

## PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY AND WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

### Public Engagement Summary - 2017

Administration conducted public engagement activities to inform amendments to sign regulations in Zoning Bylaw 12800. Administration wanted to hear from the signs industry and members of the public to understand their general concerns or interest with signs in Edmonton.

To this end, the following public engagement activities were held:

- An **online survey** in May, 2017, to understand the public's perspective on digital signs in Edmonton. The questions included what areas of the City digital signs should be allowed, how big digital signs should be, and how digital signs impact perceptions of Edmonton. The survey was available through the Insight Community and the project website, and received over 2200 responses.
- An **industry workshop** on April 6, 2017 to discuss the limitations and opportunities of the existing digital sign regulations and what sign industry stakeholders' priorities were for updating sign regulations. Thirty one people attended who are actively involved in the sign industry.
- Two **public open houses** on June 1 and 8, 2017 to discuss different aspects of digital signs including brightness, location, and number of signs. Thirty four people attended the open houses, including representatives from Community Leagues, business members who use signs, and members of the general public.
- A five week **circulation** to stakeholders to share the digital signs report and attachments for feedback. Administration emailed the digital signs draft report to external stakeholders including the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, the Urban Development Institute, members of the sign industry, and members of the general public who had participated in public engagement activities.

The main themes of input heard include:

- **Complexity** - many stakeholders felt that sign regulations are too complex and inconsistently applied. Some stakeholders suggested better ways to regulate separation distances between signs, digital sign brightness and the size of sign frames versus advertising copy area.

- **Quality and Enforcement** - some stakeholders felt signs should have good quality control so that they are perceived positively by the public and that enforcement should be more thorough to ensure fairness between different businesses and sign companies.
- **Sign Brightness** - many stakeholders felt there should be more nuance in considering the brightness of digital signs. Some noted the importance of adapting sign brightness to different seasons and times of day, and limiting the use of white backgrounds.
- **Context** - there was concern that signs contribute to visual clutter and should better fit the site plan and architecture of a development.
- **Size** - there were differing opinions on the appropriate maximum size of digital signs. Some stakeholders suggested that the size of signs should fit the context of the site and area. It was also noted that the review of signs should consider impacts on pedestrians and cyclists, not just motorists.
- **Residential Impact** - most stakeholders indicated concern with digital signs in proximity to residential areas and the need for stricter regulations for signs near where people live.
- **Signs in Parkland** - there were mixed opinions over whether digital signs should be allowed in parkland. Some Community Leagues and schools wanted to switch to digital signs for ease of changing messages and saving volunteers' time, while others were concerned about negative impacts on residential areas and wildlife.

A key takeaway from the public engagement is that in order to respond to the concerns and needs of stakeholders, signage policy needs to be developed. The opinions on signage in Edmonton are diverse. Further engagement is needed to develop values and a vision for signage in Edmonton before significantly updating sign regulations in Zoning Bylaw 12800.

Find more detailed overview of each engagement activity and the feedback received in the following pages.

## Online Survey | May, 2017

### Introduction

As part of the Digital Signs Review public consultation process, City staff conducted a survey from May 9 -16, 2017. The survey received over 2,200 responses. This survey provided an opportunity for residents to share their feedback on proposed changes to the project name. This survey was distributed through the Insight Community and the project website.

### Survey Results

1. Today in Edmonton, do you think that there are:

<b>36.6%</b>	Too many digital signs
<b>31.7%</b>	About the right amount of digital signs
<b>23.8%</b>	Don't know / no opinion
<b>7.9%</b>	Not enough digital signs

2. How do digital signs affect your perception of Edmonton as an attractive and livable city?

<b>42.4%</b>	Digital Signs have no effect on my perception of Edmonton
<b>36.4%</b>	Digital signs negatively influence my perception of Edmonton
<b>12.1%</b>	Digital signs positively influence my perception of Edmonton
<b>9.1%</b>	Don't know / no opinion

3. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

	Schools, parks, community centres and recreation centers should be able to have digital signs.	Each business should have a digital sign regardless of how many other digital signs are in close proximity.	The City should increase resources for sign bylaw enforcement.	The City should try to reduce the number of digital signs in Edmonton.
Somewhat or strongly agree	<b>58%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>38%</b>
Somewhat or strongly disagree	<b>25%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>21%</b>
Neither disagree or agree or don't know	<b>17%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>41%</b>

	The City should allow more digital signs in Edmonton.	A maximum number of digital signs should be allowed in certain areas.	Digital signs should not be allowed on the roof of buildings.	Digital signs should be allowed to have moving images for text.
Somewhat or strongly agree	13%	72%	41%	31%
Somewhat or strongly disagree	49%	8%	18%	42%
Neither disagree or agree or don't know	37%	21%	41%	27%

