

Bloor Street East Neighbourhood Association (BENA)
388 Bloor Street East, Suite 503
Toronto, Ontario M4W 3W9
info@blooreast.org

The Secretariat of
Planning and Growth Management Committee
10th Floor, West Tower, City Hall
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, On M5H 2N2

by email:
pgmc@toronto.ca

April 10, 2015

Dear Members of the Committee:

Re: **Agenda Item PG3.2 Sign By-law Enforcement: Potential Amendments to the City of Toronto Act, 2006**

The Bloor Street East Neighbourhood Association, an incorporated non-profit organization, represents residents and businesses along the Bloor Street Corridor from Yonge Street to the west to Parliament on the east, Selby and Charles to the south and the Rosedale Valley Ravine to the north.

We are zoned Commercial Residential for the purposes of the Sign By-law and are largely not within the boundaries of a BIA. We have large multinational corporate headquarters, churches, mixed use condominiums, single purpose residential towers as well as single family dwellings within our footprint.

We are in support of the recommendation to request the Province to remove Section 110(1) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 from the said Act.

- The City of Toronto is evolving rapidly and needs to adapt to the rapidly changing conditions. Areas, including ours, that were previously primarily commercial are rapidly evolving to a greater residential component. The City needs to respond in a timely fashion to these changing needs. The current legislative environment does not allow for a timely response to the growth in population nor the environmental trends.
- The City of Toronto should have control of both making and changing its by-laws. To be able to enact a by-law then not be able to change simply does not make any sense.
- Removal of the Section and the enactment of one harmonized by-law can save taxpayers money by having only one set of by-laws to enforce. The administrative difficulties and therefore additional costs to administer are articulated in the Staff Report.

We further request that the Committee consider harmonizing the sign illumination regulations with other forms of exterior illumination. The report on page 8 states:

“Members of the public expressed concern with signs located close to residential developments. The primary concern was the brightness of signs and hours of illumination”.

The issues relating to the illumination of signs under grandfathered by-laws are articulated in the report on pages 8 and 9.

However, from our experience, not all illumination complaints relate to signs nor is there an appreciation of what is regulated under the sign by-law and other by-laws when the sign is included in a comprehensive design plan or part of a development plan with no sign. These should have some co-ordination of regulation. Utilizing the research and technical expertise used by the Sign Department to develop guidelines for other illumination again can save the taxpayers money and demonstrate to the Public the cross co-ordination of City departments.

Due to our experiences with two illumination features on the top of Condominium developments, we request that the Committee review and carefully consider where these signature features belong within our changing City and what types of regulations should apply.

We do support and understand the need for lighting, where its function is to provide safety and security for property, traffic, and pedestrians (and we are cognisant that pedestrian lighting is not adequate in various parts of the City). However, illumination at the top of a building does not function to provide safety and security. Illumination should be located and dedicated to the areas of need.

Respectfully Submitted on behalf of BENA;

Linda Brett, President BENA
c.c. Councillor Wong-Tam
Councillor McConnell
BENA Executive