

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 10, 2013

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg
Daryl Condon
Walter Francl
David Grigg
Phil Mondor
Goran Ostojic (Not present Item #1 & excused Item #2)
Norm Shearing (Chair)

REGRETS:
Vincent Dumoulin
Joseph Fry
Veronica Gillies
Bruce Hemstock
Joseph Hruda
Peter Wreglesworth

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1568 East King Edward Avenue (formerly 1526-1560 Kingsway)
2.	2290 Main Street
3.	4139-4187 Cambie Street
4.	2803 West 41 st Avenue (Crofton Manor)
5.	Sign By-law Review

BUSINESS MEETING

The business meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m. and the Chair gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on March 25, 2013 where 557 East Cordova Street and 155 East 37th Avenue were presented to the Board and approved. He also gave an overview of the Development Permit Board Meeting on April 8, 2013 where 803 West 12th Avenue, 800 Griffiths Way and 685 Pacific Boulevard were presented to the Board and approved. Chair Shearing then called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1568 East King Edward Avenue (formerly 1526-1560 Kingsway)
 DE: 416646
 Description: Concurrent rezoning and development proposal for a 6-storey mixed-use building containing 655 m² (7,056 square feet) of commercial space and 4,601 m² (49,529 square feet) of residential. The proposal includes a total of 77 rental units, with a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.87, a maximum height of 23.6 m (77.5 feet), and 47 parking stalls at grade and underground. The rezoning application is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy.
 Zoning: C-2 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning/Complete
 Architect: GBL Architects
 Owner: Richard Wong
 Review: First
 Delegation: Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Architects
 Senga Lindsay, Senga Lindsay Landscape Architects
 Staff: Yan Zeng and Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-5)

- **Introduction:** Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning and development permit application under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy. The rezoning is from the existing C-2 to CD-1. The subject site is within the Kingsway and Knight Neighbourhood Centre and is just down the street from the development known as the King Edward Village condo development. Ms. Zeng noted that that the single family homes surrounding the neighbourhood centre were rezoned from RS-1 to RM-1 and RT-10 in 2005 to allow for ground-oriented housing alternatives. The particular sites located across the back lane are identified in the RM-1 zoning to permit 3-storey apartments.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting C-2 is what the site is currently zoned for and allows for 4-storey mixed-use apartment buildings. Under this zoning a setback of twenty feet for the second and third storey and a further setback of fifteen feet from the rear property line for the fourth floor would be required. This was built in to the zoning to reduce the impact of shadowing, overlook and privacy concerns for those RS-1 properties across the rear service lane. Mr. Cheng mentioned that there wasn't a rezoning policy placed on the Kingsway properties for up zoning, however this proposal is coming from a City wide rezoning policy under the Rental 100 policy. This policy states for C-2 prosperities, six storeys could be a possibility, but subject to urban design criteria.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. This rezoning application proposes a 6-storey building on what is currently zoned for 4-storeys. Further, the rear yard setback for the residential component is consistently 20 feet, whereas for a C-2 building, a further rear yard setback of 15 feet would be required for the 4th storey to address overlook, privacy and shadowing onto the properties located across the service lane.

Taking into consideration the shallow nature of the subject site and the zoning of the properties located across the lane which allows 3-storey apartment buildings, does the panel have any concerns of the proposed building height and form with respect to overlook, privacy and shadowing onto neighbouring properties?

2. Does the proposal provide sufficient visual interest for the south elevation?
3. Does the Panel have any concerns with the resulting party wall that extends above the building located directly due east, as seen from the public realm?

Ms. Zeng and Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that there will be no overshadowing to the south. He said the massing of the project reflects the mix of uses in the building. The commercial frontage is set back slightly from the building above to allow for a street wall expression along the street. There is a four foot setback for the residential component above however the balconies extend to the property line. The residential entrance is on King Edward because of the more residential character of the street and allows for a continuous commercial frontage along Kingsway. Mr. Eisenberg described the colour palette noting the charcoal coloured brick in contrast with white brick on the frames. There will be enclosed balconies on Kingsway and a continuous row of balconies on the south elevation. As well he described the sustainability strategy for the project noting the enhanced envelope, minimized glazing and a green roof. Mr. Eisenberg explained that 25% of the units are designed for families and are located at the patio level facing south.

