Sign Association of Canada (Table 1 participant) – received April 27, 2015</p>	<p>The Sign Association of Canada’s goal is that EMCs and all signs in general are appropriately legible. Messages that these signs convey can be rendered unattractive and perhaps even unreadable if they are programmed too bright or too dim.</p> <p>When discussing dimming signs two main points need to be kept in mind:</p> <p>a) We recommend that some sign districts (such as the Downtown Yong Street Special Sign District (DYS – SSD) and Dundas Square Special Sign District (DS – SSD)) be given special consideration and the lowest allowable illumination threshold be set higher than the current recommendation of 300 nits. In areas with high ambient light such as the Dundas Square, 300 nits would be too low for the sign to be displayed properly. We would therefore recommend that the regulations for the special sign districts stay at the existing 500 nits.</p> <p>b) While EMCs come with automatic dimming capabilities already, what needs to be kept in mind is that adding dimmers and timers to traditional signage could be</p>	<p>It is our position that measurement of light trespass needs to be consistent.</p> <p>While current recommendation deals with reducing light trespass from 6.5 lux to 3.0 lux above ambient light when measured at a distance of 10 meters, SAC recommends that the distance the light trespass measurement is taken from should vary based on the sign size. Not all signs should be looked at from a distance of 10 meters to measure light trespass. Larger signs/billboards are used in areas with a greater viewing distances, while smaller billboards are used in areas with a shorter viewing distance.</p> <p>The current Sign Bylaw (§694 – 18 E (3)) states: “The illumination shall not increase the light levels within 10.0 meters of all points of the sign face by more than 6.5 lux above the ambient lighting level.” This regulation would only be valid on EMC signs of 8 square feet or less.</p> <p>With respect to EMCs, the Sign Association of Canada recommends that night-time brightness level for on premise EMCs is 0.3 foot candles above ambient light conditions when measured at an appropriate distance. The calculation we recommend for the</p>	<p>The Sign Association of Canada agrees that establishing separate sign types for all signs displaying electronic copy creates more transparency and flexibility for electronic signs, especially electronic static signs.</p>

