

Regarding the proposed changes to the sign by-laws. Specifically for mobile signs.

I believe the proposed changes to the sign by-law has focussed on what some would consider aesthetics, without regard to the people that it affects the most, local businesses.

Please request the number of mobile sign permits issued per year, over the last three years. Current pandemic conditions has certainly negatively affected commercial operations. That is why you should look at each of the three + years.

Each permit is a business trying to attract someone to their location. It is not sought-after lightly, but out of need. Businesses do not order a sign on a whim. They pay for getting results. They do it to fulfill a need. Some may say that there are other forms of advertising that can be used. They are right. Personally, I encourage my clients to use them as well. None of the other forms of marketing reach the public while they are in front of my customer's location. It is a valid part of an overall marketing plan.

Some glaring errors and repercussions in the proposed changes are:

1. *Reducing the permit period to 14 days.* Repetition is important. Cutting the viewing period in half, cuts the effectiveness of the message by over 50%. Some businesses run month long campaigns. Some businesses need extended exposure to give people a chance to mull over a job change. New businesses benefit from longer exposure to attract customers. I would hope that with the reduced permit period, businesses could expect a comparable cut in permit fees. The rental price of a sign is low compared to the other forms of advertising.
2. *No neon or fluorescent letters.* Everyone is trying to stand out. Why would you want to remove an arrow from the customer's quiver? A minority of signs use them, so why take away a niche sign?
3. *50 metres between signs.* Reducing the number of signs allowed at a plaza is to the detriment of the many other businesses trying to attract customers as well. It can be hard enough for the small stores to attract attention. Don't make it harder. Since the signs are on private property, would you not agree that it should be the realm of the plaza owner or manager to regulate this? Some are quite restrictive in their requirements. Allow them control. As far as the visibility of the signs, it would be prudent to actually contact the mobile sign vendors for their input to their needs to succeed.
4. *15 metres from an intersection.* As this is proposed for safety reasons, it would be prudent to investigate if this is a real issue, or a manufactured one. Has there been a single instance of an accident occurring because of signs in place with the current by-law? We need to act on facts, not assumptions. Extending the distance on the basis of a conceptual need, verses an actual one is one that will have negative consequences with no actual benefits.

Making the proposed changes on the basis of perceived aesthetics as opposed to pragmatic reasoning can unintentionally hurt those who are paying: City taxes, people's wages, local purchasing, and community support. Although the process of updating the by-law has been a long process, it wouldn't be prudent to rush into changes without looking at the ramifications to the City's economic health as well.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

John Camelford
signs@C-Here.ca
519 835-5660