	All digital signs should not be adjacent to, or facing, a residential property.	Digital signs for businesses should not be adjacent to, or facing, a residential property.	Digital signs for schools, parks and community leagues should not be adjacent to, or facing, a residential property.	The regulations for digital signs should be stricter when they are adjacent to residential areas, compared to commercial or industrial areas.	Digital signs have a negative impact on residential areas
Somewhat or strongly agree	87%	89%	75%	90%	72%
Somewhat or strongly disagree	3%	2%	9%	2%	8%
Neither disagree or agree or don't know	10%	9%	16%	8%	21%

5. The four signs below are drawn to scale. What is a reasonable size for a digital freestanding sign?



<b>48.2%</b>	<b>10 square meters</b>
<b>28.4%</b>	<b>20 square meters</b>
<b>7.6%</b>	<b>Don't know or different size</b>
<b>7.2%</b>	<b>40 square meters</b>
<b>5.0%</b>	<b>Any sign is too large</b>
<b>2.4%</b>	<b>Less than 10 meters squared</b>
<b>1.2%</b>	<b>65 square meters</b>

6. What aspects of digital displays make for positive contributions to the city?

1	47%	Scale of sign relative to context/surroundings
2	46%	Architectural design
3	45%	Location and orientation of the sign
4	41%	Landscaping design
5	32%	Number of signs on a property
6	30%	Number of signs in an area
7	28%	Digital signs in any form do not make a positive contribution to the city
8	26%	Uniformity of sign design for different businesses located close together
9	23%	Size of words and letters
10	21%	Overall sign size
11	21%	Only one sign type allowed per sign location
12	19%	Brightness

## Digital Signs Workshop | April 6, 2017

### Introduction

At the April 6, 2017 Digital Signs workshop, 31 members of the sign industry attended to share their needs, wants, values and priorities. Several topics and options were presented at wall stations for review and commenting. Additionally, small group discussions revealed key themes regarding digital signs in Edmonton. The results are presented on the following pages.

Some key themes that emerged as part of this workshop were: A need for more enforcement for signs, that the current rules over-regulate signs, that there are several impacts that can occur from digital signs (mostly due to lighting effects), and that signs need more quality control.

### Workshop Results

What are your needs, wants, values, and priorities?





**How should window signs and fascia signs be differentiated?**

- Definitely no room for digital in window signs, viewing is not optional
- Just lights in window also problematic. Need to regulate. Consistency for emerging technology.
- Window signs should be treated like fascia - they are aimed at the same audience
- New and future innovation will turn any surface into an Electronic Message Centre (EMC)
- Fascia digital for strip malls. Changing tenants, saving materials, energy
- Graphics 50% of window no permits required whether applied inside or outside of glass. Open/Hours not restricted. Electronic message restricted - require permit - size type
- Should be either or, not both allowed. Window vs. temporary sign vs. permanent sign

**What aspects of digital displays make for positive contributions to the city?**

- Extra costs may make it harder to sell. Minimum landscaping. Mandatory Pole, cladding, etc.
- Amber Alerts and/or emergencies/city messaging a must on all digital signs. Landscaping requirements should be based on built environment.
- Regulations on amount of light and hours (night, day) and zones (residential, downtown)
- Aspects for positive contribution: Follow the rules, stay focused on off-premises, not on/off. Reduce size to just area
- Ensure that signs are fully functional and do not include discoloured copy
- Sound design!
- Landscaping feature requirements Calgary Trail and Whitemud - waterfall. Adds aesthetics to area

**How should the sign area of a multi-sided sign be calculated? What is a reasonable size for a sign?**

- Signs up to 65 m<sup>2</sup> should be allowable in appropriate areas. Different sign sizes make sense based on setbacks, traffic speed, development in area, etc. Sign area should be done on a per-side basis
- 65 m<sup>2</sup> common in other major cities (Vancouver, Toronto, Saskatoon, Regina, Winnipeg)
- 20 m<sup>2</sup> sign size
- One face of single, double or multiple-viewing one at a time 10x2, 20 m<sup>2</sup>
- Sign size should be dependent on parcel size, surrounding landscape, setback from roadway

- No limit on size of sign. Regulations should be based on context. Interesting perspective Rogers Place good example

