



Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

BL.03-SIG (2010)

PDC APR 19 2010

DATE:	March 30, 2010
TO:	Chair and Members of Planning and Development Committee Meeting Date: April 19, 2010
FROM:	Edward R. Sajecki Commissioner of Planning and Building
SUBJECT:	Sign By-law 0054-2002, as amended Sign Variance Applications

RECOMMENDATIONS: That the Report dated March 30, 2010, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building regarding Sign By-law 0054-2002, as amended, and the requested two (2) Sign Variance Applications described in Appendices 1 to 2 to the Report, be adopted in accordance with the following:

- 1. That the following Sign Variances **be granted**:
 - (a) Sign Variance Application 09-04211
 Ward 7
 Khan Khokhar & Associates
 3024 Hurontario Street

To permit the following:

(i) Two (2) fascia signs located on the second storey of the building.

	V E 7 1 (Sign Variance Application 10-00165 Ward 11 Bank of Montreal 7050 Saint Barbara Boulevard To permit the following: (i) One (1) fascia sign (sign E) attached to a wall which does not form part of a building. (ii) One (1) sign (sign A) located on the west elevation which projects above the roof of the building. 	
BACKGROUND:	The <i>Municipal Act</i> states that Council may, upon the application of any person, authorize minor variances from the Sign By-law if in the opinion of Council the general intent and purpose of the By-law is maintained.		
COMMENTS:	The Planning and Building Department has received two (2) Sign Variance Applications (see Appendices 1 to 2) for approval by Council. Each application is accompanied by a summary page prepared by the Planning and Building Department which includes information pertaining to the site location; the applicant's proposal; the variance required; an assessment of the merits (or otherwise) of the application; and a recommendation on whether the variance should or should not be granted.		
FINANCIAL IMPACT:	Not applicat	ıble.	
CONCLUSION:	2002, as and and purpose as amended, respect, ther	ay authorize minor variances from Sign By-law 0054- nended, if in the opinion of Council, the general intent e of the By-law is maintained. Sign By-law 0054-2002, d, was passed pursuant to the <i>Municipal Act</i> . In this ere is no process to appeal the decision of Council to the unicipal Board, as in a development application under <i>ng Act</i> .	

- 2 -

ATTACHMENTS:

Khan Khokhar & Associates Appendix 1-1 to 1-8

- 3 -

Bank of Montreal Appendix 2-1 to 2-9

Edward R. Sajecki Commissioner of Planning and Building

Prepared by: Darren Bryan, Supervisor, Sign Unit

K:\pbdivision\WPDATA\PDC-Signs\2010 PDC Signs\April 19_10sign variance.doc





SIGN VARIANCE APPLICATION REPORT Planning and Building Department

March 30, 2010

FILE: 09-04211

RE: Khan Khokhar & Associates 3024 Hurontario Street – Ward 7

The applicant requests the following variance to section 17 of the Sign By-law 0054-2002, as amended.

Section 17(3)	Proposed	
A fascia sign shall be erected no higher than	Two (2) fascia signs located on the second	
the upper limits of the first storey of a	storey of the building.	
building.		

COMMENTS:

The fascia signs are proposed in similar locations as other signs on the second storey of this building. Previously, a variance was granted for the signage on the second storey of this building for the Cooksville Library. In this regard, the Planning and Building Department finds the variance acceptable from a design perspective.



KHAN KHOKHAR & ASSOCIATES INC.

M. Khan Khokhar – CSIC Member: M042340 (Specializing in all Immigration Matters)

October 26, 2009

City of Mississauga 300 City Centre Drive Mississauga, Ontario L5B 3C1

Dear Sir/Madam:

RE: LETTER OF RATIONALE FOR SIGN

Our office requires the permit to erect a sign outside the window of 3024 Hurontario Street, Suite 205, Mississauga, Ontario L5B 4M4 for the following purposes noted below:

- 1. To identify our office name and location to the public and to ensure that our clients find their way safely around to our office.
- 2. To advertise and tell people who we are and what we do.
- 3. To distinguish our office space from the other professional office spaces in the area. The other office in our building have their own signs and our office does not.

In the light of the above we would appreciate it if you would issue the permit in-order for us to erect a sign.

Should you have any question regarding this matter please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

KHAN KHOKHAR

MKK/al Encls.



