Application by Pattison Outdoor for One Third Party Ground Sign at 161 Skyway Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>June 20, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Etobicoke North (02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File No.:</td>
<td>TP-16-00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBMS File No.:</td>
<td>16-116926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

This report reviews and makes recommendations respecting an application made by Pattison Outdoor (the "Applicant") for one third party ground sign at the premises municipally known as 161 Skyway Avenue. The proposed sign is intended to replace an existing third party ground sign, moved from another location on the subject premises. The previous location of the third party ground sign was authorized by Permit #: 98-084521 (Ref. #: B87148). This current application seeks to authorize the new location.

The Applicant seeks to erect and display one illuminated third party ground sign, containing two sign faces in a back-to-back configuration, each displaying static copy, each 12.20 metres in horizontal width by 3.05 metres in vertical length, oriented both north and south and intended to attract the attention of north and southbound vehicular traffic along Highway 27. The height of the sign is proposed to be 8.23 metres. Illumination of the proposed sign is to be up-lit.

Four variances from the regulations contained in the Sign By-law are required to allow the issuance of a permit for the erection and display of this proposed sign.

Staff submit that all four variances required for the proposed sign should be refused on the basis that not all nine of the established criteria have been met. Staff are of the opinion that the Applicant has failed to meet four of the nine criteria required to be established, namely that the sign: is not compatible with the development of the premises and surrounding area; may adversely affect adjacent premises; will alter the character of the premise or the surrounding area; and, is contrary to the public interest.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Chief Building Official and Executive Director, Toronto Building, recommends that:

1. The Sign Variance Committee refuse to grant the four variances requested to §§ 694-18E(1), 694-24A(10), 694-25C(1)(a) & 694-25C(1)(c) required to allow the issuance of a permit for the erection and display of one third party ground sign described in Attachment 1 to this report.

REQUIRED VARIANCES

Table 1: Summary of Requested Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-18E(1)</td>
<td>All signs may be illuminated provided the sign shall not be up-lit.</td>
<td>The proposed third party ground sign is up-lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694-24A(10)</td>
<td>A third party sign shall not be erected or displayed within 400 metres of any limit of Highway 27 from Highway 401 to Steeles Avenue.</td>
<td>The proposed third party electronic ground sign is believed to be located within the Highway 27 Right-of-Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694-25C(1)(a)</td>
<td>A third party ground sign is permitted provided the sign face area shall not exceed 20 square metres.</td>
<td>The proposed third party ground sign is to contain two sign faces, each with a sign face area of 37.16 square metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694-25C(1)(c)</td>
<td>A third party ground sign is permitted provided the sign shall not be erected within any required setback of a building from a street as regulated by the City's applicable Zoning By-law.</td>
<td>The proposed third party ground sign is believed to encroach within the Highway 27 Right-of-Way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS

SIGN AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

Originally, permission for a third party ground sign was granted through the Building Department of the former City of Etobicoke in 1998 under Building Permit #: B87148, in and around the time the Provincial government downloaded the portion of Highway 27, within the City limits, to the City of Toronto. Between 2003 and 2005, approval was obtained and construction commenced on a place of worship to occupy the majority of the subject premises. It was during this time, or shortly thereafter, that the proposed sign was relocated from its original position to its current position. Numerous complaints have been received by the City, dating as far back as 2007. It is only through the establishment of a dedicated unit to deal with all sign-related matters that this current application is before the Sign Variance Committee. The most recent enforcement action commenced in May 2015, prompting this current application. Figure 1, below, describes the current sign, in situ.
SITE CONTEXT

