



## City of Guelph Dark Sky Bylaw Survey Summary

February 28, 2024

To supplement the input received at the two public meetings in November, the City invited the community to provide feedback through an online survey between January 16 and February 25, 2024. The survey was completed by 704 people; full verbatim comments have been synthesized thematically in the document that follows.

### Did you attend one or more of the Dark Sky workshops?

	#	%
Did not attend	602	86.4%
Prefer not to say	71	10.2%
Attended November 9 digital session	19	2.7%
Attended November 14 in-person session	3	0.4%
Attended both workshops	2	0.3%
Skipped question	7	

### Are you any of the following? (Select all that apply)

	#
Resident living in Guelph	667
Business owner or industrial property owner in Guelph	74
Business or industrial property manager in Guelph	27
Academic, researcher or innovator in the field of light pollution, wildlife, wellbeing or similar	22
Lighting manufacturer, distributor or consultant	5
None of the above	15
Skipped question	4

**Light pollution is the excessive or inappropriate use of artificial light outdoors, such as parking lot floodlights casting a glow up into the sky. How big of a problem is light pollution in Guelph?**

	#	%
A significant problem	207	29.7%
Not a problem at all	175	25.1%
Somewhat of a problem	148	21.2%
A very small problem	90	12.9%
A very big problem	78	11.2%
Skipped question	6	

- 40.9% consider it a significant or very big problem
- 34.1% consider it somewhat or a very small problem
- 25.1% say it's not a problem at all

## **What level of City involvement would be appropriate for...**

### ***Existing residential units such as houses or apartments?***

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	253	36.1%
No regulations or interventions from the City	167	23.8%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	160	22.8%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	121	17.3%
Skipped question	3	

- Responses to each variation of this question that follow were similar, with more support for non-residential units.

### ***Existing industrial buildings and properties?***

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	350	50%
No regulations or interventions from the City	138	19.7%



	#	%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	128	18.3%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	84	12.0%
Skipped question	4	

- More support for a bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, than compared to existing residential

### ***Existing businesses other than industrial (such as retail, administrative and services)?***

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	336	48.2%
No regulations or interventions from the City	139	19.5%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	125	17.9%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	100	14.3%
Skipped question	7	

- More support for a bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, compared to existing residential

### ***New residential units?***

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	313	44.7%
No regulations or interventions from the City	149	21.3%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	148	21.1%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	91	13.0%
Skipped question	3	

- More support for bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, compared to existing residential



### ***New industrial buildings and properties?***

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	393	56.2%
No regulations or interventions from the City	123	17.6%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	105	15.2%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	77	11.0%
Skipped question	5	

- More support for a bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, compared with existing industrial

### ***New business buildings and properties (other than industrial)?***

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	384	54.9%
No regulations or interventions from the City	129	18.4%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	104	14.9%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	83	11.9%
Skipped question	4	

- More support for a bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, compared with existing businesses

### ***Schools and institutions (such as hospitals and other campuses)?***

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	305	43.5%
No regulations or interventions from the City	166	23.7%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	136	19.4%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	94	13.4%
Skipped question	3	



- More support for a bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, compared to existing residential, but less support when compared to existing and new industrial and businesses
- Slightly less support for a bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, when compared to new residential builds

### **Signs and billboards?**

	#	%
A bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent	414	59.1%
No regulations or interventions from the City	126	18.0%
A bylaw to regulate just light trespass (when light is cast on a neighbouring property or structure)	101	14.4%
Posting optional guidelines to inspire less light pollution	59	8.4%
Skipped question	4	

- More support for a bylaw to regulate all outdoor lights to some extent, compared to all other previous scenarios

### **Are there other property types or levels of City involvement you would like to see explicitly considered in any restrictions?**

#### **No/None (63)**

- No (46)
  - No and no to any city involvement
  - No, Guelph is very responsible in its light use so far.
  - No. Stop wasting our tax resources!
  - No, there are enough
  - No. Reducing light will reduce safety, and increase crime in the city.
  - No. Lights are needed for property owners to deter theft and trespass. Lights are also needed for people to feel safe driving and walking. Not everyone has access to a vehicle and walking through a dark area is unsafe.
  - No. I personally think this is an asinine idea. The City has very real problems..... including vast increases in crime, drugs and homelessness. You want to focus on light? Good grief.
  - No this is beyond asinine



- No - a dark sky bylaw is not a priority for staff efforts.
- No. There are more important issues in Guelph such as crime (increasing drastically), & homeless camping wherever they want (such as downtown).
- None (10)
  - None. The city does not need to get involved. I live in an area with abundant woods and animal life and we are all co-existing just fine as things are.
  - None lay off
- N/A (3)
- I don't believe so.
- Not that I am aware of.
- Not that I can think of.
- Nil

### **Streetlights (47)**

- City street lights should be regulated in residential neighborhoods to ensure they don't shine directly into homes. Position light posts between houses instead of directly in front of windows
- Yes. The worst offender in my neighbourhood (and on the title page of your website) is street lighting. It appears that the advent of inexpensively operated LED lamps has allowed increased lumens of street lighting. What is the need (other than fear of legal liability) for such bright lamps? I understand a need at road intersections (similar to rural settings) but not for roadways. Current automobile lamps are much brighter than the old incandescent headlamps and are more than adequate to illuminate the roadway. I understand there may be a fear of walking alone in the dark, and this needs to be addressed.
- Roads
- City street lights
- Street light trespass should be reduced and/or more balanced
- Street lighting
- Street lights
- All city streets illuminated by the new LED streetlights. Also the huge lights on the Hanlon and other major routes.
- Streetlights!! Please change them to amber or yellow for the sake of animals, plants, insects, birds, human health and human safety. It was so much better before January 2000 when all the streetlights were changed to LEDs. I



understand that LEDS save energy (fabulous!) BUT I also understand that they don't have to be bright white/blue!! So no white or blue streetlights allowed.