Senga Lindsay, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and indicated that currently the streetscape will have a series of street trees. The back side of the building where all the patio spaces are located will have an edible landscape theme.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve neighbourliness;
 - Design development to soften the building expression on the south elevation;
 - Design development to the party wall;
 - Design development to improve the landscaping plans.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal as they felt the expression was not bold enough to take advantage of its location. There was concern raised regarding the roof line with some members questioning the proposed form commenting that the overall design would be more cohesive with a flat roof.

The Panel supported the height, form and massing but thought the proposal lacked neighbourliness. As well they thought the parking entry at the rear of the building and the long solid concrete parkade wall along the property line needed further design development to minimize its impact on the neighbouring properties. One Panel member

suggested depressing the first planter to reduce the amount of concrete. The Panel was also concerned with over shadowing given the location.

One Panel member noted that the south-facing balconies serve their purpose and are well modulated but could be developed a little further. Some Panel members had some concerns regarding the store fronts and felt the expression needed to allow subdivision of the CRU space rather than a continuous storefront.

The Panel thought the party wall on the east façade seemed unfinished and should have some sort of architectural relief. Some Panel members wondered why the Kingsway façade was treated differently from the King Edward façade within the frame and felt they should be the same.

Most of the Panel did not support the landscape plans and thought the lane could benefit from some vegetation and as well they thought the Kingsway side should have a different approach to the landscaping than the King Edward side.

The Panel thought the proposal was lacking in detail as a development permit application and would have liked to have seen more details in the applicant's package.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Eisenberg said he agreed with the comments from the Panel.

2. Address:	2290 Main Street
DE:	Rezoning
Description:	The proposal is for a 9-storey mixed-use building with 89 residential units. The proposal includes a floor space ratio (FSR) of approximately 4.92 (including 0.43 for commercial use), a floor area of 7,970 m ² (85,789 square feet) and a total height not exceeding 30.16 m (99 feet) to the highest habitable floor level from average grade.
Zoning:	IC-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Arno Matis Architecture
Owner:	Amir Virani
Review:	First
Delegation:	Arno Matis, Arno Matis Architecture Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg
Staff:	Yan Zeng and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application coming in under the Mount Pleasant Community Plan. The site is in the lower Main Street subarea of Mount Pleasant, the section of Main Street that is between East 2nd and East 7th Avenues. Ms. Zeng noted that the plan calls for an urban community with a mix of residential, commercial and office uses. Currently the site is zoned IC-2 and the proposal is to rezone to CD-1. Ms. Zeng described the key principles that are outlined in the Mount Pleasant Community Plan that are relevant to the site. These principles include a Distinctive "hilltown" identity; emphasis on arts and culture spaces; emphasis on public realm and pedestrian amenities; link the historical and industrial aesthetics in new development and support architectural innovation that creates new architectural legacies and have up to 6-storey mixed-use development and investigation of permitting additional height during the plan implementation phase. Ms. Zeng added that the Plan implementation phase is currently ongoing.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, further described the proposal and noted the context for the area mentioning the multi-residential development across the lane. As well he stated that the maximum density under the zoning is 3.0 FSR while the proposal is for 4.92 FSR. The maximum height under the zoning is 60 feet and the proposal is asking for 98.97 feet.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Comments are sought on the proposed form of development for this rezoning application in general, and in particular:

1. Does the proposed height and massing sought in this application demonstrate a sensitive response with respect to neighbouring sites and context?
 2. Given the potential for zero lot line development in the future of the site to the north please comment on the massing and fenestration of the north elevation.
 3. Given the proximity of residential units across the lane, please comment on the success of the landscape amenity and open areas having regard to neighbourliness, impacts and solar orientation.
 4. Does the panel support the proposed urban design in terms of siting, massing, density, and height?
-

5. Does the Panel have any preliminary advice on the overall design with regard to:
 - a. Neighbourliness including shadow and view impacts
 - b. Open space and landscape treatments
 - c. LEED™ Gold strategies and Rezoning Policy for Greener Buildings
 - d. Indicative materials and composition