### **How should we manage the separation distance between freestanding and digital sign types?**

- Depends on sizes and context of area. Current regulations provide a good balance. Distance between digital and non digital: Depends if on/off premises. Should there be different distances: Yes
- Every landowner/property owner/business owner should be allowed to advertise business regardless of what the neighbouring properties are doing
- Distance between digital off premises signs: 100m - 300m based on area. Digital off premises sign to digital on: 30 m. Digital on/off to digital on/off: 100-300m based on area. On/off premises sign to on premises sign: 30m
- Sign buffers should have a clear formula, including the size of each sign
- Off premise should be forced to observe set rules of zone. On premises signs should not be penalized because of off premises or on/off premises digital. Decrease separation between dissimilar usage.
- A-frame signs are also allowed on right-of-way without permit - Bylaw 5590
- Should be different sign distance between digital vs. non digital as digital attracts the eye more than non-digital.
- "Should be different sign distance between digital vs. non digital as digital attracts the eye more than non-digital." - I don't agree because the image is still static
- Current distance regulations are good. Should have different distances for different categories.
- Shouldn't matter if it's on premises or not, regulations should be the same distance for on and off premises

### **How would a longer minimum message affect your business?**

- 6 second ads are national agreed format/accepted
- Negatively impacts sign revenue. Punitive to both the sign industry, and land owners with signs on their property
- Highly changing signs distract drivers, cause accidents, taking drivers' eyes off the roadway
- "Highly changing signs distract drivers, cause accidents, taking drivers' eyes off the roadway" I disagree based on research
- 6 seconds is fine

- I don't see an issue here. 6 seconds or less is just fine. 10 seconds is too long considering it is read in a split second.
- Would limit our ability to sell the ads
- Depends on zoning/area. Schools in high residential different than commercial areas
- Punitive. Advertisers are used to 6 seconds, 6 seconds is common among major cities and has existed with no issues.
- Larger duration limits number of advertisers sign can accommodate. Can negatively impact revenue

### How should we measure the sign size?

- Copy area more important than sign area, larger signs allow for more esthetically pleasing signs.
- Distinguish between sign and copy area. Allow for higher sign areas in order to allow sign companies to build signs that better fit into the built environment.
- Copy area more relevant than sign area, it should be high enough so that companies have an incentive to build esthetically pleasing signs (pole covers etc.)
- Maximum area should apply to advertising copy only - should not include site identification - Kingsway
- Some structures add aesthetic appeal. Counting structure size in maximum sign area could result in less attractive structures.
- Copy area except if background or illuminated, then sign area, never structure, only sign portion.
- I don't believe the structure should be included in calculation. It doesn't convey any message.
- Measuring it by the full copy and frame structure area is a disincentive to include aesthetic improvements to the frame structure since you may go over maximum sign area
- Just looking at the area where copy goes, not the structural elements makes sense
- Structure/sign face = Ratio
- Do not include support structure in sign size, as that would not promote aesthetic additions.
- Digital copy should emulate static signs
- Should apply to everything
- Should have maximum sign area (total) and maximum information area (copy area)
- Distance from bottom of sign from ground could cause sight obstruction for drivers trying to get out of private property.

**Where are you seeing growth in demand for digital signs?**

- Signs should be allowed near intersections. Safer to react when stopped.
- Would like to see more allowable digital sign locations in the downtown area.
- They look awesome and modern. Look out the window at the Ice District. Regulations broken but signs look great!! And the message is instant and timely
- Everywhere. Reduced costs, reduced power costs, ease of maintenance.
- Digital signs can bring vibrancy and energy to commercial zoned areas
- Signs close to intersection can increase possibility of driver collision due to driver distraction - Minimum distance regulation required and will mitigate risk
- "Signs close to intersection can increase possibility of driver collision due to driver distraction - Minimum distance regulation required and will mitigate risk" - Disagree. We conduct studies through engineering firms that show no correlation between signs and collisions.
- Higher demand for larger screens
- That's when most people have time to look - when they are stopped
- Schools: convenience of changing a sign from inside in the winter. Advertising school events and important dates.

**If we did not capture a pressing issue that you are facing, please add it below.**

- Old Direct Control Zones are subject to older bylaw.
- Clearer Development Officer mandate - explain that they can't vary height. Promote Frequently Asked Question documents - educate to reduce calls. Variance power as a Development Officer - scaled back latitude in recent years. Experienced enough to give latitude - have a conversation. Break down adversarial attitudes. Online status of applications - more capacity.
- Off premises is not anywhere same as on - treat as separate entities, don't bunch them.
- Fee structure unfair and not being interpreted intelligently - fix it. Based on product type. Make it easier and cheaper to get a permit.
- Make 100m to residential and get rid of Shopping Centre (CSC) zoning for off-premises
- Safety. Don't want to sell dangerous signs. Focus on thoroughfares.
- How are existing signs going to be dealt with upon renewal?
- Enforcement resources essential. Light, not nits (light measurement currently in the bylaw)