- Consider including street lighting
- Streetlights (new ones) could focus light downward instead of in a 360 degree light.
- New streetlights are too bright.
- Looking at strategies for reducing streetlight bleed into the sky as well as toward residential units. Technology that reduces brightness when no movement is detected.
- Street light policy
- I live in an established residential area. Our street lights were “upgraded”. I understand the energy savings but the lights that were installed are far too bright. I can make a cup of tea when it’s “dark” without turning on the house lights. Evidence shows that night lighting is contraindicated for people, animals and plants.
- I'm not sure I see a type/level that would encompass street lighting, and in my opinion that is a serious issue...most of our streets are over-illuminated. Some of that lighting, notably the newer double-bulb LEDs, casts harsh light with distracting double shadows and (like too many LEDs) are subject to flickering.
- There should be financial assistance for any conversions required because any new by-laws. For instance, we live in a multi-unit, single-household condo with 5 street lights. It would be very expensive to convert these lights (I looked).
- Major streets all lit up
- Streetlights throughout the city need a bylaw - reduce the glare, the light, the exposure of the LED lights
- The city could start by reducing the brightness of street lights when there is low traffic with sensors and using a different color of light that's less reflective and does not create the same light island effect as other colours.
- The new streetlights are WAY too bright.
- Regulating street light brightness and trespass in Guelph - those are some of the worst offenders of light trespass as far as I can see. I have overly bright street lights needlessly shining sideways into my second story window.
- Street lighting (as deemed safe)
- I would like to also see options explored for reducing lighting from street lights.
- All city owned properties, including street lighting.



- Municipal street lights. Need to be lighting DOWN from a lower level for PEDESTRIANS and cyclists NOT cars.
- Street light standards. At least in new builds, they should be lower, not at second floor level.
- City street light are off-the-chart bright. It's equally important to recognize the patterns and needs of nocturnal animals, not only human comfort.
- I assume city streets and property would already be included, if not it should be.
- Street lighting. Focus street lighting to intersections only (including on the Hanlon). Eliminate street lighting on residential streets
- Light crosswalks well. Have lights directed to only light the crosswalk areas. Crosswalk lights could even be activated by a pedestrian push button so could be off when not in use.
- Focus any on street lighting to sidewalks (lower to the ground over sidewalk itself), and let spill from sidewalk lighting light the bike lanes.
- Investigate sidewalk and street lighting light colours that lower impact on migrating birds, insects, wildlife in general.
- Lighting on city streets. The new LED lights are horribly bright.
- Street lights facing apartment and residential buildings, including on the Hanlon.
- Unnecessary street lights turned off or dimmed during the night.
- Street lights
- Reducing street lights. There are too many and too bright on small streets.
- Streetlights - consider motion sensors in a test area that brightens/dims them based on activity (not on or off, just brightness level). This has been tested in other municipalities.
- I would like to see less lighting on some city streets. The use of LED lighting on streets is very bright and intense, is there a way to turn these down?
- Streetlights are likely the largest contributor to light pollution. I hope this topic can at least be considered.
- Look at hours of street lighting. Are 3 am lights necessary on all streets?
- Limit the height of light poles
- Also, in case this doesn't come up in the latter part of the survey, I propose that covers be considered/allowed for the exceedingly bright LED streetlights in Guelph, especially if a resident requests them. They are blinding to look at directly, but they too contribute to the 'daylight overnight' effect in residential areas. They have unavoidably been installed on the existing poles, which were spaced to accommodate much dimmer lights, so





the effect is overwhelming. For example, in our house, even with wooden slat blinds and curtains closed, it is possible to see everything in the upstairs hall and bedrooms at night, and so we are able to walk around easily. I believe (and research shows) that this level of light pollution negatively affects human sleep patterns. For instance, since those LEDs were installed, I have not managed more than about 6 hours of sleep per night (formerly 8 - 9). The effect is much more pronounced in winter, when the leaves are off the trees. "

- I would like to see the city regulate itself! The new streetlights which the city has been installing are one of the worst sources of light pollution in the city. I have heard it claimed by staff that they generate less atmospheric light pollution, but at ground level, they are atrociously bright and in the white-blue colour spectrum which is most disruptive to eyesight and natural rhythms. They could be the best streetlights in the world, but if they are causing negative effects below 5 metres (where 99% of us and the animals live), they are extremely disruptive.
- Support for light dimming and sensors in parking lots and roads.

### **Industrial, commercial, institutional (27)**

- Office buildings, such as Cooperators, do not need lights on at night.
- I'm not sure if included as there are tons of lights on on empty office buildings at night and seems to be a waste of hydro.
- Small commercial businesses
- A suggestion for all commercial and industrial spaces would be that outside of business hours exterior lighting should be kept to the minimum need for security purposes.
- Businesses operating at late hours
- Schools and housing units tend to have really large and overbearing "floodlights". They are intrusive. I would understand if either of these places had security but they don't. Thus the need for the lights are moot.
- Industrial - I use the University of Guelph as an example where on certain nights, the reflected light into the sky in my opinion is offensive to the surrounding residential areas. There must be a cut off point as to the amount of needless illumination that facility emits constantly and regularly.
- I think it should be mandatory for offices to have their lights off when the building is closed or the business day ends.
- A closed business should not be allowed to be emitting ANY idle light. Motion activated lights would be fine, but we have gigantic swathes of industrial and retail land that is lit up like it's daytime in the middle of the night and the only



argument anyone can make is that it technically reduces the chance of break-in. If you're in a sea of darkness and a motion detected light goes off, that is far more noticeable than a would be burglar walking through an idle light.

- Churches, make them dark.
- I think it is important to watch out for when business or industrial properties are near residential properties to make sure the lights are not shining into home windows. If certain kinds of environmentally friendly lights and ways of lighting so nature and people are not as impacted, can be encouraged that would be great.
- Any businesses, industrial, retail etc., or marketing-related lights should be regulated. There should be a little less regulations for residential areas (lighting outdoor recreation fields should still be permitted).
- Excessive lighting kept on indoors when a building is closed.
- I believe the goal of these efforts should be to minimize impacts on residential properties, eg industrial or commercial impacting residential properties. For example if security lighting is shining in to a residential property 24-7 , this should be minimized
- One of my concerns involves JL's Hardware on Wellington, where lighting for the eastern yard spills up the hill and DID illuminate local FOG near Christmas time, to an extent that it was VERY HARD to safely find, and then drive down the Exit from the westbound Wellington Overpass to take the southbound Hanlon Expressway. The effect of the lights was to make the atmosphere WHITE.
- There is no reason for office buildings to keep their lights on when they are closed for business.
- Businesses without activity at night from other people (after closing hours).
- Any office / school buildings to close all lights when not in use. It's a shame to drive by and see lights on.
- Businesses casting spotlights into the sky, businesses with floodlights improperly aimed, flooding neighbouring properties. Headlights of cars owned by businesses, especially of those businesses are in the business of modifying headlights (a growing concern).
- Differentiate new from existing schools and institutions
- The parkade buildings that are largely unused overnight are a huge source of excess and preventable light pollution. As are the commercial high rises downtown (such as Cooperators) who choose to leave their office lights on 24/7



