

MINUTES OF TORONTO CITY COUNCIL  
June 23 and 24, 1997

18.42

---

Land Use Committee Report No. 9

Council adopted the following Clauses without amendment.

Clause	Page
1     Variances from Chapter 297, Signs, of the City of Toronto Municipal Code (Wards 4 and 14)	1
3     Site Plan Approval - 164 Eglinton Avenue East (Ward 16)	10
4     Application for consent under Chapter 276, Article 1 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code - 245 Douglas Drive (Ward 13)	14
5     Kensington Market Action Plan (Ward 5)	19
6     Victoria University Lands - Ontario Municipal Board Settlement (Ward 5)	23

18.43

---

Land Use Committee Report No. 9

Clause	Page
2     Variance from Chapter 297, Signs, of the City of Toronto Municipal Code - 3044 Yonge Street (Ward 15)	7

While considering this Clause, Council had before it the following report from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services (June 20, 1997):

Subject: Further Report respecting 3044 Yonge Street: Request for approval of a variance from Chapter 297, Signs, of the City of Toronto Municipal Code to permit one illuminated roof sign (Ward 15).

Origin: Land Use Committee Report No. 9, Clause 2 (p:\1997\ug\uds\pln\cn971229.pln) -jc

Recommendations:

1.     That City Council refuse Application No. 997033, as revised, respecting a minor variance from Chapter 297, Signs, of the City of Toronto Municipal Code to permit one illuminated roof sign.

or

2.     That City Council approve Application No. 997033, as revised, respecting a minor variance from Chapter 297, Signs, of the City of Toronto Municipal Code to permit one illuminated roof sign substantially in accordance with Figures 2 and 3 attached to this report; and
3.     That the applicant be advised, upon approval of Application No. 997033, as revised, of the requirement to obtain the necessary permits from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

Background: On June 5, 1997, the Land Use Committee had before it my report dated May 12, 1997 regarding permission to erect one illuminated roof sign at 3044 Yonge Street. The Committee recommended approval of the illuminated roof sign and requested that I meet with the applicant and report directly to Council on the possible reduction in size and/or illumination of the sign and on the number of applications for sign variance heard by the Land Use Committee, which have circumstances similar to this application.

MINUTES OF TORONTO CITY COUNCIL  
June 23 and 24, 1997

Revised Application:

Following a meeting with the applicant on June 12, 1997, the applicant has agreed to amend Application No. 997033 as follows:

- i) overall sign area reduced from 124 m<sup>2</sup> to 56 m<sup>2</sup>;
- ii) south facing sign (panel 1) reduced in size from 62 m<sup>2</sup> to 19 m<sup>2</sup>;
- iii) south facing sign (panel 1) re-oriented, perpendicular to front wall;
- iv) north facing sign (panel 2) reduced in size from 62 m<sup>2</sup> to 37 m<sup>2</sup>;
- v) sign height (including supports) reduced from 8 metres to 7 metres; and
- vi) light source relocated from bottom of sign to top of sign and directed downwards.

Comments: As outlined in my original report, the proposed roof sign does not comply with Chapter 297 of the Municipal Code in that roof signs are prohibited in all CR and MCR districts. City Council adopted this prohibition on April 24, 1995 based on a study of roof signs along main streets in CR and MCR districts. Roof signs detract from the streetscape and negatively impact the skyline views along our commercial streets and from adjacent residential districts. Signs which were legally erected prior to the passing of the by-law and which do not conform to the current sign provisions of the Municipal Code are permitted to remain with a legal non-conforming status.

At its meeting of April 1 and 2, 1996, City Council adopted By-law 1996-0168 which further amended the sign regulations of Chapter 297 of the Municipal Code by deleting the as-of-right replacement provisions for legal non-conforming signs. City Council adopted this recommendation because it was felt that the continued replacement of non-conforming signs would serve to prolong the lifespan of signs in areas where Council had decided that they are no longer desired (i.e. roof signs in mixed-use commercial/residential districts). Therefore, while the signs' faces and attributes can be changed, no changes are permitted as-of-right to the sign structure, location or height of legal non-conforming signs.