- How far is City prepared to go to defend bylaw? Legal reps at Subdivision Development and Appeal Board (SDAB) hearing - Development Officer to defend purpose of regulations, establish impact. Court of Appeal. Goes beyond enforcement by the Board. Appeals/variances by the Board weaken the bylaw.
- Permit renewal - roll of the dice
- What is the problem with roof signs or digital roof signs?
- Sign placed crossing property line. Two different bylaws

<b>COMMON THEMES FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS</b>	
<b>Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality Control: brightness, engineering, landowner authorization</li> <li>• Quality Control: enforcement (brightness) Follow up concerns. Quality of sign impacts urban landscape (landscaping, sign quality, “simulate or match architecture) Clarification: Requirements, where permitted, issues with discretionary, simplification of process and timely, Process cleanup: rejected at City and approved at Subdivision Development and Appeal Board (SDAB). Static signs: Rules should also apply to digital</li> <li>• Public should perceive signs positively. Need high quality examples</li> <li>• Everything needs to look good. Keep inferior products out.</li> <li>• Resolution should be higher when people are closer, but doesn’t matter much when viewed from a distance. Regulate based on distance of viewer.</li> <li>• Design and aesthetics: landscaping, cladding, match architecture (consistent)</li> </ul>
<b>Enforcement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City needs to take action on safety issues (distractions)</li> <li>• Enforcement: brightness: quality of the signs</li> <li>• Lack of enforcement allows low quality signs and repeat offenses. Gives signs bad name</li> <li>• Complaint based - lack of resources</li> <li>• Sign Compliance: Did not build what was applied for, need mechanism to take down.</li> <li>• What is distracting, scientifically?</li> <li>• Over regulation: discretion of paying advertisers.</li> <li>• Increased enforcement is required for sign offenses</li> <li>• Greater compliance with sign bylaw is needed in heritage areas</li> </ul>

<b>Over Regulation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design elements are self regulated</li> <li>• City trying to limit impact, limits sign area. Pigeonholes you into doing something basic. Sign area should include copy but not other things.</li> <li>• Height signs is way less of an issue in other cities. Restriction on height variances should be relaxed for some types of development. Problem if it's not high enough to see.</li> <li>• 24 hour city, so not all signs will turn off</li> <li>• Ease of use - simple and straightforward</li> </ul>
<b>Fairness and Equality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Real estate signs (or other signs not requiring permits) placed anywhere</li> <li>• Digital signs: modern form of communication</li> <li>• Businesses need to communicate that digital signs are an efficient, easier way to communicate</li> <li>• Consistency - same rules in all instances/ and for all people. All play by the same rules</li> <li>• Charging construction cost for an already built sign makes no sense</li> <li>• Equal opportunity: larger companies have more strategic locations</li> <li>• Lost appeals and undermined by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board</li> <li>• Subdivision and Development Appeal Board needs more consistency. There are signs that should be refused but are later approved by the Board</li> <li>• Larger companies can obtain better legal advice</li> <li>• What does the City want to do? Increase in third party signs or help local businesses?</li> <li>• Going to Subdivision Development and Appeal Board is frustrating for everyone</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use Impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light pollution - large amount of waste (need efficient lighting)</li> <li>• Environmental perspective: with respect to an overall lighting bylaw and the element of signs that contributes to this. Energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Light pollution (inappropriate brightness, esp. at night)</li> <li>• Digital signs have a lot of waste light (it's not targeted)</li> <li>• Need to consider digital sign impact (day vs. night)</li> <li>• Health impact due to lighting and light pollution</li> <li>• Curfew times. Turn the lights down low. Can also save energy</li> <li>• Brightness is always an issue for the public. Dimming signs properly, just too bright. City has dimming guidelines, enforce them</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of digital signs getting better: pixels are getting smaller, content runs better</li> <li>• Too much copy on screen hard to read and more distracting</li> <li>• Is quality of ad related to effectiveness?</li> <li>• Every school should have a digital sign, many requests for one</li> <li>• Encourage diverse designs and character in digital signs</li> </ul>
<b>Bylaw Changes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of renewal - consistency</li> <li>• Third party advertising being used on sign owners premises - why is it allowed?</li> <li>• Clarification/consistency: less discretionary, simplification of process (time/requirements), video vs. static (content on sign, clarification where permitted)</li> <li>• Huge expense to renew sign permits. Risk in investing if renewals are difficult or uncertain. Needs to be a reasonable renewal process - if nothing changes, sign renewed</li> <li>• More consistency between development officers and Subdivision Development and Appeal Board. Give development officers more latitude to have some discretion - not exercised as much anymore. Used to be able to vary height</li> <li>• Accessible, clear on website</li> <li>• Try to remove vagueness and subjectivity. What does adversely affect built environment mean? What does sign dominates the site mean?</li> <li>• All signs on site need to be cohesive with overall development</li> <li>• Possibly limiting digital signs on premises to only advertise for their own business and possibly advertising only in hours which the business is open. When 3rd party advertising is added on signs, most businesses would want to have them illuminated longer.</li> <li>• If the bylaw changes, what will happen with existing temporary signs that haven't changed. Some sort of grandfathering should be in place - digital and static.</li> <li>• Land surveys: good to know. Good to be tightening up. Neighbourhood Convenience Commercial Zone: get rid of digital on-premises signs. Business - high traffic. Signs shouldn't be the beauty. Distance from residential</li> <li>• Some good quality signs don't comply with regulations. Sometimes regulation doesn't solve the problem of quality</li> <li>• Room for innovation - keeping up with technology</li> <li>• What is the purpose of temporary approvals? If the area doesn't fundamentally change, renewal should be simple</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Revisit bylaw for temporary digital</li> <li>● Height restriction - Other areas have no height constraints. Would like to see smaller scale off-premises signs permitted to allow more flexibility eg. at schools. Clean up with temporary signs with allow small scale off premises signs</li> <li>● Area specific - character areas</li> <li>● Fairness of Process: takes time and money to get a permit that is denied</li> <li>● Go to Subdivision Development and Appeal Board to get a sign. Lots of preparation/effort</li> <li>● Sign appeals should be taken to the Court of Appeal instead of the Subdivision Development and Appeal Board</li> <li>● Planners should have greater variance power in granting sign permits</li> <li>● Use plain language in notification letters</li> <li>● Ease of use: other cities have pages on digital signs. Create specific guidelines</li> <li>● Regulations should be clearer and less open to interpretation</li> <li>● There needs to be increased consistency among the signs approval team</li> <li>● Clarify permitting process for different sign types</li> <li>● Too many variances granted can weaken the regulations</li> <li>● Keep up with innovations in technology</li> <li>● Provide sample submission packages to Sign Association to distribute to their members</li> <li>● Increase communication efforts about upcoming changes to submission requirements</li> <li>● Increase education efforts about the importance of applying for sign permits.</li> <li>● Increased information sharing will improve relations with applicants</li> <li>● Increase amount of sign permitting information provided on the City's online mapping service. Include higher quality aerial photography in maps</li> <li>● More consistency required in setback regulations. Need easier access to Curb to Property Line maps</li> <li>● Association would like a more streamlined permitting process with reduced timelines</li> <li>● Allow a temporary banner to be put up, the permanent sign permit is in planner review</li> <li>● Provide an email address or phone number that Association members can contact to report illegal signs</li> </ul>
--	---