3024 Hurontario Street

Application #SGNBLD 094211 VAR Application Dt. 2009-03-11



APPENDIX 1-5



3024 HURONTARIO ST. SOUTH ELEVATION

	AL- MUSHT AQ TR AV 281-098	ELL ERSINC.		
KANG- KANG- HEALTH CO HEALTH CO BOS-272				
				DFFICE L. WINCHIE itor 905-277-5558
KHAN 905-277-211	1 KHOKH 1 I *I Immigra	tion Consulta		Member CSIC
		235"x19.5		
Regency Signs & Printing Tel.: 905-461-9502 Cell: 416-520-0507 Fax: 905-461-9428	CUSTOMER NAME <u>Mr. Khan Khokkhar</u> BUSINESS NAME: <u>Mississauga, ON.</u> ADDRESS:	Cell:	905.277.2111 Jut may not be exact when viewing or printing this drawing. All colors	CUSTOMER APPROVAL X CUSTOMER SIGNATURE
regency2000@rogers.com 7171 Torbram Rd., Unit 29, Mississauga, ON. L4T 3W4	LOCATION:	equivalent. If these	du nay not be east men remin o priming on priming an order e colors are incorrect, please provide the correct PMS match and a re	vision to this drawing will be made. DRAWING BY: DEV

APPENDIX 1-7



INSTALLATION & DETAILS

003-09



SIGN VARIANCE APPLICATION REPORT Planning and Building Department

March 30, 2010

FILE: 10-00165

RE: Bank of Montreal 7050 Saint Barbara Blvd. – Ward 11

The applicant requests the following variances to section 1 and section 4 of the Sign By-law 0054-2002, as amended.

Section 1	Proposed	
A fascia sign shall be attached to a wall	One (1) fascia sign (sign E) attached to a wall	
forming part of a building.	which does not form part of a building.	
Section 4	Proposed	
Signs projecting above the roof line of a	One (1) sign (Sign A) on the west elevation	
building are defined as roof signs. Roof signs	which projects above the roof of a building.	
are specifically prohibited.		

COMMENTS:

Sign E is proposed on an architecture feature of the building which is part of the canopy design over drive thru ATM area. In this regard, the Planning and Building Department finds the variance acceptable from a design perspective.

Sign A, proposed on the west elevation of the building, projects approximately 0.4m (1.33 ft.) above the roofline of the building, but is consistent in height with the other fascias signs on the building. In this regard, the Planning and Building Department finds the variance acceptable from a design perspective.





Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

7050 Weston Road, Suite #230 Woodbridge, Ontario L4L 8G7

T: (905) 761.5588 F: (905) 761.5589

Ian F. MacNaughton MA, FCIP, RPP

Bernard P. Hermsen MUDS, BES, MCIP, RPP

Paul R. Britton BES, MCIP, RPP

W. Brent Clarkson MA, MCIP, RPP

James D. Parkin BES, MCIP, RPP

Carol M. Wiebe BES

Kris Menzies BES, BEd, MCIP, RPP

David M. McKay Msc, MICP, RPP

Brian A. Zeman BES, MCIP, RPP

Offices in:

- Kitchener
- Vaughan
- London
- Kingston
- Barrie

City, Town and Rural Planning

Municipal Plans and Studies

Land Development

Urban Design / Community Planning

Landscape Architecture

Natural Resource and Aggregate Planning

Expert Evidence and Mediation February 16, 2010

Supervisor, Sign Unit City of Mississauga 300 City Centre Drive Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

Dear Sir or Madam;

RE: APPLICATION FOR SIGN VARIANCE BMO BRANCH BUILDING 7050 ST. BARBARA BOULEVARD MHBC FILE: 06132AL

On behalf of our client, Bank of Montreal (BMO), we are pleased to submit the attached application for Sign Variance to permit the installation of three fascia signs on the property located at 7050 St. Barbara Boulevard. In support of this application, please find enclosed the following:

- 1. Authorization from Bank of Montreal, allowing MHBC Planning to act as agent on their behalf;
- 2. Authorization from the landowner, allowing MHBC Planning to act as agent on their behalf;
- 3. Four (4) 8.5" x 11" copies of the Site Plan;
- 4. Four (4) 8.5" x 11" copies of the sign detail drawings;
- 5. Four (4) building renderings; and
- 6. Four (4) sets of photographs.

Purpose

The purpose of this application is to allow for three new fascia signs on the north, east and west elevations of the bank branch that is now under construction at this address. The proposed signs do not comply with the provisions of Sign By-law 54-02.

The proposed fascia signs on the west and north elevation (Signs 'A' and 'B' respectively) are 1.07 metres above the roof line. Section 4.6(f) of the Sign Bylaw prohibits roof signs except where attached to a rooftop mechanical enclosure structure. The by-law defines a roof sign as "a sign supported entirely or partly by the roof of a building or structure and which sign projects above the roof." As the proposed sign projects above the roof by 1.07 metres, the staff of the City's Sign Unit have interpreted the sign to be a roof sign, and therefore not in compliance with Section 4.6(f).

The proposed fascia sign on the east elevation (Sign 'E') is located on the exterior of an architectural tower feature, above the roofline of the bank branch it is attached to. The sign is 2.86 metres above the roof line of the bank branch. There are no provisions in the Sign By-law for tower signs, therefore Sign E is not in compliance with the Sign By-law.

In addition, Section 17.3 of the Sign By-law requires that "a fascia sign shall be erected no higher than the upper limit of the first storey of a building..." Sign A, Sign B and Sign E exceed the upper limit of the first storey of the building.