- Regarding schools and other institutions, I think it should be based upon times of use. So stricter measures if the building is not currently in use or closed. Therefore schools would have hours that they are closed. Well a hospital is open 24 hours a day.
- Existing (not new) institutional properties which might currently be having a substantial impact on neighbours with excessive light emissions..
- Existing Institutional Properties having substantial impact on neighbouring properties.
- University of Guelph
- Industrial/shipping areas with painfully bright lights on buildings shining outward
- Perhaps indoor lighting should also be included somewhere on this survey, especially for schools and retail spaces that do not operate at night and are more likely to be near a residential neighborhood

### ***Sports fields/parks (23)***

- The UofG stadium is also a bit of an issue, especially so close to the arboretum.
- Sport field lights are controlled by timers which is good.
- Sportsfields and equivalent
- Sports fields
- Sports-fields and parks near waterways
- Sports fields are a major light polluter, and if they don't already have restrictions on hours.
- Yes .... tennis courts
- City parks- I advocated to have timers installed at Jubilee Park for the tennis courts and the ice rink pad as they would come on whether there was ice or not all winter, then restricted again to actually pushing a button to turn them on. Same with the tennis courts. The place is overly bright in my opinion, however with the changes made they only come on when there is a demand for them to be turned on. Not sure what is done to the dozens of other parks in Guelph with similar amenities however 'Parks' worked with me to resolve a specific problem we faced with light trespass and pure waste of electricity that is being paid for in tax dollars.
- City parks should be subject to the same bylaws and not be permitted to cast light on neighbouring properties
- Sports fields
- Sports Fields, whether adjacent to schools/rec centres or not.



- Restrict lighting in parks and tree protection zones and any building that backs onto a residential area.
- Restricting lighting in tree protection zones and in parks and any buildings that back on to tree protection zones....specifically the new condo development that backs on tree protection zones at paisley and Elmira (that area was previously old growth forest area and was cut down to build condos)
- Tennis courts
- Outdoor sports fields
- City owned recreational and park lands.
- Ball park and stadium lighting. Especially when not in use.
- Outdoor sports courts. The tennis court light near me are extremely bright and stay on very late.
- Sportsfields
- Sports fields
- Recreational fields and facilities- lights off at 1000. Lights lowered or minimized until closing.
- Sports fields, outside of reasonable operating hours.
- Sport fields

### **City properties (18)**

- Major works and public buildings. Especially the ones that seem to have the need to have their lights fully on, or most of all the time. In larger cities, many businesses and governmental buildings will keep most of their lights on 24/7. Despite no one being there outside perhaps maintenance and security. Perhaps light could be available to them on a per use basis, rather than having all of most of the building lit up like a Christmas tree despite only having a small skeleton crew. Especially if such buildings have a secure access on the main floor.
- City buildings
- City Hall
- The City should lead by example by taking a hard look at night lighting of its own buildings, although I realize I know very little about how much lighting is required (and where) to protect public safety.
- City Hall and other government buildings
- The city itself should set the example
- By far the main source of light pollution, somehow ignored here, is the municipality itself—mainly streetlights and the like. If Guelph is really interested in reducing light pollution, the main answer is therefore obvious:



reduce streetlighting, either by reducing the brightness of the lights or by, say, turning off every other light. This would also reduce costs.

- City owned/managed buildings
- All city owned properties, including street lighting.
- City facilities (recreation, community centers) or municipal buildings such as City Hall or Police Station. Parking lots or structures.
- The City buildings like the Waste Resource Innovation Centre on Dunlop Drive when contacted about the amount of light being shed at the facility was supposedly due to security. Since when is it important to protect our waste from being stolen?
- I assume city streets and property would already be included, if not it should be.
- City owned properties. Lead by example.
- City owned lights/street lights and city buildings
- Municipal buildings, transportation hub, elimination of mercury lighting
- City Property. It's inappropriate to enforce this on industry/property owners, and not be something the city has to adhere to as well.
- The city is the WORST offender. This survey refers only to residential or commercial properties. Is the city exempt for some reason
- City properties

### **Parking lots (15)**

- Parking lots. Many can be much dimmer and still be adequate. Also, parking lots should be on timers so that they turn off after hours.
- Parking lots! These need motion activated lights instead of giant lights blazing from dusk until dawn.
- For safety, parking lots need to be lit, but no light trespassing allowed. This is not rocket science.
- Large Parking Lots all lit up
- The one that I'm most impacted by is the downtown parking garage next to city hall.
- Parking lots
- Parking lots for residential and businesses (and suggest use of video / cctv with lighting to deter unscrupulous behaviours)
- Parking lots
- Special consideration should be given to parking lots for safety reasons.
- Commercial - I would say that in today's crime plagued areas, more than sufficient parking lot lighting should be allowed without interference from the



city unless that light pollution interferes with adjoining properties of residential occupancies, light trespass.

- Large mall parking lots
- I assume parking lots would be included in which ever building or property is being addressed, but if not I think they should be included.
- Parking lot of building lights set high off the ground or not shielded to avoid impacting others.
- The parkade buildings that are largely unused overnight are a huge source of excess and preventable light pollution. As are the commercial high rises downtown (such as Cooperators) who choose to leave their office lights on 24/7
- Support for light dimming and sensors in parking lots and roads.

### **Residential (12)**

- We have some homeowners near to us with extravagant outdoor lighting (deemed security lighting), that is ridiculous in my opinion re the colour of the illumination, as well as the amount of illumination (see McCann Drive as a reference point). I suppose if they want them on all night (consider environmental issues and cost /pollution to produce the light), it should not affect the quiet enjoyment to neighbours etc. re light trespass.
- Schools and housing units tend to have really large and overbearing "floodlights". They are intrusive. I would understand if either of these places had security but they don't. Thus the need for the lights are moot.
- It would also be important to give bylaw officers some "teeth" when it comes to enforcing changes at existing properties. e.g. for those residential properties that have multiple (can be 15-20!) bright/LED soffit or other exterior lights that impinge on neighbours' enjoyment of a "dark sky".
- Residential. I live near preservation park and light pollution from residential properties keeps increasing and increasing. We used to have fireflies in our yard and now we never do.
- Residential neighborhoods
- Some new homes have excess lights as a decorative feature.
- All new homes and renovations should have shielded lights to prevent skyglow and reduce light trespass.
- Residential houses and even commercial and institutional buildings that have all the pot lights along the eaves that cause the building to be completely lit should not be permitted



- I believe the bylaw should extend to cover existing (not just new) residential (and other buildings) in particular the relatively recent, but seemingly contagious practice of 'uplighting' the exterior of one's home for presumably decorative purposes. In addition to being an unnecessary use of electricity, it results in virtually daylight conditions during the night in some neighbourhoods.
- Residential, high-density townhomes/condos
- Decorative architectural accents, emergency lighting
- I would like to see residential light trespassing bylaws for adjacent properties.