## Digital Signs Open Houses | June 1 & 8, 2017

### Introduction

On June 1, 2017 an open house was held to discuss digital sign regulations with the users of signs, such as businesses, schools and Community Leagues. On June 8, 2017 an open house was held for the general public. People who had completed the insight survey about digital signs and provided their email address were invited to the event. In total 34 people attended the two open houses.

At both events, display boards were laid out with key questions for participants to answer. People provided comments on post it notes so that participants could read the input and respond. Similar questions were asked at both events and the answers have been grouped into key themes below.

### Engagement Summary

Below is brief summary of some of the key points we heard at both engagement events. All detailed comments are provided in the following pages.

- **New Locations** - Some Community Leagues and schools would like to switch to digital signs for ease of changing the messages, being able to display more information, and saving volunteers' time. Other participants noted that digital signs should not be on parkland as they would negatively affect adjacent residential areas and contribute to light pollution.
- **Sign brightness** - comments focused on the need to consider the impact during different seasons and times of day, the effect of white backgrounds and choosing the best option for measuring brightness
- **Context** - it was felt the signs should fit the site plan, the architecture of the area, and not contribute to visual clutter
- **Size** - some preference for small sign sizes, and general concern with the scale relative to the surroundings and how it impacts pedestrians and cyclists

- **Animation** - desire to limit the videos and fast moving images as they are too distracting for drivers
- **Location** - some felt signs should be restricted in residential, mixed use, main street and high traffic areas. Digital signs may fit in some commercial areas, industrial areas and malls.

### Open House Feedback

SIGNS IN SCHOOL/PARKLAND	
<b>Interest in Digital Signs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bylaw prevents Community Leagues from installing lighted or digital signs on parkland</li> <li>• Community League signs use letters on a board and take money in human resources to change</li> <li>• Keeping changeable copy current is a challenge</li> <li>• Without digital signs users are unable to put up more than one message at a time</li> <li>• Want to replace older signs and get more visibility</li> <li>• Would like to have the opportunity for a digital sign on parkland for ease of updating the message - fine with diming it during certain hours</li> <li>• Digital signs should be allowed for schools, community leagues and recreation centres, with restrictions on brightness and how they face residential properties</li> <li>• Tension between getting our message out, but not impacting adjacent residential</li> </ul>
<b>Concern with Digital Signs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emit too much light, are too distracting and unsafe, take away from the look of neighbourhoods</li> <li>• Do not want digital signs on community or school property because in a residential area it would be impossible to not adversely affect residents</li> <li>• Digital signs may have a place and purpose business wise, but don't belong anywhere near a residential area</li> </ul>