	<p>challenging and costly.</p> <p>With respect to electrical, to retrofit an existing traditional sign could be tricky. Here's why:</p> <p>i. The sign has been most likely CSA / ESA inspected at the shop meaning that any site alteration done would require a new certification.</p> <p>ii. Depending on the level of work required, a certified electrician may be required – which would mean extra costs.</p> <p>Dimming: When it comes to dimming then the size of sign would have a major impact on the costs.</p> <p>You can only dim non-gaseous, charged illumination. Hence, fluorescent cannot be dimmed. It is typically driven with high output cold start ballast for our colder climates.</p> <p>The options for dimming would be an additional diffuser vinyl layer at a minimum cost of \$500 for a small sign and up to \$15 a square foot for a larger sign. For a larger sign this would be on acrylic signs on the inside surface but would require a new face for flex face type signs at about \$25 a square foot.</p> <p>The other option would be to retrofit fluorescent with LEDs which can be quite expensive.</p>	<p>measurement distance is: $\sqrt{\text{Area of sign in square feet} \times 100}$. This distance measurement was developed by Dr. Ian Lewin of Lighting Services who was commissioned in 2008 by the International Sign Association (ISA) to develop a scientifically-researched, understandable recommendation for EMC brightness. Dr. Lewin is a past chair of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IES), and is greatly respected within the lighting field. <i>[Note: the SAC attached the study to its comments submission to the City of Toronto]</i></p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>Neon is quite often replaced with LEDs as a less expensive long-term option.</p> <p>LEDs can be dimmed in most cases by lowering the output voltage of the power supply. SAC members have replaced 12 volt power supplies with 9 volt to reduce light output by about 40%.</p> <p>Another option is to have dimmable power supply. However, the challenge here will be to have all the dimmable power supplies set to the same level, so the LED are all equally bright.</p> <p>Cost: The sign cost can range from \$500 and up, with the average being around \$1000.</p> <p>Timer: Generally a timer is fairly easy to install and can be installed by an electrician on the primary sign feed. This can be a variable cost pending sign power source, but the most common challenge is to have all the businesses' signs hooked into one timer, so they go on and off at the same time. Timers do not work on EMCs as EMCs must have their own timer or dimmer built in.</p> <p>Cost can range from \$200 - \$300 for simple sign on one circuit, \$300 - \$500 for photocells and around \$2000 for a number of signs to be linked on same timer. Then you also need to add the cost of labour which could be a minimum of 4 hours at \$150 per hour per crew.</p>		
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>Timing is as quick as the business owner can hire an electrician - a couple weeks. No sign permit would be required for this work, possible electrical permit but we do not think so.</p> <p>The above costs take account only of materials and cost of labour. One should also factor in the cost of new permits, taxes, and other installation related costs. In our meeting with Mr. Ted Van Vliet in March 2015, we shared examples of the costs associated with changing a fairly large grocery store sign. In the case we mentioned, the production of a new sign cost around \$10,000, while the cost of taking down the old sign, putting up the new sign, new permits, taxes, closing down a lane of the road, hiring police to direct traffic cost also the same amount – putting the cost of the sign change over \$20,000.</p>		
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Name	Question #4 Institutional uses: What concerns, if any, do you have with allowing illuminated/non-electronic readograph signs in R Sign Districts?	Question #5 Hours of illumination: How will reduced hours of illumination from 11pm to 9pm impact the uses of signs in R Sign Districts, if at all?	Question #6 Third Party Electronic Signs: Are Third Party Electronic Signs appropriate outside of the DS-SSD (Dundas Square Special Sign District), and GG-SSD (Gardiner Gateway Special Sign District)?
Sign Association of Canada (Table 1 participant) – received April 27, 2015	We support having illuminated non-electronic as well as electronic readograph signs permitted in the R districts. We are currently receiving a lot of requests for EMCs for schools and churches. As long as the electronic readograph signs are set at an appropriate illumination level and remain	The Sign Association of Canada supports proper regulation for signs. Provisions 1 and 2 already address sign illumination. If that is done properly and enforced properly, then there is no need to reduce the hours. Protecting and supporting our customer base is very important to us. In our mind,	In our opinion, to be banned from all but these districts seems drastic and extreme. It is our opinion that if Third Party Signs can be controlled via proper regulation, then why not explore other districts as well? Third party signs have done great things for the Dundas Square district.

	<p>static, they shouldn't be invasive or a nuisance to the homes around.</p> <p>These institutions are often hubs for the community and it is very important for them to communicate the different events (bake sales, movie nights, parent council meetings etc.) to the community.</p>	<p>reducing the hours of illumination from 11pm to 9pm can be problematic as it might: have an adverse effect on businesses; pose enforcement problems; and, in some communities, increase security issues. 1) There are restaurants and grocery stores located in residential areas that might be affected by this change. 2) Even if the new regulation will pertain only to the stores that are closed for the day, in our opinion it will be very difficult to monitor and enforce those businesses that are in fact closed during this period. 3) We have had SAC members across the country report to us that having store signage on late has decreased incidences of vandalism in poorly-lit areas.</p> <p>There are already rules and regulations in place that protect the residential areas, so adding another layer of rules just adds more bureaucracy.</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Name	Question #7 Public notice: What are the best ways to inform the public and involve them in sign variance applications?	Additional Comments
<p>Sign Association of Canada (Table 1 participant) – received April 27, 2015</p>	<p>Ideally, the public notice should be sent to those most affected; meaning that it should be done in a lineal way (residences/businesses facing the sign) rather than a radial way – sending a notice to every business/residence in a set radius from the sign.</p>	<p><u>Response to “Electronic and Illuminated Sign Study” Power Point Presentation – Slide 12</u> Currently, the following changes to the Sign Bylaws are being proposed: First Party Electronic Signs in Commercial (C), Employment (E) and Utility (U) Sign Districts Permit first party electronic signs in C , E and U sign districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% of sign face area can display electronic sign copy (5m2 on ground sign, 3m2 on wall sign max) • Only one electronic sign per property • Minimum lot frontage of 100 m • Must be in a location with 10+ tenants • Copy must be in lower 50% of sign face • Minimum setback of 30m from an intersection