### **Broad/all (10)**

- As many as possible
- Makes sense to make it as broad as possible.
- All
- Bylaws should be retroactive and apply to all structures and properties, including sports fields, city buildings, businesses, industries and residences.
- Regulations should apply to everyone.
- All properties
- All property types, with an emphasis on buildings which also use higher levels of power to light the building - taxing the power grid for unnecessary use.
- All Lights shining up in the sky
- All property types should be considered.
- All property types not listed above.

### **Multi-storey buildings (10)**

- I live in a condo building downtown and the light pollution can be significant. Lighting from other condo buildings lighting up the exterior of their building creates a lot of light that enters into my condo.
- The townhouse complex is too bright at night with inappropriate type of lighting instead of downlighting
- Multi-story buildings, e.g. offices, where interior lights should be turned off when occupants are not in to avoid bird strikes
- High rise residential and business buildings
- Please include Multi-unit residential buildings. For example, the property at 50 Yarmouth Street was allowed to have lights facing outwards instead of down. If just a few lights are left on it casts light into properties as far away as Dublin Street.
- Tall Buildings





- Regulations to discourage developers leaving lights on in empty buildings under construction. That high rises control indoor lighting to avoid bird to window collisions. This is an inside lighting problem, not just an outdoor lighting problem.
- Yes. Limit the use of outdoor lighting for all existing condos.
- Residential, high-density townhomes/condos

### **Car dealerships (9)**

- Car dealership lots
- Car lots
- Auto Dealership lighting
- The Automall is one big light pollution area HOWEVER, there is not enough policing, as we have seen, that protects the business property, so that is unfortunately a necessary evil that must be dealt with carefully. What about motion sensor lighting in that instance that is dim until something moves and then it blasts full daylight?
- Auto mall
- Can we do something about the auto-mall. It's disgusting.
- Take a look at the auto mall for an example of excessive light.
- The auto mall on Woodlawn
- Car dealerships - lighting orchestrated so it doesn't ruin the night sky but still allows security

### **Lighting direction (9)**

- The vertical transfer and light pollution of lights in parks. Lamps are needed for safety, but shooting the light vertically may be the issue.
- Commercial business' and residential properties where light has significant skyward projection, or projection into road users vision. A number of households in south end have wrap around exterior pot lights that act as a distraction to road users.
- Eliminate upward lighting in places like parking lots. Gentle uplighting of things like trees can be pleasant but no need to leave it on all night.
- Lights that shine towards a residential property window affecting the residents. Light affecting wildlife. Flood lights.
- Light trespass is a major issue for residents especially in light of the recent increase of LED luminaires. Exhibition park Arena lights are on the side of the building directed towards the parking lot. I would like to see lights directed





from a light pole toward the Arena. The existing lights are intense and affect my residence at 61 Division Street.

- No spotlights shining into the sky
- No spotlights in the sky.
- Bylaw to restrict light that goes up into the sky, not just light trespass to neighbouring properties or structures. Lighting should be directed down to where it's needed not be permitted to go into space where it's not needed.
- Excessive uplighting, hours of illumination, weeks of illumination for seasonal decorations and light trespass should all be addressed. Bylaws should be enacted rather than voluntary compliance which is easily blown off.

### **Downtown (9)**

- The Armoury (the existing lights are too bright and invasive.
- Are very intense lights such as those near the armoury necessary. I understand they are needed for security but must they be so bright and directed toward my condo (160 Macdonell St)? Can they not at least be angled down? As Guelph grows, more people are living downtown. We all know that darkness is necessary for quality sleep.
- The light that circles the sky from somewhere downtown (a downtown business?) is very intrusive.
- The decorative lights on buildings downtown. While they look nice, the lights are shining directly into the sky and can be seen changing the colours of the clouds when overcast
- Additionally the spot light that can occasionally be seen projecting from business' on Macdonell at night.
- Do not permit spotlights being directed into the sky. The marijuana shop on MacDonell regularly shines lights into the sky and is very disruptive.
- There is a downtown bar at Wyndham and Woolwich that uses an outdoor portable revolving light on weekends to draw people. It's awful -- the light goes high up into the sky and revolves -- and I don't know why they're allowed to use it. So definitely night life businesses.
- Office buildings down town should be saving energy by shutting off all but emergency lights after hours
- That spot light shining up to the sky outside a bar downtown is uncalled for!

### **Outdoor lights/billboards (7)**

- Considering light pollution when approving outdoor light signage/decor.
- Signs that are overly bright.



- Billboards and info boards (like the one at Riverside Park). The fewer light pixels used, the better. Also, please don't have moving images - it is distracting! There is a massive billboard on Highway 6, as you drive from Fergus to Guelph. It is ALL LIGHT and it is horrible at night. It makes driving dangerous. (This is an example; obviously, you don't have any say over that sign!)
- The very bright LED billboards should be limited. These are almost blinding.
- The city should have a bylaw restricting outdoor lighting in all aspects within the city limits. It is outrageous that there is so much light pollution that it is adversely impacting migratory birds and destroying our night sky. How “Wilson’s” on Hwy 24 can get away with the excessive amount of lighting is unbelievable. I understand they are considered Guelph-eramosa but are extremely close to the city of Guelph and very important conservation area for migratory birds. It’s excessive. I live close (within the city of Guelph) and it has destroyed my night sky. As a business they should be responsible for providing se unity and not by destroying the night sky. Neighbours in kortright hills keep their nights on all day snd all night .. it’s wasteful and impacts nesting birds. They are either ignorant or just don’t care. This is WHY a bylaw is needed
- Illuminated signs are too bright and do not need to be on all night
- Please pass something to make people turn off those awful bright neon signs late at night! They're not even open and there's so much light pollution. Also downlights please!