The subject premises is designated as an E-Employment sign district and is located in Ward 2 (Etobicoke North). It has been improved with a two-storey place of worship, approximately 3,200 square metres in area with 156 parking spaces. The place of worship is operated by the Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church. The subject premises abuts Highway 27, a limited access, high-speed roadway running north and south between Highway 401 and the northern limits of the City. West of the subject premises, across Skyway Avenue, is the Royal Woodbine Golf Club, contributing to the protection and naturalization of the Mimico Creek. East of the subject premises, across Highway 27, are two intersecting hydro corridors and a hydro transformer station. To the south is Highway 401. The subject premises and the location of the proposed sign are within lands regulated by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (“TRCA”). Approval from the TRCA is required to be obtained prior to any permit issued for the proposed sign. Additionally, the proposed sign is located within the Provincial Ministry of Transportation's Corridor Management Area, because of its proximity to Highway 401. Approval from the Ministry is required to be obtained prior to any permit issued for the proposed sign. Finally, the proposed sign may encroach into the Highway 27 Right-of-Way. If the proposed sign does in fact encroach into the Highway 27 Right-of-Way, approval from the City’s Transportation Services Division is required to be obtained prior to any permit issued for the proposed sign.

An aerial view of the subject property is provided as Figure 2 to this report. A sign district map excerpt of the subject property and the surrounding is provided as Figure 3 to this report.
Nine Established Criteria in §694-30A

The Sign By-law contains specific criteria to be used in evaluating an application for a variance. Specifically, §694-30A states that an application for a variance may only be granted where it is established that the proposed sign meets each of the nine established criteria. Staff are of the opinion, that while some of the criteria have been established, there is not a sufficient basis to determine that all nine of the mandatory criteria have been established. Specifically, staff believe that there is an insufficient basis to conclude that the proposed sign
will be compatible with the development of the premises and surrounding area as required by 694-30A(3); that there is an insufficient basis to conclude that the proposed sign will not adversely affect adjacent premises as required by 694-30A(5); that there is an insufficient basis to conclude that the proposed sign will not alter the character of the premises or the surrounding area as required by 694-30A(8); and, that there is an insufficient basis to conclude that the proposed sign is not contrary to the public interest as required by 694-30A(9). Furthermore, there is information that supports the staff position that these four criteria have not been met.

A detailed overview of staff’s opinion on whether each of the nine criteria have been established, and the rationale for this opinion follows below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Criteria Description</th>
<th>Has Criteria Been Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-30A(1): The proposed sign belongs to a sign class permitted in the sign district</td>
<td>YES, staff are of the opinion that this criteria has been established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**
The proposed sign is classified as a third party sign class because it advertises, promotes, or directs attention to businesses, goods, services, matters, or activities that are not available at or related to the premises where the sign is located. The premises is designated as an E-Employment sign district. As such, the criteria has been established because third party signs are permitted in the E-Employment sign district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Criteria Description</th>
<th>Has Criteria Been Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-30A(2): In the case of a third party sign, the proposed sign is of a sign type permitted in the sign district</td>
<td>YES, staff are of the opinion that this criteria has been established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**
The proposed sign is defined as a third party ground sign which is a sign type permitted in the E-Employment sign district. This criteria has been established.
Section/Criteria Description | Has Criteria Been Established?
--- | ---
694-30A(3): The proposed sign is compatible with the development of the premises and surrounding area | NO, staff are of the opinion, that this criteria has not been established

**Rationale:**
The rationale submitted by the Applicant to support the granting of variances references established criteria that was replaced by Toronto City Council in 2013. The Applicant has failed to provide a rationale that would support the criteria that the proposed sign is compatible with the premises and surrounding area. Staff are of the opinion that this criteria has not been established.

The proposed sign is incompatible with the subject premises because the use of the subject premises as a place of worship is not consistent with outdoor advertising or commercial advertising, in general. Places of worship are specially designed structures or consecrated spaces where individuals or groups of people come to perform acts of devotion, veneration, or religious study. Performing acts of devotion, adoration, or religious study is not consistent with the display of commercial advertising.

The proposed sign is also located within the TRCA's regulated area. In regulating lands within these areas, the TRCA seeks to protect, restore and enhance the various watersheds in the Toronto region. A third party ground sign located within the regulated area is not consistent with the objectives and mandate of the TRCA.