Ms. Zeng and Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Arno Matis, Architect, further described the proposal and noted although it is a small project but is diverse with a retail frontage along Main Street wrapping around to East 7th Avenue and mid-block is the residential entry. There are three 2-storey townhouse units which are family oriented. On the lane there are four units for art oriented spaces. There is an indoor amenity space on the second floor and the roof deck is a shared space for the residents. He described the architecture noting the massing and the setbacks that are required on the Main Street and East 7th Avenue frontages. Mr. Matis indicated that the stepping of the building is in response to the "hilltop" town massing and respects the heights in the area. He said they attempted to make a contemporary building with some historical references with the use of materials and colours.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and explained that the streetscape and lane is important. Along Main Street there is a wide setback which allowed them to have seating at the edge of the building. There are small garden terraces at the residential frontages and on the lane there will be special paving up to the art oriented spaces. One idea from a public art point of view is to include large panels that might be programmed with the neighbourhood. The common space for the residents on the roof will have incredible views and there will be three zones: children's play, urban agriculture and a communal table.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider improving the landscape plans on the lane;
 - Consider making the townhouses on the lane 2-storey;
 - Design development to improve the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had done a good job with the neighbourhood planning committee.

The Panel thought it was a thorough and extensive presentation for a rezoning and commended the applicant for the information. They supported the height, density and massing. The Panel thought the manner in which the massing had been articulated and modulated in response of various conditions was supportable. They also thought the shadow and view impacts had been well managed. The Panel agreed that the detailing of the building would be critical to its success.

The Panel liked the residential units on the lane with one Panel member suggesting the production spaces could be two storeys as this would help with daylighting.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and thought the roofscape would be exciting however they thought more could be done on the lane. They added that they wanted to see more space to have an adequate buffer for the lane elevations.

There were a few areas that the Panel wanted to see further development in including the performance of the building for solar energy. Although they said they appreciated the gradation in the solid to glazing they weren't convinced that it was enough on the south façade. One Panel member mentioned that the building wasn't reading as a LEED™ Gold building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Matis thanked the Panel for their comments and said he looked forward to further design development.

3. Address:	4139-4187 Cambie Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for two 6-storey residential buildings on Cambie Street and one 2-storey townhouse on the rear lane, with a total of 76 residential units, including 11 townhouses and 65 apartment units. The proposal includes a floor area of 86,415.71 square feet, a floor space ratio of (FSR) of 2.6 and two levels of underground parking with 114 parking stalls.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	F. Adab Architect Inc.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Marco Ciriello, F. Adab Architect Inc. Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects Charlie Lorenzen, C. Lorenzen & Associates
Staff:	Grant Miller and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-6)

- **Introduction:** Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning on a RS-1 site to CD-1 at the northwest corner of Cambie Street and West 26th Avenue. The site falls within the Queen Elizabeth area of the Cambie Corridor Plan. The plan supports residential buildings up to 6-storeys in height with a suggested density range of approximately 2.0 to 2.5 FSR. The project is also subject to the Cambie Corridor Housing Policy which requires the provision of up to 20% guaranteed market rental units. However, staff are currently reviewing options that will more efficiently and effectively implement the housing policy objectives of the Cambie Corridor Plan. In the interim, negotiation of a cash contribution to the Affordable Housing Fund will be pursued. This application was made in December 2011 and is subject to the City's Green Buildings policy requiring LEED™ Gold.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, further described the proposal to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 under the Cambie Corridor Plan. He noted that there are three lots that have been consolidated under the proposal. There is a lot next door that is not part of the proposal and will be developed at a later date. The building will be 6-storeys but under the Cambie Corridor Plan there is a call for a notable step-back in order to establish a streetwall at four storeys. As well townhouses are proposed at the rear of the site. Mr. Potter noted the 24 foot separation between the buildings in the courtyard and mews.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Comments are sought on the proposed form of development for this rezoning application in general, and in particular:

1. Taking into consideration the Cambie Corridor Plan and its design principles, looking at the south elevation of the south building:
 - a. does the form of the proposed massing successfully relate to the W 26th Avenue context?
 - b. related to part a, does the proposed form and massing successfully transition to the adjacent single family context ?
2. Given the recommended separation of 24 feet between buildings, is the scale of buildings as it relates to the open space between buildings successful?