### **Stores/malls (5)**

- The big box stores and the strip malls/Stone Road Mall are the worst.
- Stone Road Mall, Strip malls, Big box stores anything with parking lots not used after close.
- Malls
- Shopping mall areas
- Retail and grocery stores

### **Security lights (5)**

- Need to factor is security lighting - use motion sensors etc to allow floodlight or other lights to come on. Obviously sports fields can be exempt for operating periods



- Considerations need to be made for lighting restrictions for building and businesses concerned about vandalism and theft (car lots etc). We use light to deter harmful activities, but this causes serious over-lighting.
- Most lighting is to deter theft and other crimes, there should not be any restrictions on lighting.
- I think even porch lights or security lights on single existing dwellings should be considered.
- Light = property security

### **Safety considerations (6)**

- Areas with pedestrian, public transit and cycling traffic should maintain good lightening for safety
- Be sure to take vision accessibility into consideration, especially for residential and pedestrian areas - some folks need more light and may not be able to afford highly specialized options to control pollution and still be safe
- This idea will result in reduced safety and when someone gets hurt there will be law suits. Furthermore, the city currently doesn't have enough by-law officers to enforce what is currently on the books. If you can't enforce it what is the point? Please don't suggest we hire more by-law officers. The tax payers of Guelph can't handle more tax increases.
- I think light is a safety issue for such things as paths and short cuts from say U of G or shopping Mall to housing.
- Lights keep us safe
- There needs to be enough light to discourage people from trespassing on properties who have intent to rob or harm others. The photo shown at the top of the survey shows a LOT of light. I haven't seen the stars in Guelph since early childhood, more than 85 years ago. Perhaps the lights could be installed at the top of buildings and shone downwards where intruders would be walking. There is a lot to think about and plan for. I would hope that we could consider the other life on our planet who live along side of us who are confused by the artificial light at night.

### **Construction (5)**

- I'm not sure if a construction zone qualifies as an Industrial property, but I've lived across from one for over a decade as condos are built. (Metalworks Guelph). While I understand the need for lights on the property grounds overnight, I've often wondered why there are bright spotlights left on up high, blinding the eyes of neighbours looking out of their own windows. Luckily we



have curtains and have been able to make do. The noise pollution is a whole other issue which would be a far better focus of resources than this light pollution bylaw, in my opinion.

- Construction sites
- Construction activities,
- Construction sites in Guelph produce allot of light pollution. Outside house lights should can be replaced by sensor lights. city should have a strict law to save electricity.
- New apts, condos etc, while still being built - noticing many lights on at night. These are unoccupied such as 1098 Paisley/Whitlaw. Also going along with this is making Guelph a bird friendly city and preventing bird/building collisions due to lightning being left on, particularly during migration.

### **Public education (5)**

- While I feel that a regulatory bylaw approach is what is needed across all categories, a critical step before this is education. This should be both about why, but also to highlight how minor changes can be to align with dark sky principles. It is often not about complete replacement/change, but small additions (shields, etc.) and more intent around where we cast light. Guidelines around minimum footcandles, trespass and city standards can also be tooled to have benefits to dark sky approaches.
- Posting options & education to reduce light pollution.
- City should prepare pamphlet or webpage explaining what kinds of lights are dark sky compatible. See US home depot for examples.
- Educational pamphlets would also be great.
- Regardless of what is considered or confirmed, the City should definitely be posting guidelines to inspire less light pollution and educate the community to turn off lights to contribute to environmental and SDGs.

### **Light colour (4)**

- Colour spectrum of lights should be of a warm temperature, not the cool blue intense lighting, such as installed on the Norwich street bridge. Very disruptive, confusing for all wildlife.
- I would like to see regulation around the colour of light.
- I'm more concerned about the low quality LED being sold that shifts colors, were seeing green and purple lights coming around after 4-5 years on new lights. We mfg and install high quality life lighting.



- City lights should be at or below 3000K temperature - e.g. street lights - anything above this is unpleasant and unnecessary.

### **Enforcement (4)**

- As little City involvement as possible. I don't want a lot of tax dollars spent on this initiative. However I do want an enforceable mechanism in place to prevent the following: 1) Someone shining light on a neighbouring property (residential or otherwise); 2) Someone shining a light that interferes with road travel (e.g. the Volkswagen dealership on Woodlawn - their parking lot lights shine onto Woodlawn for no reason.
- I think creating a dark space for people watching the sky at night or taking photos of the sky. But I do not think By laws enforced by city are necessary. Cost of enforcing and getting people to report offenders just causes more bad neighbourliness in this once friendly city!
- This is not enforceable by the City in existing structures as I have a single family home on Glenholme Drive that was built in the 2020's and is under the Dark Sky criteria and it was enforced at the City planning stage, but was not enforced at the construction stage. The light required for security is much more important than it is otherwise. We have had a great deal of issues with people breaking in at night and the only thing that has stopped them is motion detection flood lights.
- Make sure bylaw is enforced

### **Events / seasonal (4)**

- Event lighting
- Excessive uplighting, hours of illumination, weeks of illumination for seasonal decorations and light trespass should all be addressed. Bylaws should be enacted rather than voluntary compliance which is easily blown off.
- Perhaps occasional events will need to be considered.
- To not regulate residential holiday lighting

### **Car lights (2)**

- Is it possible for the City to have any control over vehicular headlights? They have gotten so bright to the point that it's dangerous for other drivers.
- Not property types, but how about regulating headlights on vehicles. The LED headlights are blinding and dangerous.



## Traffic lights (2)

- Is there a way for traffic lighting spillage can be controlled? The traffic lights in our neighbourhood mean we all must have opaque curtains.
- If you replaced all the traffic lights in Guelph with roundabouts, it may reduce the pollution. When the lights changed to LED the problem was created. There are too many lights in the city. I can barely see the stars at night anymore.

## Other

- I would also like to see some work research on noise pollution in the city as well with regards to the amount of horns alarms being used when people lock their car doors etc.
- A noise pollution bi law please - the small planes fly very low , loudly and are uninvited backyard guests across Guelph
- Not really applicable to the question, but often the sensitivity on some exterior light sensors is so sensitive that the lights go off everytime a person walks by on opposite side of street. Overkill for "safety"
- Fireworks
- Farming (greenhouse) lighting
- Not just a bylaw change but the city regulates lighting to a degree on new buildings. In this case lighting would be part of the permitting process.
- This is not an issue, stop wasting tax dollars on non issues.
- A way to implement warnings based on photographic complaint mechanisms rather than service call on first complaint if possible
- We have by-laws and I have seen by-law officers driving around the city. However, any engagements by myself with the by-law officers has been ineffective and futile. We don't need any new by-laws. I would like to see a full accounting of these current positions.
- The questions only allow me to select one response but it is a series of steps that are needed, with bylaw being the overarching goal. It is clearly needed in Guelph and aligns with other ecologically-responsive policy (natural heritage, etc.).
- I'd like to see a by-law that fined landlords that still had vacant units especially due to the high cost of rent. It would enforce them to lower the rent amount in order to be more affordable and likely to get tenants in ASAP.
- A bylaw should consider the following: 1) Measurable foot candles of light output (not wattage), 2) Hours that illumination are allowed (ie: 6 pm -11 pm), 3) The length of time that seasonal decorations can be left up (ie: 4 weeks -