Requested Sign Variance

As the proposed signs do not comply with Sign By-law 54-02, we request that the following variance be granted:

Notwithstanding Sections 4.6(f) and 17.3 of Sign By-law 54-02, the following shall be permitted on a bank branch located at 7050 St. Barbara Boulevard:

- One (1) sign located on the west elevation (Sign A), to be permitted to exceed the upper limit of the first storey of the building by 1.07 metres. The proposed sign shall be considered a fascia sign for the purposes of the Sign By-law and shall be subject to all other provisions for fascia signs.
- One (1) sign located on the north elevation (Sign B), to be permitted to exceed the upper limit of the first storey of the building by 1.07 metres. The proposed sign shall be considered a fascia sign for the purposes of the Sign By-law and shall be subject to all other provisions for fascia signs.
- One (1) sign located on the architectural tower of the east elevation (Sign E), to be permitted up to the upper limit of said architectural tower feature. The proposed sign shall be considered a fascia sign for the purposes of the Sign By-law and shall be subject to all other provisions for fascia signs.

Justification

1. The proposed variance maintains the intent of the Sign By-law:

The purpose of the Sign By-law is to regulate signage within the City for greater visual cohesion and to limit excesses in signage. The proposed signage has been designed to be integrated with the building façade for greater architectural harmony. To best achieve this in the context of contemporary design, articulation of the façade is required. The integrated signage assists with this articulation, and does not produce a stark contrast between the signage and the façade. In addition, the proposed signage does not exceed the sign area regulations of Section 13 of the Sign By-law. As such, the proposed signage scheme makes for a greater visual cohesion with the building and does not generate an excess of signage. The proposed variance to permit this signage therefore maintains the intent of the Sign By-law.

2. The proposed variance is appropriate and desirable for the subject building and the subject site:

The proposed variance would permit three signs above the roofline of the building. The proposed signage has been designed to be integrated with the building and parapet design so as to present a modern architectural finish for the branch. The architectural tower feature provides a point of interest on the building and is intended to screen the drive-through ATM. The signage proposed for the tower gives it a focal point, and provides presence for the branch. Due to the tower's nature, it is taller than the building it is connected to. Therefore to optimize the use of the tower and its height, the signage is located at a point that is higher than the roof line.

The principles of integrated design and defined presence are well established in contemporary commercial development. There are many examples in Mississauga, including recent commercial development in the Eglington and Winston Churchill area, Winston Churchill & Argentia, and the

Heartland Centre at Mavis & Matheson. The proposed development is located within a contemporary commercial centre, therefore the architecture and design of the BMO building, including the signage, has been designed to be consistent with these trends. The signage is therefore suited to the building and site on which it is located, and consistent with contemporary commercial architecture. As such it is appropriate and desirable for the building and the site.

3. The proposed variances were not required to permit similar signage on other BMO bank branches within the City:

Sign permits were issued for BMO bank branches at Matheson & Mavis (5800 Mavis Road) and at Eglinton & Plantation (2825 Eglinton Avenue West). These branches were completed recently and exhibit a very similar signage scheme. Both feature signage on tower features, and signage located above the level of the roofline. Photos of both of these branches have been included which illustrate their signage schemes. The proposed variance would recognize this existing trend for this site.

4. The proposed variance is minor in nature:

Although Signs A and B are 1.07 metres above the roof line, they only extend 0.4 metres above the roof parapet. The signs are also to be integrated with the design of the building facade. This leaves the roof line relatively flush, but still articulated to avoid blandness. As such, from a visual standpoint and in terms of the intent of the Sign By-law, the variance for Signs A and B represents only a minor adjustment.

The variance for Sign E on the tower would permit only one sign at this height. The height of the tower (7.87 metres) suits a higher sign. When considered against the roof of the building, the tower sign extends 2.85 m above the roofline, but when considered as an architectural feature, the sign is integrated with the tower and does not extend beyond the upper limit of the tower. We consider the tower an architectural feature and an identifying marker for the bank branch, and as such is exceptional relative to the main building façade. Given the height of the tower feature, and that there are no provisions in the by-law for tower signs, it is a minor request to allow signage at this height on this feature.

In addition, the proposed signage area is well within the Sign By-law permissions. The following table illustrates this relative to Section 13 of the By-law:

Elevation	Façade Area	Permitted Signage	Proposed Signage	% of Elevation
North	108.23 sm	21.65 sm (20%)	21.55 sm	19.9%
West	141.49 sm	49.52 sm (35%)	21.46 sm	15.2%
South	103.77 sm	20.75 sm (20%)	7.71 sm	7.4%
East	149.57 sm	52.35 sm (35%)	16.63 sm	11.1%
Total	503.06 sm	144.27 sm (29%)	67.35 sm	13.4%

Conclusions

Based on the above analysis, we believe that the proposed sign variance maintains the intent of Sign By-law 54-02, is appropriate for the site, and is minor in nature. Please accept this application and call if you have any further questions.

Thank you,

APPENDIX 2-6

Yours truly, MHBC PLAMNING

(

Ryan Moore, M.Pl., LEED ® AP

cc: Blair Apple (BMO) David McKay (MHBC)





APPENDIX N



APPENDIX 2-9