3. In view of the notable building steps prescribed in the plan above the 4th storey to establish a “shoulder height”, please comment on the effect of the upper storey balconies on the scale of the shoulder height and the overall building streetwall.
4. Taking into consideration the Cambie Corridor Plan and its design principles, does the panel support the proposed urban design in terms of siting, massing, density, and height.
5. Does the Panel have any preliminary advice on the overall design with regard to:
 - a. Neighbourliness including shadow and view impacts
 - b. Open space and landscape treatments
 - c. LEED™ Gold strategies and Rezoning Policy for Greener Buildings
 - d. Indicative materials and composition

Mr. Miller and Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Marco Ciriello, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they introduced secondary urban spaces which are represented by the mews and the space between the two buildings. At the ground floor there is 40 feet of separation between the two buildings with a water feature at the entrances. Mr. Ciriello described the architecture noting the building is stepped back at the fourth level and there are patio spaces within the mews for the unit’s outdoor space. Mr. Ciriello mentioned that the building follows the guidelines with stepping on the fifth floor with glass railings along the balconies.

Mary Chan-Yip, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that they wanted to create a sense of semi-privacy for the residents to allow them to use the outdoor amenity areas along the street face. They created several layers of vegetation with a double row of street trees along Cambie Street and West 26th Avenue. The entrances have a water feature with a physical connection to the mews. As well there are seating areas, urban agriculture and the laneway will have fruiting plantings. The roof deck will have a green roof component to manage storm water and the townhouses will have light coloured pebbles on the roof.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the stepped expression;
 - Consider increasing the width of the courtyard space;
 - Design development to improve the response to the residential across West 26th Avenue;
 - Consider adding an indoor amenity space;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal as they had a number of concerns regarding the architectural expression and the separation between buildings in the courtyard.

The Panel agreed that the proposal met the intent of the Cambie Corridor Plan but found the massing wasn’t supportable and there wasn’t much of a step in the building. As well they thought there might be too much density on the site. They also thought the width of the courtyard and mews spaces were too tight and with the addition of balconies made the separation even less. They felt there was a problem with access to daylight and shadowing as well as privacy issues especially since living spaces and bedrooms are opposite each other.

The Panel also thought that the shoulder height at the fourth floor was not well represented. They noted that the buildings looked like 6-storey buildings and are rather bulky in their expression. A couple of Panel members noted that the south elevation was showing a lot of horizontality and needed more stepping back from the lane. As well they thought the expression along West 26th Avenue wasn't responding to the scale of the current residential or the future conditions along the street. One Panel member thought the applicant had a responsibility to modulate the forms differently to allow the orphan site next door to be developed in the future.

Some of the Panel thought there needed to be an amenity space in the building that should be placed adjacent to an outdoor space. The Panel supported the landscape plans and liked the addition of urban agriculture on the site. However, a couple of Panel members thought there should be more common outdoor spaces for the residents. A couple of Panel members thought there should be views through the mews to make it a place of discovery.

The Panel felt the LEED™ Gold strategy needed some more development. A couple of Panel members suggested adding green roofs to the townhouses to improve outlook from adjacent units. As well one Panel member suggested having a storm water management system in place. One Panel member suggested the applicant look at using geothermal in their sustainability strategy and as well put more effort into the building envelope to reduce the use of mechanical means for cooling the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ciriello said that they would take some of the comments under consideration. He said there is a step in the buildings but it is concealed by the balconies but that was easily solvable. He said he wasn't sure if they could increase the width of the courtyard as they need a certain depth for meaningful unit space. Mr. Ciriello said they would look at creating more views through the mews space. He thanked the Panel for their input.