NOT 4 months), 4) Degrees kelvin of luminaires (ie: less than 3000 degrees Kelvin), 5) short period of phase in, 6) Use of “no person shall” language (vs recommendations and preference language that causes confusion), 7) direct illumination exemption for properties that follow the principles of: dimmed if possible, off when not used. Commercial guidelines need to be specifically stated with respect to: 1) Search lights, strobe lights, advertising signs, 2) Exemption parameters. The city needs to do an audit of measures that they can undertake themselves. Areas to consider include: 1) The number of days that buildings of architectural significance in the downtown core are illuminated (ie: a night or two of colourful celebration for political events, support for other nations or under served communities is fine but having these buildings illuminated every night presents a literal physical barrier to human and ecosystem health). 2) Street lamp illumination (ie: can lights be dimmed between 11 pm and dawn ? Studies have shown no decrease in safety). 3) Permission for private and public recreational facilities should be included (ie: full cut off fixtures are appropriate here as are hours of operation). 4) Levels of illumination for residential vs intersections vs thoroughfares)

- Specific, physically measurable guidelines are needed for bylaw enforcement officers.
- So many other communities have implemented this. This an easier form of pollution to remove than others, that have such broad health and ecosystem effects. The time is now. Even one street lamp has documented negative impacts.
- I recognize we can't enforce bylaws easily but the existence of bylaws still helps to raise awareness, make it easier to enforce when complaints are registered and prevent escalation of more and “decorative” lights (like spotlights on houses, billboards lit up at 3 am when few drive by)
- This is a waste of taxpayer money
- Less city involvement, full stop.
- There are many many more serious issues that the resources of the City should be used on BEFORE this one sees the light of day!
- Seasonality - wildlife sensitivity to light may differ throughout the year (e.g., spring and fall bird migration) so the most restrictive actions may not need to be enforced year-round.
- I think any restrictions at all infringe on the right of individuals to choose how to deal with their property that they own and have paid for and pay taxes on. I live near a bush and all animals seem quite used to any artificial lighting





- I would like the city of Guelph staff and most of its councillors to take their heads out of their own assholes.
- CITY SHOULD FOLLOW ONTARIO BUILDING CODES ONLY
- There are so many more important critical issues. The house is on fire and your wondering whether to change the curtains. Unbelievable
- Leave us alone already. Use our resources for something productive
- Leave people alone... This is a free country
- I think you covered the primary property types
- I can't list any other property types. However, it's clear that we need to regulate all sources. It's like any other common resource that needs to be managed. If you don't regulate everyone there's not much point in doing it at all.
- There needs to be a dedicated zone for wildlife and no light preferably together
- Parking travel trailers on the streets and in driveways.
- Limited city involvement.
- No restrictions
- No involvement by city whatsoever
- In autumn 2023 I sent an email message on this topic. I do not agree with dark sky initiative. If the city wants to share options, fine, but options only, nothing beyond that. Increasing crime, pedestrian-vehicle collisions, visibility of signs - street, speed, other - for public area safety. Need for emergency responders to locate residential home owner, occupied residence requires display of our civic (street #) address. In my area - Terraview Crescent - any street lighting now is very dim. As I drive home during evening hours the neighbourhood is very dark. I use overnight lighting year round on my front porch & above garage door where my street # is located. I have a garage so my car is usually protected however most nearby by neighbours park in driveway or on the street.
- Keep the city as is... each resident or business wants to regulate themselves
- Businesses and properties require light for various reasons. Public policy should be careful in how it will negatively impact your business and residential communities.
- Any structures close to / immediately adjacent to parks or green space
- The only problem with lighting is if a bright light was shining directly in to someones bedroom. Otherwise I don't see a problem.
- Reduction of all unnecessary lighting.





- If we want to talk about light pollution onto a neighbors property. Why don't we have a survey about weed and leave pollution. 🙄
- No, this is stupid. Deal with the tent city instead.
- The combination of By-Law, the building department and maybe zoning should be considered.
- Lighting plans regardless of type or application should be subject to dark city principles
- Flight paths to reduce night time light pollution i.e., from the Waterloo Airport.
- Site design for new construction that minimizes light, such as heavy tree cover.
- We live in a city. If you want a dark sky go to the Country.

## **Are there specific property types or building sizes that should be excluded from any restrictions?**

### **No exclusions (122)**

- I think that NO types and building sizes should be excluded from any restrictions. We need to find better ways to conserve energy and protect our natural environment. Obviously, safety must be considered but I think we have much more 'light' in Guelph than is necessary to keep us safe. Appropriate positioning, reduced quantity of lights, less intense lighting can make a big and positive difference. We don't need ballpark lighting!
- I see more and more residents with outdoor lighting, which I know interferes with the natural functioning of insects and birds. It seems that the cheaper and more efficient lights get, the more of them there are. It's excessive. So, I think it should include everyone.
- Everyone should be requested to aid in the reduction of light pollution.
- To make an impact on light pollution, all properties need to follow new regulations.
- No building and/or site where a structure is situation should be exempt from an established lighting standard to control light pollution.
- None. All should apply.
- No. If one type of property is exempt, other types will whine that "It'S nOt fAiR"
- No. Within reason. Obviously a hospital would require lights on 24hr on all floors, but we could turn off office lights and interior lights in closed shops.



- All dwellings should be included, so that single/fully detached homes can't install unnecessary and excessive lighting either.
- None. All building would have restrictions
- No it should be universal
- No exclusions for lights that spill to the properties of neighbours. Security lighting limited to only a low level of brightness - 10 very bright lights pollute the sky unnecessarily. More motion lights vs constant lights. And more lights on timers?
- I don't think so. We want to balance business interests and fun with causing less harm. The weird safety rules in many buildings, such as schools, that require a bunch of lights on at midnight when it is 100% empty is super bizarre and needs to be changed.
- None should be exempt. You will have to do a lot of education as to what is considered acceptable in terms of building and home ownership
- NO! I don't understand why light pollution WOULD not be considered in buildings with fewer than 10 units.
- I think that all buildings should be required to address, to the fullest extent, light pollution.
- All properties captured by the regulations.
- No. BUT emergency services for eg hospitals, might be excluded. Street traffic lights and emergency lights. Smaller buildings should comply with by law.
- No. A properly drafted bylaw could account for any differences/distinctions between the various property types or building sizes.
- No, none. The rules should apply to all.
- No, but consideration could be given for public, non-profits, and businesses, in terms of phasing in regulations.
- None, safety lights can be shielded to keep lighting focused downward.
- No, all property types and sizes should be regulated.
- No, nothing should be excluded.
- Every thing should be included. Let's make this a dark sky friendly city. also the street lights are brighter than is needed in many areas of the city. Our street lighting is noticeably brighter than cities like Oakville. Light pollution on the ground, especially in over lit areas are also a problem because of interfering with amphibians, birds, night flying insects such as fireflies, turtles etc. I have petitioned the City at the Council Meeting when the smart street lighting was adopted. I made a presentation on the importance of including



the whole city not just the street lights. I am interested in helping out if there are any committees being formed. thanks. Brenda Aherne