<b>How would sign be operated</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Colour - not just black and white</li> <li>● Needs to be visible at night</li> <li>● Low luminosity, basically looking like a poster - do not need animation</li> <li>● Would want animation (for example soccer registration showing a kid running)</li> <li>● Freestanding and angled not to impact residents</li> <li>● No video or moving effects, turned off at night, and 2-3 messages with 10 second timing</li> <li>● Dilemma in designing a sign that could be changed (wording, messaging, graphics) remotely from a computer that would not create light into residential front windows</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	--

## REGULATING DIGITAL SIGNS

<b>Brightness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Primary design consideration should be brightness and the distraction to drivers</li> <li>● To reduce impact of digital signs, reduce brightness and temperature</li> <li>● Looped messages need individual control of brightness because the varying background colours when the sign is changing are distracting</li> <li>● Bylaw should only stipulate brightness limits in luminance (nits) - current signs have too high of nits (450 versus recommended 150 maximum), which can be a source of disabling glare for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>● Signs should not have a bright white background - it is distracting</li> <li>● Front lit instead of backlit - use a different display technology (electronic ink) so the sign is not an outward light source, but just a digital billboard</li> <li>● Adaptive brightness - snow, cloud cover and rain can affect the perception of sign intensity</li> <li>● Consider seasonal brightness - It should be easy to write an algorithm to vary the brightness and white balance to dim the signs for the winter commute</li> <li>● Dim lights when dark, especially in the winter when they reflect off the snow, which creates more light pollution</li> <li>● Require all signs to have an operational sensor that will dim the signs for night use</li> <li>● There is dark skies technology that can minimize the distance and direction that digital light travels</li> <li>● Follow the general principles that are promoted by the Light Efficient Communities</li> </ul>
-------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coalition</li> <li>Reduce the amount of flashing and frequency of image changes</li> </ul>
<b>Architecture and Context</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Architectural design should fit with overall site plan</li> <li>Ideally signs should follow the architecture of the area they are in and fit the context of the adjacent land uses and type of street</li> <li>Sign frames that fit the character of the area</li> <li>Digital signs do not always fit with the character of the area, especially in older areas</li> <li>Affects how attractive a city is year-round, but really affects the winterscape</li> <li>Make them more visually attractive</li> <li>Visual clutter is bad for urban design and vibrancy</li> </ul>
<b>Maximum Sign Size</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 votes for 2 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>1 vote for 5 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>3 votes for 10 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>1 vote for 65m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>20m<sup>2</sup> is easier to be seen</li> <li>All sizes are acceptable other than 65m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Scale relative to surroundings should be considered</li> <li>All signs should be human scale and comfortable for cars, and people cycling and walking by it</li> <li>It is relative to the context of the location, adjacent built form and use by humans and animals (for parkland)</li> <li>Also relative brightness is influenced by the size of sign</li> <li>Size should be dependent on percentage of field of view as opposed to actual size</li> </ul>
<b>Animation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Video/moving effects makes signage more relevant</li> <li>Flow rate of animation a concern as message should be visible at a glance</li> <li>Keep duration of stills to a minimum of 8 seconds</li> <li>Signs with too many moving images are an intentional distraction from driving</li> <li>Not a fan of any sort of complex video playing on the screen - no scene, no quickly</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changing images, no flashes of light</li> <li>• Slow changes in intensity and colour</li> </ul>
<b>Number of Signs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many signs can create clutter</li> <li>• Scale signs to scale of property</li> <li>• Not many small signs, invest in a big one for a whole property, otherwise it is visual clutter</li> <li>• One sign per property - if there are multiple businesses than one per business</li> <li>• Decrease the number of signs per kilometre</li> <li>• Decrease the number of signs per business</li> </ul>
<b>Sharing Signs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing a digital sign like the one at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT) would be good, that way there is less equipment</li> <li>• Looped signage for multiple places can offer a solution in certain areas</li> <li>• Have seen shared business digital signs and they are too bright distracting and irritating</li> <li>• Good to share sign boards, if possible, if businesses are close together (one major sign per strip mall)</li> <li>• I would be pleased to advertise community events (on business sign)</li> </ul>
<b>Sign Content</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content of signs should be carefully considered (ex. nudity, sexual content, drinking, smoking etc.)</li> <li>• Non-offensive content - proper vetting of ads prior to being run</li> </ul>
<b>Type of Advertising</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A message is a message - there should not be a distinction between on/off premises</li> <li>• There should be a difference between permits for digital signs close to a school/ business and community and a digital sign for advertising with no connection to the community (3rd party)</li> <li>• I prefer signs be “attached” to the building, not a billboard</li> <li>• Prefer signs attached to a structure or within the frame of a building, not randomly sprouting from every available free space</li> </ul>
<b>Hours of Operation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hours of operations tied to zoning or permit</li> <li>• Non-intrusive digital signs that can be turned on/off at specified times eg: off at 9 p.m. on</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>at 5 p.m.</li> <li>• Strict limits on shining on houses from 10 p.m. to sunrise</li> </ul>
<b>Less Regulation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easier access to permits based on current process and guidelines</li> <li>• Window signs should have minimum regulation and all other signs facing roadways focus on minimize video/movement of images</li> <li>• The city doesn't regulate any other form of advertising therefore they shouldn't regulate digital signs</li> </ul>
<b>Concern with Digital Signs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to seriously consider the negative effects of light pollution and the adverse effects of lighting conditions in signs, which can be possible triggers of photosensitive epilepsy</li> <li>• Light pollution adversely affects the environment (bird migration, predatorprey interactions, diurnal cycles etc.)</li> <li>• Consider migratory birds</li> <li>• Light pollution affects human health - melatonin and other hormonal production</li> <li>• They are ugly, unsafe and a big distraction</li> <li>• They distract drivers, are overall ineffective and unappealing</li> <li>• Overall, digital signs do not have a positive effect on the City</li> <li>• Open that digital signs are illegal - they cause distracted driving</li> <li>• Digital signs have not added to the attractiveness of Edmonton</li> </ul>