4. Address:	2803 West 41st Avenue (Crofton Manor)
DE:	416371
Description:	To construct a new 6-storey Senior's Supportive and Assisted Housing building with 76 residential units facing West 41 st Avenue.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Number TEN Architecture
Owner:	Revera
Review:	Third (Second as Development)
Delegation:	Barry Cosgrove, Number TEN Architecture Mark Anthony, Number TEN Architecture Bev Winjack, LADR Landscape Architects Inc. Jeff Crossing, Revera Wendy MacDonald, Advicas Group (Sustainability) Laurie Schmidt, Brook Pooni Associates
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a new central 6-storey supportive housing building for seniors on this site. The previous CD-1 zoning allowed 3-storeys for the central residential block circa 1989 while the rest of the project was built in 1973. The amended form of development was approved in principle in 2010 allowing for the 6-storey central block which set out a number of design conditions. This proposal shows the changes intended to address design advice from the recent Panel review (February 13, 2013) which includes the roof form, architectural expression and the terrace facing West 41st Avenue, material choices and sustainability measures.

Panel comments were sought on the landscape and architectural design of the revised proposal, and in particular:

- Resolution of the issues previously identified by the Panel in 2010 and 2013;
- Resolution of the expression and roof form chosen for this building; and
- Design of outdoor terraces and pond at grade to the south of the new block.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Anthony, Architect, further described the proposal noting the changes since the last review. He said the roof and the base have been better integrated with the body of the building and the façade has been articulated through its massing and various architectural elements. As well the variety and size of the windows has been changed and now has Juliette balconies and some punched windows. Mr. Anthony said they also increased the wall thickness so the windows are set deeper into the façade. The symmetry has been broken both at the roof line and the entry element. The biggest change is to the roof line which now comes down to the fifth floor and wraps to the east and west making a dormer expression on the fifth floor. The gable materials have been dropped down into the body and some of the stucco has been replaced with stone. A skylight has been introduced to reduce the shadow line of the roof veranda. Mr. Anthony added that the massing on the north façade has been left fairly simple. As well the bistro terrace size has been increased and the size of pool has been reduced. Wendy MacDonald, Sustainability Consultant, mentioned that they have focused more on the energy credits in the LEED™ checklist. She added that the developer has committed to using the building as a pilot project for a solar hot water system. In addition they are

putting efforts into the envelope to improve sustainability. Ms. MacDonald said they will be looking at waste management practices and as well they will be starting a composting program.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the relationship between the south elevation and roof;
 - Design development to improve the entry;
 - Consider reducing the amount of stucco being used on the building;
 - Consider improving the sustainability strategy to achieve LEED™ Gold.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it had improved since the last review.

The Panel thought the change in the roof ends were supportable and helped the corner of the building. However a several Panel members weren't convinced regarding the joining of the upper building and felt the proportion of the roof was inconsistent. One Panel member noted that the back elevation was more successful than the front.

As well a number of Panel members thought there needed to be more symmetry at the front of the building. One Panel member suggested reducing the bridging element so it recedes from the end piece. Most of the Panel thought the west was nicely terraced. One Panel member thought the two piers on either side of the entry were confusing and suggested different materials. Most of the Panel thought the applicant had improved the use of materials but felt that there was still too much stucco.

The Panel thought the sustainability strategy was improved since the previous submission. They liked that the applicant was showing more educational elements for residents to see. Several Panel members suggested the applicant apply for LEED™ Gold certification. One Panel member suggested more extensive solar panels be added to the south roof to preheat hot water.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Anthony noted there is a drop off location along the side of the building. He added that the initial element at the top of the building was for a veranda and felt it was a strong element. As well he said they would look at bringing more symmetry to the design.