- No. If all properties abide by the bylaws then it is fair for all.
- No. I think restrictions should be eased in, but I think they should be effective for all buildings.
- No! Every single building and property should be accountable.
- No. All artificial light should be regulated.
- No, I don't believe so. Motion detection lighting could be utilized more, that turns off when no one is in the area.
- Absolutely not!
- No, because the cumulative effect of many smaller buildings adds up to a significant impact.
- No. All should be included.
- None
- No, but let's face it, most residential areas are not the problem here, so if we got a bylaw that only focused on residential, it would be pretty useless.
- No. All properties contribute to the whole.
- No. All buildings should be able to have a reasonable amount of light to deter from theft or damage.
- Not in my opinion.
- No, again, asinine
- Not that I know of.
- NO - all buildings should be included (perhaps consider lumens (?) for different building/site types.
- No, this is stupid. Deal with the tent city instead.
- No. This is important. Excessive exposure to elevated lighting levels affects a person's circadian rhythms and sleep patterns. Window coverings, including light blocking blinds and curtains, are frequently not effective in solving light pollution.
- None. Exposure to elevated lighting levels is impactful to health and the environment, regardless of the source.
- None. My neighbour's outdoor light is on all night in back yard. This waste of electricity needs to be stopped. I rather view the stars,
- None. Restrictions can be modified but none should be excluded.
- No excessive light is cumulative.
- No! If you are going to do this, do it right and keep exclusions to a minimum and have it apply to any # of units. And then the really hard part; work with stakeholders to educate, support and enforce.



- Not that I can think of
- No, no matter the size.
- No - it should be easier to accomplish the requirements at smaller scales, and smaller property types and buildings have a cumulative effect in neighbourhoods, arguably greater than larger-scales of development.
- Absolutely not!!!
- None. Wildlife does not understand the concept of human property ownership. Light trespass...on a neighbouring property applies only to humans. If the city is serious about restricting light for ecological reasons, we must think of light trespass onto/into wildlife habitats; which are everywhere."
- No - all should be included
- No! Please adopt Dark Sky guidelines for all lighting. It is the easiest type of pollution to decrease.

### ***Safety/security considerations (30)***

- In certain cases, lighting is required for safety purposes but I don't think anyone should get a free pass without considering the impacts
- Anywhere where personal safety would be affected
- Safety should be considered in ALL instances!
- Bus shelters, campus areas where student safety is impacted
- There should be adequate lighting to provide safety entering and exiting buildings, walking along city streets, and walking in parking lots. The only place for lights pointing skyward would be at an airport. I'm not even sure if that is necessary.
- Health and safety, park and walk ways...
- Parking lots. Reduced lighting is not good for women walking alone to their cars.
- Not unless it's for safety as in guiding aircraft. Most outdoor lighting would simply need a 'way to direct the light downwards. .
- Where safety and or security is needed.
- Community services, charities, homeless shelter, etc. Buildings related to healthcare and safety.
- Any building that requires lighting to provide safety for those around it or the decrease or elimination of vandalism should be excluded from restrictions.
- All properties especially residential homes who have to have outdoor lights on 24/7 to protect themselves entering their homes in the dark. And to protect our property and vehicles from theft. We have caught so many people on our cameras and when we've been awake trying to get into our



cars. I leave outside lights on when I or my teenager is coming home in the dark. There are too many criminals in Guelph, it's not a safe place to live especially with no lighting in the dark.

- I'm not sure about exclusions, but any areas needing pedestrian safety should be differently regulated at least to allow for visibility.
- University of Guelph, where students, staff, and faculty have evening classes and need sufficient ambient light for safe passage within the campus.
- I repeat, crime, pedestrian safety, visibility of traffic signage - street, speed, other - are very clear reasons to not practice dark sky planning,
- Schools and hospitals should not be enforced, lighting is a safety concern
- Hospitals and parking lots need adequate lighting for safety, but perhaps new stores, subdivisions or new builds could reduce the exterior lighting by a small amount and potentially make a significant impact
- Lights keep us safe
- Only where a safety or mandatory requirement is legitimate
- The downtown should not be made any darker that it is now. If anything more light would be helpful is the downtown area to reduce crime.
- Residential-lighting is required for security!
- Facilities with storage yards housing large equipment or construction material. This would be useful so as to minimize theft and destruction of high value property at night.
- I think safety-related lighting could have different levels of restrictions, and also in areas where significant nightly traffic is expected (like hospital entryways, etc).
- Perhaps ones that are for safety and well being.
- Some lighting for walking / biking trails may be appropriate depending on use, and assuming light can be directed down, toward ground without lighting up the entire sky.
- Yes, places where light is needed for safety like perhaps the emergency area of the hospital.
- I believe that as a private property owner, there should not be any involvement with the city to limit the light pollution. As we look towards a sustainable future within Guelph, making the outdoors a safer place can encourage more people to be using public transportation, walking or riding their bicycles. Reducing the light can impact more crime in a given area and limit the ability for people to feel safe in the community.
- This is difficult, as we are in the north west corner of Guelph and have next to no policing of the area. If you cannot police the area, then the only thing you



can do is set up security and LIGHTS. What else could be done to protect our buildings? Silveri Jewelers has been hit so many times they don't let you in, now, unless they recognize you as a customer. And things are only going to get worse as more people lose their homes and incomes are not increased enough to support their needs. I really think this is coming at a bad time. Too many desperate people now breaking in everywhere. We have had bicycle riders in our industrial area with knives at hand trying to get into cars. It's gotten crazy. We are considering adding light to dissuade another robbery of vehicles from our property.