In this instance, the applicant proposes to install a new roof sign structure in approximately the same location as a previously existing sign for the purposes of third party advertising. The sign would consist of two illuminated sign panels oriented south and north-east. As illustrated on Table 1, the south facing panel would have an area of 19 m<sup>2</sup> and would be smaller than the previously existing sign panel. This panel would also be oriented south, perpendicular to the building wall in order to minimize visibility of the sign to visitors in Lawrence Park. The panel facing north-east would have an area of 37 m<sup>2</sup> and would be larger than the previously existing sign panel. However, the overall size of the proposed sign has been significantly reduced from the original application and would be slightly smaller than the previous sign at this location. Unlike the intricate vertical support structures typically associated with roof signs, the proposed sign would be supported by two individual metal posts anchored to the roof of the building. The height of the sign (measured to the top) would not exceed the height of the previously existing sign. Lastly, the applicant has agreed to relocate the light source to the top of the sign panels and directed downwards in order to reduce the potential negative impact that might result.

Since the prohibition of roof signs in CR and MCR districts, I have consistently recommended refusal of traditional roof signs because they detract from the streetscape and negatively impact the skyline views and the adjacent residential uses (see Table 2). I have only recommended approval of roof signs in a few instances, where the classification of "roof sign" was arguably a technical matter resulting from the sign being located partially above the roof level or when it was located fully above the roof level but integrated into the architecture of the building (see Figure 4). The current proposal, while meaningfully improved in terms of its size, height and degree of illumination, is a traditional roof sign in that it would be erected above the roof of the building exceeding the heights of buildings in the immediate area. The sign would still be highly visible from residential uses immediately south and east and represents an intrusion into this largely residential neighbourhood which, in my view, is not appropriate.

Conclusion: In my opinion, the erection of a roof sign at this location would set an unfortunate precedent for other properties in this area and in other CR and MCR districts throughout the city.

For the reasons outlined above and, given the prohibition of roof signs in this district, I am recommending that Council refuse this application, as revised, and adopt Recommendation No. 1 above. Should Council wish to approve this application, as revised, it should adopt Recommendation Nos. 2 and 3 above.

I  
F  
\*  
A  
N  
99  
99  
99t  
99t  
997  
997

\*  
\*\*

**MINUTES OF TORONTO CITY COUNCIL**  
**June 23 and 24, 1997**

Table 1

## Roof Signs At 3044 Yonge Street

	Panel 1 (South Facing)	Panel 2 (North Facing)	Overall Sign Area (Panels 1 +2)	Illuminated	Height * of Sign Above Roof
Removed Sign	43 m <sup>2</sup>	19m <sup>2</sup>	62 m <sup>2</sup>	Yes (shining up)	7m
Proposed Sign	62m <sup>2</sup> -14'x48'	62m <sup>2</sup> -10'x48'	124m <sup>2</sup>	Yes (shining up)	8m
Revised Proposal	19m <sup>2</sup> 10'x10'	37m <sup>2</sup> 10'x48'	56m <sup>2</sup>	Yes (shining down)	7m

\* Measured to top of sign

Table 2

Requests for Approval of a Variance to Permit Roof Signs  
 Considered Since City Council's Prohibition of Roof Signs (April 24/95)

Application No.	Address	Ward	Type of Roof Sign	UDS Rec.	LUC Rec.	City Council Motion
995064	1 Dundas St. E.	6	Traditional **	Refuse	Deferred	N/A
996011	2263 Yonge St.	16	Traditional **	Refuse	Refuse	Approved Aug.12&13/ 96
996019	668 King St. W.	5	Traditional **	Refuse	Refuse	Refused Sept. 16/96
996022	332 Yonge Street	6	Traditional ***	Refuse	Approve	Approved Sept. 16/96
997009	45 Eglinton Ave. E.	16	Integrated *	Approve	Approve	Approved April 14/97
997015	302 Yonge Street	6	Integrated ***	Approve	Approve	Approved April 14/97

\* "Integrated" Roof Sign refers to signs which are located only partially above the roof line and/or which are fully integrated into the architecture of the building.

\*\* "Traditional" Roof Sign refers to signs which are located wholly above the roofline atop of steel supports and which are not integrated with the architecture of the building.