Finally, as provided in the Applicant's submission package in Attachment 2 to this report, correspondence from the Ministry of Transportation ("MTO") on July 30, 1998 stated that no MTO permit was required because there was only one sign face, facing north and not visible to Highway 401. This is obviously not the case, as the south-facing sign face contemplated in this current application is the second sign face on the proposed sign and it faces Highway 401. The role of MTO's Corridor Management Office is to, in part, reduce the visual impacts of signs along highways under the jurisdiction of MTO. This current proposal conflicts with that role.

As such, staff is concerned that the proposed sign is not compatible with the development of the premises and surrounding area, and it is the opinion of staff that the Applicant has failed to provide any information to convince that this criteria has been established.

§694-30A(4): The proposed sign supports the Official Plan objectives for the subject premises and surrounding area | YES, staff are of the opinion that this criteria has been established

**Rationale:**
The subject premise is designated as an Employment Area in the Official Plan. Employment Areas are places of business and economic activity. It would appear that there are no Official Plan objectives that would compromise or contradict the current proposed sign.
### Section/Criteria Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
<th>Has Criteria Been Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-30A(5): The proposed sign does not adversely affect adjacent premises</td>
<td>NO, staff are of the opinion that this criteria has not been established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**

As noted above, the proposed sign conflicts with MTO’s policies respecting the management of highway corridors under its jurisdictional control. As per a 1998 communication from MTO's Corridor Management Office, a south-facing sign face is contrary to the policies in that it would be visible to Highway 401.

The Applicant states in the rationale supporting the granting of variances that the existing condition of the proposed sign means that the adjacent premises are not adversely affected. This is a matter of no importance because what was authorized in 1998 is not what is currently existing – it continues to be displayed without a valid permit from either the City, MTO, or the TRCA. Additionally, there have been numerous complaints by the public respecting the proposed sign since as far back as 2007.

Staff believe that the Applicant has not provided enough information to convince that this criteria has been established. Staff also believe that this criteria has not been established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
<th>Has Criteria Been Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-30A(6): The proposed sign does not adversely affect public safety</td>
<td>YES, staff are of the opinion that this criteria has been established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**

Although there are concerns about driver distraction, particularly where these signs are located adjacent to highways, the City has found there is not conclusive evidence that these signs are related to automobile collisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
<th>Has Criteria Been Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-30A(7): The proposed sign is not a sign prohibited by §694-15B</td>
<td>YES, staff are of the opinion that this criteria has been established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**

Prohibited signs are described at §694-15B, and the proposed sign is not a sign prohibited by this section. This criteria has been established.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Criteria Description</th>
<th>Has Criteria Been Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-30A(8): The proposed sign does not alter the character of the premises or surrounding area</td>
<td>NO, staff are of the opinion, that this criteria, has not been established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**
For similar reasons as stated above, the Applicant states that the character of the area is not altered by the existence of a sign since 1998. Staff disagree for similar reasons as also stated above. The various permissions and approvals that are required to be obtained to allow for the proposed sign have not been obtained and the sign has existed for a number of years in contravention of various municipal and provincial policies and regulations.

It is the opinion of staff that the Applicant has not provided sufficient rational to demonstrate how the proposed sign will not alter the character of the premises or surrounding area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Criteria Description</th>
<th>Has Criteria Been Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694-30 A(9): The proposed sign is not contrary to the public interest</td>
<td>NO, staff are of the opinion that this criteria has not been established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**
The Applicant states that the existence of a sign for 18 years means that there is no "evidence to indicate that the sign is contrary to the public interest." Staff disagree with this statement as there has been numerous complaints from the public respecting the proposed sign. In addition, a neighbouring property owner operating a business in the vicinity of the proposed sign has expressed concerns with the application, particularly as it relates to its location within an area-specific restriction, within 400 metres of Highway 27.