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum setback of 60m from R, RA, CR, I or OS Sign District <p>We find that this bylaw amendment would be overly restrictive as it would only apply to a dozen locations in Toronto: Yorkdale, Sheridan Mall, Sherway Gardens, Cloverdale Mall, Peanut Plaza, Scarborough Town Centre, Eaton Centre, Gerrard Square, and maybe a few more in Scarborough and North York.</p> <p>With respect to the 30% cap, we feel the current bylaw effectively manages this and putting in a cap restricts the size and effectiveness on smaller free standing signs.</p> <p>With regards to the requirement that the copy must be in the lower 50% of sign face, the Sign Association of Canada feels that this is an unnecessarily complicated restriction which could affect the effectiveness and visibility of the EMC.</p>
<i>Response from PCU</i>		<p>Many thanks for submitting the Sign Association of Canada's comments.</p> <p>Please contact me with any further comments or questions.</p>
<p>Steve Wolowich, Astral Out of Home (Table 2 participant) – received April 22, 2015</p>		<p>Comment 1: That was the worst example of a workshop ever conducted. That was not a workshop. That was a presentation followed by a questionnaire. The spirit of the councillors motion for an industry workshop was not provided. A workshop should include an exchange of ideas. Collaboration. Dialogue. Discussion. Staff has failed to provide such. And that failure was not accidental. It was deliberate. It was shameful and insulting to the sign industry.</p> <p>Comment 2: [in response to email below from Kate Nelischer, PCU]: Meaning based on Oxford Dictionaries: * Workshop: a meeting at which a group of people engage in intensive discussion and activity on a particular subject or project.</p> <p>Did you hold an Industry Workshop Meeting? I think not!</p> <p>Please register my comments.</p>
<i>Response from PCU</i>		<p>Thank you for your email and comments.</p> <p>We're sorry to hear that you were not satisfied with the format of the Workshop. We designed the event so as to encourage collaboration and discussion amongst participants, focussing primarily on the seven amendments suggested by the Planning and Growth Management Committee. The table discussions format is a consultation method we use for many City projects, particularly when we want to</p>

		<p>solicit feedback on specific issues.</p> <p>The breakout groups weren't meant to simply give participants time to fill out their workbooks as a questionnaire, but to use that time as an opportunity to engage in dialogue with other people at the table, understand other views, and ask questions of the Subject Matter Experts available. Opportunities for questions from the audience were given following the presentation as well. Having smaller groups discuss the proposed amendments was intended to encourage dialogue amongst industry stakeholders, and we felt that most participants engaged in meaningful conversations that were recorded by our facilitators.</p> <p>A copy of the meeting presentation and workbook has also been distributed to those industry stakeholder contacts who were invited to the meeting but who did not attend, in order to gather their feedback as well.</p> <p>We hope that you will also submit your comments and perspective on the proposed amendments.</p>
<p>Sid Catalano, Pattinson Outdoor (Table 2 participant) – received April 23, 2015</p>		<p>As a former employee of the City of Toronto and oversaw the Sign Bylaw for six years and as a member of the sign industry for twenty years I have to say I was offended at the industry work shop held Monday evening</p> <p>This was such an embarrassment to the City and everyone involved. If I had to rate this industry workshop on a scale of 1-10 I'm sorry to say the score would barely pass 1 in my books</p> <p>I was involved in industry workshops in my days with the industry while as an employee with the City of Toronto Planning Department and those workshops were a series of meetings which were beneficial, insightful, meaningful and did bring about results</p> <p>I would be pleased to share those experiences with you but what happened Monday night was utterly shameful</p> <p>I'm very sorry for these comments but in my mind are very sincere given my previous experiences on matters similar to this</p> <p>Feel free to share my comments with the Sign Bylaw Unit, I have no issues with that at all.</p>
<p><i>Response from PCU</i></p>		<p>Thank you for your email and comments.</p>