#### LOCATING DIGITAL SIGNS

<b>Road Safety</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location should not conflict with road safety</li> <li>• Restrict digital signs at intersections, especially major ones</li> <li>• The colors of the digital sign can be confused for the changing of the traffic lights</li> <li>• Restrict on arterial roads</li> <li>• No signs on freeways: Whitemud, Henday, Yellowhead</li> <li>• Keep away from heavy vehicular traffic areas to reduce driver distraction</li> <li>• They must be on major corridors and they have to be controlled (suggestion that the City should own and control these signs)</li> </ul>
--------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher restrictions in high collision areas, where there are lots of pedestrians, and at traffic circles</li> </ul>
<b>Appropriate Sign Locations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to business districts, downtown, and high traffic areas getting signs within reason</li> <li>• Yes signs in industrial or retail areas</li> <li>• Small signs in malls that are well-removed from roads are possible areas</li> <li>• Permissible - inside malls, industrial as long as they are not facing traffic</li> </ul>
<b>More Restrictive</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More restrictive regulations in residential, mixed use and main street areas</li> <li>• Residential areas, including mixed use, must be free of signs that can affect people's ability to sleep, distract drivers and thereby create a safety issue</li> <li>• Third party digital signs should never be allowed in, or impact on, residential areas</li> <li>• No digital signs anywhere - they take away from green space and cost the City in enforcement and energy costs</li> <li>• Digital signs lead to increase in light pollution this is bad for our health and for wildlife, therefore, keep out of residential areas and parks</li> <li>• Minimal residential (school, community halls only)</li> <li>• Any restrictions should only pertain to residential areas</li> <li>• The downtown is already an area where there is a confusing and unattractive mix of lights controlling traffic, decorative lights etc. - no more please</li> <li>• Consider sign-free stretches to give the brain a respite from constant bombardment of advertising</li> </ul>

## CIRCULATION | December 12, 2017- January 17, 2018

As part of the standard circulation process for proposed Zoning Bylaw changes, Administration emailed a draft of the committee report and attachments to external stakeholders, including:

- Members of the sign industry
- Members of the general public who had indicated their interest by signing up at public engagement events
- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues
- Urban Development Institute
- Canadian Home Builders Association
- Adjacent municipalities
- Public and Catholic School Boards

Stakeholders had the opportunity to provide feedback during the five week circulation. Seven individuals responded and their comments are summarized below.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS
<b>Sign Industry</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed amendment changes should not be done until after policy work is completed. Industry was not adequately consulted on the proposed changes.</li> <li>• The sign renewal clause was included to protect the non-conforming status of existing signs and removing this clause is not in keeping with the principles of originally putting it in the Zoning Bylaw and will have a substantial negative impact on sign investments</li> <li>• Removing the variance power of a Development Officer or the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board to allow a rooftop digital sign is unfair</li> <li>• Digital signs that are on-premises versus off-premises should be treated differently, with stricter regulations for off-premises signs and sign permits for digital on-premises signs should be more than five years</li> <li>• Interest in allowing digital signage on moving vehicles</li> </ul>