5. Address:	Sign-Bylaw Review
DE:	N/A
Description:	Workshop to discuss potential updated to the City of Vancouver Sign By-law. The purpose of the Sign By-law review is to develop a new, comprehensive Sign By-law that will incorporate other City of Vancouver sign policies and regulations, streamline the application and approvals process and address items not currently addressed, such as current and emerging technologies (e.g. high definition digital signs).
Zoning:	N/A
Application Status:	Workshop
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	N/A
Review:	First
Delegation:	Cameron Owen, IBI Group Holly Foxcroft, IBI Group Marin Rendl, Martin Rendl Associates (Sign By-law Specialist)
Staff:	Ian Cooper

EVALUATION: NON-VOTING WORKSHOP

- **Introduction:** Ian Cooper, Senior Rezoning Planner, explained that staff have been asked to review and make recommendations with respect the current sign by-law.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. What are the most common issues that you confront with the existing Sign By-law?
2. From an urban design perspective, what principles should shape the development of a new Sign By-law?
3. What are your thoughts on a digital sign district (e.g. Dundas Square LA Live)?
4. Recently the UDP approved the West Pender Place development, which included illuminated public art. Due to complaints and legal action by neighbouring residents, the City's legal services department is investigating the appropriateness of using the sign By-law to regulate the illuminated public art. Do you think the Sign By-law should regulate public art?
5. Is the City's Name Policy achieving its objective on naming civic buildings?

Martin Rendl, Sign By-law Specialist, gave a power point presentation noting the stakeholder consultation they have started and matters related to the current by-law. The sign by-law is being reviewed as there is no comprehensive by-law. There is a by-law dealing with private property, signs and advertising on the public street, Parks Board has a by-law and the Library Board has another by-law.

The current by-law goes back to 1974 and has had amendments over time but the big gap is that it hasn't kept pace with technology and signage trends especially digital signs. In many cases there is no relief in the by-law if applicants can't meet the requirements. The applicant needs to go to the Board of Variance or other terms of relief. So the new by-law will also look at an up to date approval process to make it more efficient.

The intention is to have one sign by-law that it is easy to understand and consolidates all the by-laws and policies within the City. Mr. Rendl said they have also been asked to look at revenue producing opportunities. The present sign by-law only deals with where the sign is located and the size and doesn't integrate the Naming Policy where corporations would have naming rights on a facility.

He noted that it is a three phase project and they are currently finishing the first phase which looked at existing conditions. Their time frame is to be finished by the end of the year. He said that in the next phase they will be developing some principles around what the sign by-law should be doing so it is not just regulations that are not tied to any principles or objectives.

Mr. Rendl explained that the current by-law mentions how many signs are allowed on a frontage of a property, where they can be located, the size of the sign and also the application process that is set out in terms of the permit.

He noted that signs in the City right-of-way are managed by Engineering Services under the Street By-law. Election signs are not covered at all. There are signs that aren't regulated and these include internal signs regarding warnings or way finding which they will also look at bringing under the new by-law. He added that they are looking at bringing in some objectives regarding place making and linking that to urban design objectives and other planning policy.

Mr. Rendl noted that with the advent of digital signs there has been a focus on driver's safety as they can be like large TV screens. They also can raise issues in terms of brightness especially in residential areas. He added that studies have shown that drivers tend to look at these signs longer.

Mr. Rendl mentioned that there have been changes in building design and architecture and the by-law assumes that most buildings have a window surrounded by masonry whereas most new buildings have glass walls. The by-law wording states that windows can't be covered with signs but printed adhesive films are beginning to show up in store fronts which aren't addressed in the current by-law. As well the by-law has strict regulations as to who gets signage on the second floor.

Mr. Rendl also mentioned that murals are a recurring issue of when it is a mural and when it is a piece of art. This is another issue they plan to solve with the new sign by-law. As well they will be looking at large vinyl banners that are used to advertise events. Hoardings around constructions sites will also be taken into consideration.

- **Related Commentary:**

- This will create the ability to apply similar approaches to signage throughout the City;
- Urban design approaches and principles will be applied to the site as well;
- The Panel supported the approach to updating the sign by-law;
- There should be some flexibility for specific projects or neighbourhoods;
- Wouldn't want to see public art regulated as this might lose creativity;
- Separate group should be responsible for reviewing public art;
- Digital signs will work with some projects so there needs to be some flexibility to explore this type of media;
- There needs to also be a light pollution policy;
- Would like to have more opportunity on the Urban Design Panel for engagement especially around artistic representation on building facades that might not be contemplated under the current bylaw;
- Consideration should be given to the visually impaired to make sure signs are readable.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.