It is the opinion of staff that the Applicant has not established that the proposed sign is not contrary to the public interest.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the rationale and materials submitted by the Applicant, a review of municipal policy and regulation, and, a review of the signage and enforcement history respecting the proposed sign, it is staff’s position that the Applicant has not provided enough information to establish that the proposed sign meets all nine of the established criteria for the variances to be granted. Although, information exists to support that some of the criteria have been established, staff are of the opinion that there is not a sufficient basis to establish the proposed sign is compatible with the development of the premises and surrounding area; will not adversely affect adjacent premises; will not alter the character of the premise or the surrounding area; and, is not contrary to the public interest. There is information to support the conclusion that the proposed sign is, in fact, *not compatible* with the development of the premises and surrounding area; *may adversely* affect adjacent premises; *will alter* the character of the premise or the surrounding area; and, *is contrary* to the public interest.
As such, it is recommended that the Sign Variance Committee refuse to grant the four variances from the Sign By-law required for the proposed sign.

CONTACT

Robert Bader
Supervisor, Sign By-law Unit
Tel: (416) 392-4113
E-mail: rbader@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

___________________________
Ted Van Vliet
Manager, Sign By-law Unit

ATTACHMENTS

1. Description of Sign and Required Variance
2. Applicant's Submission Package
ATTACHMENT 1: DESCRIPTION OF SIGN AND REQUIRED VARIANCES

Description of Sign:

One third party ground sign to be located at the premises municipally known as 161 Skyway Avenue containing:

(a) One sign face described as follows:

1. In the shape of a rectangle;
2. Having an area of 37.16 square metres;
3. Having a horizontal measurement of 12.20 metres;
4. Having a vertical measurement of 3.05 metres;
5. Having a height of 8.23 metres;
6. Displaying static copy;
7. Illuminated in an up-lit fashion; and
8. Oriented in a northerly direction.

(b) One sign face described as follows:

1. In the shape of a rectangle;
2. Having an area of 37.16 square metres;
3. Having a horizontal measurement of 12.20 metres;
4. Having a vertical measurement of 3.05 metres;
5. Having a height of 8.23 metres;
6. Displaying static copy;
7. Illuminated in an up-lit fashion; and
8. Oriented in a southerly direction.

Required Variances:

1. The requirement contained at §694-18E(1) which states that all sign may be illuminated provided the sign shall not be up-lit. The proposed sign is up-lit;

2. The requirement contained at §694-24A(10) which states that a third party sign shall not be erected or displayed within 400 metres of any limit of Highway 27 from Highway 401 to Steeles Avenue. The proposed sign may encroach into the Highway 27 Right-of-Way;

3. The requirement contained at §694-25C(1)(a) which states that a ground sign is permitted in an E-Employment sign district, provided the sign face area shall not exceed 20.0 square metres. The proposed sign is to have a sign face area of 37.16 square metres; and

4. The requirement contained at §694-25C(1)(f) which states that an electronic ground sign is permitted in an E-Employment sign district, provided the sign shall not be erected within any required setback of a building from a street as regulated by the City's applicable Zoning By-law. The proposed third party ground sign is believed to encroach within the Highway 27 Right-of-Way.
ATTACHMENT 2: APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION PACKAGE

Application by Pattison Outdoor – 4 Third Party Sign Variances – 161 Skyway Avenue

Application
Sign Variance

Folder No. Date (yyyy-mm-dd)

Project Information
Street No. Street Name Lot No. Plan No.
161 Skyway

Describe the variance(s) being applied for:

If it is an application for a variance required for the modification or restoration of an existing sign, please provide the following:

Existing Sign Dimensions Location
10'x40' BACK TO BACK ON THE PROPERTY SETBACK FROM HWY 27 FRONTAGE

Please provide the reasons/justification for the request (Attach any supporting documentation or additional pages as required):

SEE LETTER

Property Owner Information
First Name Last Name
90 SHERMAN 416-918-3851

Company Name (if applicable)
HOLY R

Street No. Suite/Unit No. Province Postal Code
10, 100 X 534

ONTARIO M9W 5L3

Telephone No. Fax No.
416 213-0344

Attachment Required:

- Sign Variance Data Sheet
- Copies of any supporting documents
- All necessary plans and specifications required to verify the nature of the Sign By-law Variance(s) requested

Continue on next page
Application Information and Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>CATALANO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattison Outdoor Advertising LP</td>
<td>905-282-6846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street No.</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Suite/Unit No.</th>
<th>Mobile No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2900</td>
<td>Matheson Blvd E</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>416-839-5911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Fax No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4W 4V9</td>
<td>905-282-9698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-mail Address: scatalano@pattisonoutdoor.com

Do hereby declare the following:

- That I am [ ] the Property Owner as stated above
  - [ ] the owner's authorized agent
  - [ ] an officer/employee of ____________, which is an authorized agent of the owner.
  - [ ] an officer/employee of ____________, which is the Property Owner's authorized agent.
- That statements contained in this application are true and made with full knowledge of all relevant matters and of the circumstances connected with this application.
- That the plans and specifications submitted are prepared for the sign variance(s) described and are submitted in compliance with copyright law.
- That the information included in this application and in the documents filed with this application is correct.

Signature: scatalano
Print Name: scatalano
Date: January 30, 2016

Continue on next page
This data sheet forms part of an application for a Variance from Chapter 694 of the Toronto Municipal Code, Signs.

### Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Plan No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site and Building Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Lot Frontage</th>
<th>Lot Depth</th>
<th>No. of Building(s) on the lot</th>
<th>Date of Construction of Building(s) if known (yyyy-mm-dd)</th>
<th>Building Height(s)</th>
<th>No. of Storeys</th>
<th>Building(s) Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Use(s)

- PLACE OF WORSHIP

### Site Context

Please describe the land uses, buildings and sign districts surrounding the proposal (use additional pages if necessary).

- **North**: INDUSTRIAL
- **South**: 
- **East**: HWY 40 AND VACANT LANDS
- **West**: W/O SKYWAY - VACANT - GOLF COURSE

### Proposal

Please describe in detail what is being proposed (use additional pages if necessary).
February 3, 2016,

Mr. Robert Bader
City of Toronto Sign Bylaw Unit
100 Queen Street W., Floor 1E
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N2

RE: Sign Bylaw Variance – 161 Skyway Avenue

Mr. Bader:

By way of this letter, I am making application for a minor variance to the City’s Sign Bylaw respecting 161 Skyway Avenue.

The property is located on Skyway Avenue and the property backs onto the Hwy. 27 frontage and south of Meridian Road.

The applicant is seeking to legalize the existing billboard which has been situated on the property since 1998. However since the issuance of the permit the actual location of the sign on the property has been moved.

The applicable variances that pertain to this application is the size of the sign and its proximity to Hwy 27, within 400 metres.

HISTORY

In 1998 a sign permit was issued by the City (B8714B) to erect one (1) 10 by 40 single face, third party ground sign on the property, which at the time was vacant land.

In 2004 a swap was made with Astral Media, whereby they took over ownership of the sign, with Pattison relinquishing its rights of the sign structure. In 2007, Pattison was offered back the sign previously submitted to Astral Media. At the same time the property got developed, but still undetermined as to who built the existing sign, which is now the subject of this sign variance application. Furthermore the sign was relocated to the existing location where it now sits due to development, however there does not appear to be any permits in conjunction with the new location.
Again this application is seeking to legalize the existing billboard which is now located to the north of the property and adjacent to Hwy 27.

The existing third party ground sign has dimensions of 10 feet by 40 feet and it is a back to back sign, meaning two (2) faces, with an approximate overall height of 24-27 feet high.

The variance we are seeking is that the existing sign is within 400 metres of Hwy 27, and the size of the sign

**Why should this variance be granted?**

(1) Is warranted based on physical circumstances applicable to the property or premises

Based on the site plan the existing sign and its component parts are located to the rear of the existing building away from the main entrance. The physical circumstances, i.e. the foot print of the building in relation to the lot provide a suitable non offensive location for the existing billboard.