<b>Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the development of signage policy</li> <li>• Note that a key question for Community Leagues as part of a policy project will be determining if digital signs should be allowed in parks, and if so what regulations should apply</li> <li>• Interested in future education to Community Leagues and the public about proper lighting in neighbourhoods</li> </ul>
<b>Alberta Dark Sky Association</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in signage policy, particularly as it relates to controlling light from digital signs</li> <li>• Concerned with the use of blue light, the time of day that digital signs are on, and the size, intensity and location of digital signs</li> </ul>
<b>Adjacent Municipalities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments or no concerns with proposed approach</li> </ul>

## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS | April, 2018

At the March 13 Urban Planning Committee meeting, Committee requested further consultation with stakeholders about the proposed changes to sign regulations in Zoning Bylaw 12800. To this end, Administration held three meetings in early April, 2018 with available individuals from the sign industry and their representatives. The discussions were focused on understanding the impacts of the immediate proposed changes on people actively involved in the sign industry.

Throughout our discussions the key points of discussion were:

- Being unable to develop roof signs with digital copy
- Having to include older, existing signs in the five year permit cycle for off-premises signs
- Applying the separation distances to all freestanding signs
- Removing the definition for changeable copy

Below is a summary of the input heard. This input was used to clarify and refine the proposed amendments to sign rules.

PROPOSED CHANGE	FEEDBACK
Simplify general sign definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most stakeholders noted no concern with the majority of the proposed changes to sign definitions</li> <li>• Some stakeholders noted that definitions are clearer and simpler, which will aid implementation of the rules</li> <li>• <b>Changeable Copy</b> - there was concern that removing this definition meant that signs with “crawler” messages or prices for gas bars would be considered digital signs and be subject to the digital sign regulations</li> </ul>
Simplify sign use class definitions and clarify which sign uses can	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most stakeholders noted no concern with the majority of the proposed changes to use class definitions</li> <li>• <b>Roof Signs</b> - adding to the definition that there can be no digital copy on roof</li> </ul>

have digital copy	<p>signs was seen as having a large impact because this change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Removes the variance power that currently allows digital roof signs</li> <li>○ Will be expensive for stakeholders with existing digital roof signs who will have to remove them in the future</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Temporary Digital Signs</b> - adding to the definition that there can be no digital copy on temporary signs was seen as unfairly disadvantaging the portable signs industry.</li> </ul>
Remove the renewal clause	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Some stakeholders noted that they would be in support of removing this clause as it creates more equity between applicants applying for off-premises signs</li> <li>● Some stakeholders felt removing this clause would be unfair to some, particularly when the sign has been existing with no problems and the context of the area has not changed</li> <li>● Some stakeholders expressed concerns with the fact that all off-premises signs have five year permits</li> </ul>
Clarify that the separation distance between signs applies to all types of freestanding signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Some stakeholders noted no concern with the proposed wording change to separation distance between freestanding signs</li> <li>● Some stakeholders noted that this change would have an impact in instances when off-premises signs have been placed closer to on-premises signs. When the off-premises sign permits expire they would potentially have to be taken down or moved if a variance was not granted by the Development Officers or Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.</li> <li>● Some stakeholders noted concern that people will have to remove digital signs on the same freestanding sign structure with the proposed change in wording</li> </ul>
Add digital sign regulations to specific sign schedules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Most stakeholders noted no concern with the proposed changes</li> <li>● Some stakeholders inquired about having a larger sign size for digital signs in the Ellerslie special area zones. Previously these signs were not subject to any maximum size regulations.</li> </ul>

## CIRCULATION | June 4 - July 3, 2018

As part of the standard circulation process for proposed Zoning Bylaw changes, Administration emailed a draft of the committee report and attachments to external stakeholders, including:

- Members of the sign industry and their representatives
- Members of the general public who had indicated their interest by signing up at public engagement events
- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues
- Urban Development Institute
- Canadian Home Builders Association
- Adjacent municipalities
- Public and Catholic School Boards

Stakeholders had the opportunity to provide feedback during the four week circulation. Three individuals responded and their comments are summarized below.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS
<b>Urban Development Institute</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requesting clarification on the different digital sign use class definitions</li> <li>• Requesting clarification on why the radial separation distance between freestanding signs is 30 meters in some zones and 45 meters in others</li> </ul>
<b>Light Efficient Communities (2 responses)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressing concern about the continued installation of digital signs, particularly the possibility for negative impacts on residential areas</li> <li>• Suggesting a curfew on digital signs</li> <li>• Looking for better regulations for digital signs, such as more accurate measuring of sign brightness, restriction of motion effects, and longer dwell times before messages change</li> </ul>