	<p>I'm sorry to hear that you were not satisfied with the format of the Workshop. The event was designed to encourage collaboration and discussion amongst participants, focussing primarily on the seven amendments suggested by the Planning and Growth Management Committee. The table discussions format is a consultation method we use for many City projects, particularly when we want to solicit feedback on specific issues.</p> <p>The breakout groups were meant to provide an opportunity for participants to engage in dialogue with other people at the table, understand other views, and ask questions of the Subject Matter Experts available. Opportunities for questions from the audience were given following the presentation as well. Having smaller groups discuss the proposed amendments was intended to encourage dialogue amongst industry stakeholders, and we felt that most participants engaged in meaningful conversations that were recorded by our facilitators.</p> <p>A copy of the meeting presentation and workbook has also been distributed to those industry stakeholder contacts who were invited to the meeting but who did not attend, in order to gather their feedback as well.</p> <p>We will be preparing a consultation report for the Workshop that will include an overview of the consultation event, submitted comments, and a discussion summary. This will be available once it is completed.</p> <p>I hope that you will also submit your comments and perspective on the proposed amendments. Please contact me with any questions or comments.</p>
<p>Stephen McGregor, Outfront Media (Table 2 participant) – received April 23, 2015</p>	<p>I attended at Monday's meeting.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the current intention is to bring this matter back to P & G in June, and that this would entail a delay, I will urge your office to re-consider the role you are playing, and should be playing in this matter, and to hosting a genuine workshop which facilitates the exchange of concepts, ideas and proposals.</p> <p>In my view, the maintenance of the integrity of your office demands this.</p> <p>Councillor Colle's motion calls for an industry workshop. That has not yet taken place.</p> <p>I found the process of Monday's meeting profoundly disturbing. To be presented with staff's proposals and to have those proposals followed by a questionnaire with those questions themselves framed in a leading manner, neither satisfies the spirit of the Councillor's motion nor supports its intention.</p>

		<p>You know little of the recent history of the sign industry and its regulators. And you might take it that because we do not “like” the proposals, we chose to take umbrage with the process.</p> <p>This , most assuredly, is not the case. As a matter of fact, there are some of the proposals we would be pleased to see adopted. Conversely, there are many, the implementation of which would be calamitous for us. A true workshop would lead, I would hope, to a more even outcome and a more fulsome and balanced staff report.</p> <p>Further, on behalf of my company, two weeks ago I made a proposal at P & G in regards to the illumination of our signs which I would think would be of tremendous interest to staff and I would be pleased to further explore it. That could be fleshed out were a true workshop be convened.</p> <p>The parameters of a meaningful workshop would be fairly simple; it would start with a roundtable discussion which very well might include interested Councilors. I could make suggestions to you; I could contact Councillors now if you wish.</p> <p>But if the City is interested only in meeting a timeline, and is interested only in saying there was consultation for the sake of being able to say that it took place, then I guess we’ve already had our workshop. And, in that case, a mockery has been made of “process”.</p> <p>Again, I urge your office to push back, and to insist that something meaningful take place.</p> <p>I would be happy to speak directly with you.</p>
<p><i>Response from PCU</i></p>		<p>Thank you for your email and comments.</p> <p>I'm sorry to hear that you were not satisfied with the format of the Industry Workshop. The process was designed to respond to the motion presented at the Planning and Growth Management Committee and encourage collaboration and discussion amongst participants. The Workshop, and the workbooks that were distributed, focussed primarily on the seven amendments suggested by the Planning and Growth Management Committee. The table discussions format is a consultation method we use for many City projects, particularly when we want to solicit feedback on specific issues.</p> <p>The breakout groups were meant to provide an opportunity for participants to engage</p>

		<p>in dialogue with other people at the table, understand other views, and ask questions of the Subject Matter Experts available. Opportunities for questions from the audience were given following the presentation as well. Having smaller groups discuss the proposed amendments was intended to encourage dialogue amongst industry stakeholders, and we felt that most participants engaged in meaningful conversations that were recorded by our facilitators.</p> <p>A copy of the meeting presentation and workbook has also been distributed to those industry stakeholder contacts who were invited to the meeting but who did not attend, in order to gather their feedback as well.</p> <p>We are moving forward with the comments and questions gathered at the Industry Workshop that was held on Monday evening. We will be preparing a Consultation Report for the Workshop that will include an overview of the consultation event, comments submitted by April 27th, and a discussion summary. This will be available once it is completed.</p> <p>I hope that you will also submit your comments and perspective on the proposed amendments. Please contact me with any further questions or comments.</p>
<p>Shailesh Garg, Everest Signs (not present at Workshop) – received April 23, 2015</p>		<p>I am wondering if there are any changes proposed to the max height and sign area allowed for a multitenant and multi-storey apartment rental building in residential district?</p>
<p><i>Response from PCU</i></p>		<p>There are some recommendations in the Staff Report relating to sign face area for signs associated with institutional uses (e.g. community centres, churches and schools) in Residential Sign Districts. The staff recommendation is that the maximum sign face area be limited to 5 square metres for ground signs so that they are not too imposing on the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>There are no specific recommendations relating to multi-tenant buildings.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>
<p>Roy Dzeko, Outfront Media (Table 2)</p>		<p>I was at the Public Consultation meeting on Monday April 20 2015 which was labeled to be an industry workshop and a usual farce run by the Sign Bylaw Unit.</p> <p>I'm still outraged at what the sign bylaw unit did by dragging your well respected</p>

