

RE: BURNABY SIGN BYLAW REVIEW
SUMMARY REPORT

ITEM SUPPLEMENTARY 15
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 30
COUNCIL MEETING 1983 04 25

MUNICIPAL MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the recommendation of the Director Planning and Building Inspection be adopted.

* * * * *
TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER 1983 April 22
FROM: DIRECTOR PLANNING &
BUILDING INSPECTION
SUBJECT: BURNABY SIGN BYLAW REVIEW
SUMMARY REPORT

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT this report be received for information purposes.

REPORT

- 1.0 Council on 1983 April 18 received the Planning & Building Inspection Department staff report on the Sign Bylaw review, and heard a delegation presented by Mr. A. MacDonald representing the Burnaby Chamber of Commerce response to the report.
- 1.1 The following is submitted for the assistance of Council, to identify the subjects on which agreement has been reached, and to provide a brief synoptic statement of the positions of the Chamber's Committee and your staff relative to the remaining items.
- 1.2 Twenty-one amendment proposals have been considered in the review process. Based on Mr. MacDonald's submission, it appeared that differences remained on 9 of these 21 topics. Some of the differences are fundamental in nature (for example, proposals by the Chamber to double the maximum area and number of freestanding signs) while others are more related to degree or application where acceptance of a principle had been signified in the staff report (for example, locations and sizes of Illuminated Changing Message System signs and exemption of signs in exterior locations as well as in fully enclosed walls).
- 1.3 Two of the 9 (Items 3.7 and 3.11) related to a Chamber request to refer topics for further study under the subject of poster panels. In response, staff have reviewed their position and would agree to support the Chamber's suggestion to defer recommendation pending completion of the poster panel study.
- 1.4 As a result, we understand that substantial agreement has been achieved on 14 of the 21 amendment proposals, as set forth in the recommendations of the 1983 April 18 report item or as noted here:
- | | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Item 3.1 | Item 3.11 (defer) |
| 3.2 | 3.13 |
| 3.6 | 3.14 |
| 3.7 (defer) | 3.16 |
| 3.8 | 3.19 |
| 3.9 | 3.20 |
| 3.10 | 3.21 |

This report does not propose to elaborate on these items.

- 1.5 For the assistance of Council in dealing with the 7 remaining topics, the following is a summary of the positions of the Chamber and of the Department on each:

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SIGN BYLAW COMMITTEE POSITION	ITEM (Per Report) 83 04 18 SUBJECT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - support exemption of internal signs that cannot be viewed from public places or other properties. - recommend limitation to internal to avoid potential for overlook from other sites and buildings, exposure to lanes, parks, nearby residential areas, and other public places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maintain original proposal to exempt all signs, whether indoor or outdoor, not visible from a public street. - mentioned examples of outdoor shopping centre areas in addition to enclosed shopping malls. 	<p>3.3 Proposal to amend the definition of "Sign" (exemption from Bylaw's controls of signs not visible from a public street).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accept ICMS signs in principle, with location criteria and sign type and size controls to be consistent with intensive commercial centre setting. - recommend acceptance as permitted facia-type sign oriented to a public street in C3 or CD/C3 Districts, with maximum height of 25 feet and maximum area of 150 square feet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - propose that ICMS signs be permitted in C3, C4 and P2 Districts. - define existing "Sign, Animated" definition of "Sign, Animated" (introduction of illuminated Changing Message System signs) 	<p>3.4 Proposal to re- place existing definition of "Sign, Animated" (introduction of illuminated Changing Message System signs)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - oppose change in method of measurement which would increase area of freestanding signs by 100%. - proposed amendment would produce excessively large free-standing signs and would compromise the interests of owners of existing complying freestanding, in effect requiring them to replace their displays with signs twice as large in order to compete for visibility. - the present definition and method of measurement should be retained, but no objection to increase from 60 square feet to 64 square feet where applicable to suit material dimensions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maintain original proposal to double the permitted area of freestanding signs by counting only one face of multi-faced sign. - also propose to increase face area dimension to 64 square feet for those Districts which presently have a maximum of 60 square feet. - proposal related to individual letter signs withdrawn 	<p>3.5 Proposal to re- place definition of "Sign Area" (amend basis of measurement of area of free-standing signs).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would be a retrograde step to begin accepting exposed structure or sign members protruding beyond the visual outline of the building. - to avoid increased visually obtrusive effect maintain present standards calling for cantilever attachment, no external structural members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - propose to amend regulations to permit structural support above roof line, rather than using cantilever type of attachment. - particularly aimed at fitting signs to older buildings. - willing to enclose structural member as part of the sign. 	<p>3.12 Proposal to permit structural supports for projecting signs to extend above the line of roof or parapet.</p>

Item (Per Report)	83 04 18	Subject	Chamber of Commerce Sign Bylaw Committee Position	Departmental Position
3.15		Proposal to redesignate M4 District from Schedule III to Schedule IV (to increase sign display potential in the Special Industrial District).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - propose to increase sign potential in M4 to same standards as other industrial zones. - a review of land-use in the M4 zone is warranted relative to industrial versus residential occupancy, and following land-use review sign potential should be re-examined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - continuing residential presence in the M4 area (on a recognized, conforming basis) justifies maintaining the present environmental control and residential amenity. - the present designation reflecting residential component should be retained; Council may wish to consider asking for a land-use study as a separate topic.
3.17		Proposal to permit roof signs and projecting signs in Schedule IV.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maintain proposal for projecting signs in industrial and lower intensity commercial districts. - desire higher degree of visibility. - proposal to introduce roof signs withdrawn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maintain principle of sign display needs and exposure in balance with effect of signs on character of the zone. - appropriate to maintain the distinction between signs in Schedule V (higher commercial intensity areas) and Schedule IV. - present sign types adequate and appropriate to lower intensity areas.
3.18		Proposal to double the number of freestanding signs permitted in Schedule IV and V.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - propose to increase maximum number of freestanding signs per street frontage from 2 to 4. - propose to observe minimum separation of 100' between such signs on a site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommend against encouraging greater numbers of freestanding signs than are now permitted. - public interest better served by efforts to integrate sign displays with buildings or to use freestanding signs with greater individual identity/visibility.

The foregoing is provided for the information of Council.

A. L. PARR
 DIRECTOR PLANNING & BUILDING INSPECTION

DGS:1f
 Chief Building Inspector
 Municipal Solicitor
 Assistant Director-Long Range
 Planning and Research

ITEM SUPPLEMENTARY 15
 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 30
 COUNCIL MEETING 1983 04 25