(2) Is consistent with the architecture of the building or development of the property

The property situated at the northeast corner of the property. The building on the same lot is a place of worship and is an elevated one storey and two storey building. The existing billboard is distanced away from the building thereby not impacting on the building or the architectural features that make up the building itself.

(3) Is consistent with buildings and other features or premises within 120 metres of the location of the proposed sign

Apart from the building on the subject property and buildings to the immediate north, the remainder of the surroundings is vacant lands and a golf course to the west of the property.

(4) Will not alter the essential character of the area

There has been an existing ground billboard on this property since 1998 when the lands were completely vacant. In about 2006-7 the church was built on the property. I do not see the alternate location where the billboard presently sits as altering the character of the area, as there always was a billboard on this site since 1998.

(5) Will not adversely affect adjacent properties
Again, as mentioned in the point above with respect to the character of the area, the long existence of a billboard since 1998 will not adversely affect adjacent properties, as we are dealing with an existing situation.

(6) WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT PUBLIC SAFETY

The existing sign, being in existence since 1998 and in the alternate location since about 2006-7, has not generated any concerns from the public and usually the public will voice their concerns if there is issue with the existing billboard. To date our office is not aware of any complaints or concerns from the public.

(7) IS IN THE OPINION OF THE DECISION MAKER: NOT CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST

If this were a new sign and not existing, it may be contrary to the public interest in so far as the public perceives signs within proximity of Hwy 27 to have an impact on traffic. Again in the 18 years the existing sign has been here, there has not been evidence to indicate that the sign is contrary to public interest.

(8) IS OF A SIGN CLASS OR A SIGN TYPE THAT IS PERMITTED IN THE SIGN DISTRICT WHERE THE PREMISES IS LOCATED

The property at 161 Skyway Avenue for purposes of the new City Sign Bylaw is zoned U for Utility District which permits third party ground signs.

(9) IS NOT EXPRESSLY PROHIBITED BY SUBSECTION 694-15B

The existing sign or the alteration of the sign we are seeking is not expressly prohibited by Subsection 694-15B.

We believe the variance sought in this instance based on the nine listed criteria above is within the general intent and spirit of the City’s new Sign Bylaw. We look forward to discussing the matter further before the City’s Sign Variance Committee.

Yours truly,

Sid Catalano
Pattison Outdoor Advertising LP
Application by Pattison Outdoor – 4 Third Party Sign Variances – 161 Skyway Avenue

TORONTO - Etobicoke Civic Centre

BUILDING PERMIT

This card must be kept posted in a conspicuous place on the site of construction.

Owner BISHOP MAR EMANUEL

Site address 161 SKYWAY AVENUE

Date of issuance JULY 2, 1998

Yaman Uzumeri, P. ENG
Chief Building Official

Bruce Ashton, P. ENG
Deputy Chief Building Official
Ontario

Corridor Management Office
1st Floor, Atrium Tower
1201 Wilson Avenue
Downview, Ontario
M3M 1J8

July 30, 1998

Mr. Just Cole
Pattison Head Office
Edison Centre
2345 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M4P 2E5

Dear Mr. Cole:

Re: amendment to my letter of July 29, 1998
your fax of July 1, 1998, requesting MTO clearance
161 Skyway, Etobicoke

I have re-assessed the noted proposal and site specifics, and as you pointed out, the subject site is vacant of buildings. MTO has no objections to the proposed single faced GROUND sign, based on the assumption that the sign will face in a north easterly direction and will not visible from Hwy. 401. Once the sign is placed, however, and it is determined by MTO that it is visible from the provincial highway, the prompt removal of the visible sign will be the responsibility of the respective landowner, with no compensation by MTO. I trust that "PATTISON" will make the landowner aware of this condition.

This location appears to be, not visible from Hwy. 401, and installation may proceed without MTO permit. Thank you for this inquiry. Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Lisa Cole,
Permits Officer