<p>participant) – received April 23, 2015</p>	<p>office into a farce of a meeting and what was supposed to be an Industry Workshop for Amendments to Sign Bylaw 694-10.</p> <p>In the last 3 years the Sign Bylaw Unit has held more than 13 Public Consultation meetings on signs in the City of Toronto .There are no records of the 13 Public Consultation meetings held to include comments by Industry, public or stakeholders. This in itself leads one to believe that the process is not Transparent.</p> <p>We should all ask ourselves.</p> <p>Why was your office not asked by the Sign Bylaw Unit to be present and record opinions of the past 13 Public Consultations meeting about signs?</p> <p>I'm sorry Kate that you have been put in this terrible situation by the sign bylaw unit.</p> <p>There is nothing that you did wrong, however we need to know how we can try to correct the wrong that is being done to us.</p> <p>Do all Public Consultations requested by City of Toronto staff need to be run by your office?</p>
<p><i>Response from PCU</i></p>	<p>Thank you for your email and comments.</p> <p>I'm sorry to hear that you were not satisfied with the format of the Workshop. The event was designed to encourage collaboration and discussion amongst participants, focussing primarily on the seven amendments suggested by the Planning and Growth Management Committee. The table discussions format is a consultation method we use for many City projects, particularly when we want to solicit feedback on specific issues.</p> <p>The breakout groups were meant to provide an opportunity for participants to engage in dialogue with other people at the table, understand other views, and ask questions of the Subject Matter Experts available. Opportunities for questions from the audience were given following the presentation as well. Having smaller groups discuss the proposed amendments was intended to encourage dialogue amongst industry stakeholders, and we felt that most participants engaged in meaningful conversations that were recorded by our facilitators.</p> <p>A copy of the meeting presentation and workbook has also been distributed to those industry stakeholder contacts who were invited to the meeting but who did not attend, in order to gather their feedback as well.</p>

		<p>The Public Consultation Unit is not involved in all City of Toronto consultations, but we were happy to be involved in this Workshop with the Sign Bylaw Unit. We will be preparing a Consultation Report for the Workshop that will include an overview of the consultation event, submitted comments, and a discussion summary. This will be available once it is completed.</p> <p>The appendix of the initial Staff Report in December 2013 and April 2014 includes comments that were received as part of the previous consultation process. You can review this document here:</p> <p>http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2014/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-68026.pdf</p> <p>We hope that you will also submit your comments and perspective on the proposed amendments. Please contact me with any questions or comments.</p>
<p>Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo Ltd (Table 3 participant) – received April 28, 2015</p>		<p>In respect to the proposed amendments to Chapter 694 of the Municipal Code relating to the Electronic and Illuminated Sign Study, we respectfully request that the proposed changes (i.e. the draft By-law) be released for public review in a format/single document where the reader can easily track and compare all the proposed changes to the existing provisions within the in-effect Sign By-law.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of our comments, and we will continue to participate in matters pertaining to the amendment of Chapter 694 of the Municipal Code, and we may provide additional comments as required in the future.</p> <p>Lastly, would you please kindly add my contact details to the notification list of any meetings/decisions with respect to this matter.</p> <p>If you have any questions or require anything further please let me know.</p>
<p><i>Response from PCU</i></p>		<p>Thank you for submitting your comments on the proposed amendments.</p> <p>I have added your information to the project mailing list, and will be sure to send you any updates in the future.</p>