- Low lights on city trails and parks for personal safety, street lights, and pedestrian access/ parking. Motion lights only for security in plazas etc
- Care should be taken when restricting lights that may shine on a neighbouring property but are needed for safety or to prevent vandalism.
- Any areas that are safety concerns to pedestrians or in parking lots where vehicles have to be accessed late at night

### **Emergency services (30)**

- Hospitals (8)
- Emergency services where well lit signage is essential.
- Hospitals, Police stations
- Medical settings
- Emergency services,
- Health and safety, park and walk ways...
- Hospitals and other 24 hour emergency service buildings.
- Hospitals and healthcare centres might be excluded.
- Community services, charities, homeless shelter, etc. Buildings related to healthcare and safety.
- Emergency service sites like police and fire stations
- Hospitals, senior / LTC where good visibility is more critical at all times.
- Hospitals and other 24-hour healthcare or emergency services.
- Hospital, police and fire stations
- As I've indicated in my responses above, educational institutions and hospitals.
- Hospitals, health care
- Hospital, emergency services, etc need appropriate lighting outside
- I'm not sure. Maybe some emergency services or similar.
- Hospitals should be excluded



- Health Care Facilities; Secure facilities, e.g. police station, depending on circumstances
- Buildings and services that support the community 24/7, like hospitals, fire and police stations and the like. Their importance and utility should be at 100% and if that means having some or exceptions for a by-law then so be it. However if light pollution can be restricted without impacting the service to the community then these should also be pursued. The point is to be reasonable and weight these services in contrast to their objective needs.
- Hospitals, fire, senior dwellings, police etc.
- Yes, places where light is needed for safety like perhaps the emergency area of the hospital.
- Obviously a hospital would require lights on 24hr on all floors, but we could turn off office lights and interior lights in closed shops.

### **All buildings (18)**

- All buildings to be excluded
- Yes all buildings
- Yes all of them. Work on stuff that matters not this nonsense. Deal with all the crackhead methheads roaming around the city before we worry about fucking lights.
- All of them. The brighter it is the more criminals can be seen.
- All buildings. Reducing light will reduce safety, and increase crime in the city.
- Any and all properties should be excluded.
- All of them. This is ridiculous
- All. If a business owner, homeowner , or building owner wants to ensure their property is lit up for safety, or personal preference that's their choice, you limiting this is looking more and more like communism , stay in your lanes.
- ALL. Dark skies is a waste if tax payers time and money!

### **Residential (13)**

- Residential (3)
- Small, private homes for security.
- Existing residential
- Should not restrict reasonable lights on residential properties. Should allow for action if a neighbouring property has lights that shine towards a residential property window.
- Residential housing
- Residential, regardless of type.



- Private residences should be exempt, unless the amount of light is really extreme.
- Existing residential priorities.
- As far as I can tell, there is no problem from residential buildings. Very very few (in fact I know of none) are really lit much at all. In commercial settings, such as large parking lots, lighting is far, far, far brighter. But in these settings it is also less intrusive in the sense that not so many people live near them to be bothered by the light.
- Standalone houses
- Residential properties should not regulated with the rising concern of household theft in the City. Looking at the problem holistically, light pollution from residential properties is marginal and regulation would be disproportionate to the vulnerability it could cause to Guelphites.

### **Schools (6)**

- Schools (2)
- Universities
- University of Guelph, where students, staff, and faculty have evening classes and need sufficient ambient light for safe passage within the campus.
- Bus shelters, campus areas where student safety is impacted
- Schools and hospitals should not be enforced, lighting is a safety concern

### **Industrial, commercial (4)**

- Industrial, retail and office building should have well illuminated buildings, parking areas and common areas. Nothing worse than a security risk or safety issue for its occupancy
- Bars and restaurants
- Industrial
- If it is an active place of business during the dark they shouldn't be restricted from doing business.

### **Downtown (4)**

- The accent lighting used on various building in downtown Guelph should not be part of any bylaws or even guidelines. This decorative lighting has a different purpose highlighting the unique buildings of Guelph and is festive in nature. The survey doesn't ask for what we believe the city should be doing in regards to light pollution. Ask not what others should do before telling us what you are doing





- Downtown areas, public spaces.
- Downtown
- Civic / public buildings, maybe part of the downtown core

### ***Christmas lights (3)***

- Christmas lights for the month of December.
- Christmas lights
- Christmas lights

### ***No restrictions (3)***

- There should be no restrictions at all
- No restrictions
- I'm not in favor of regulating any

### ***Sports fields (3)***

- Sports fields
- Sports field lighting should be during use only.
- Outdoor sports fields should be excluded except during after-use hours, e.g., after 11:00 p.m.

### ***Churches (3)***

- Churches
- The church of our lady
- The huge church since it's pretty at night

### ***Bus stops (2)***

- Bus stops
- Bus shelters, campus areas where student safety is impacted

### ***Educate rather than enforce (2)***

- This being said I think education is a effective way to make an impact. Posting optional guidelines to educate and inspire residents to mitigate light pollution would be appropriate, and encouraged."
- Government should not be regulating this activity, but rather, should try to promote it through education.



## **New builds (2)**

- Only new construction
- All new builds of any size. Light pollution needs to be reduced for future builds.

## **Other**

- Restrictions should not apply by building size, but more by the types of lights they use to illuminate the grounds and building.
- Tiny homes or small buildings shouldn't be regulated more suggestions.
- Recent home trends towards always on, glaring soffit lighting is awful and should be stopped. security lighting should have limits on how brilliant.
- This is not a correct statement as I have a Single family residential home and it currently applies. I would like to know how the City enforced me to be dark sky certified if the example bellow is correct?
- Don't go after the tax payers look in the mirror. There are more street lights and traffic lights that have an impact than your tax payers.
- Yes...for larger properties
- Any required new modifications that would cost homeowners significant expense (updating fixtures, expensive bulbs), should exclude those in lower income brackets or have rebates etc so that changes aren't a financial hardship folks can't afford
- I'm in favour of restrictions on residential properties given the impact of outdoor lights on insect and bird populations
- It's not just the brightness of lights, but the colour. A sodium map with a warm glow is strikingly different from a halogen or led bulb producing bright white/blue light. The later is a larger share of the problem.
- The number of levels on new apt. buildings especially near the downtown area
- Everyone has a responsibility for controlling light pollution, so even individual properties should be encouraged in some way to contain/control their emittance (such as covers on backyard light to direct light 'down', and restrictions to be off if not in active use after certain hours).
- I've listed residential (both existing and new) as 'Bylaw to regular all outdoor lights to some extent, but I'm mostly refering to condominiums and townhouses, etc. For detached/semi-detached I would say 'A bylaw to regulate just light trespass'. I realize that detached/semi-detached can both be multi-unit properties, and in terms of regulation may be more like a condo/townhouse. I would suggest using the four unit 'as of right' as the



cutoff, rather than 10 units. But in the example listed below, it would not be a just situation for a single unit to blast lights overhead while a larger complex was required to reduce light pollution.

- I would consider permitted short term extensions ie a week plus or minus
- Good luck. I cannot imagine you will get far working with a city that insists residents purchase clear plastic bags in which to place waste plastic bags for the garbage.
- City needs to suggest less light use without making it another taxable offence! Appeal to thought for neighbours and wild life!76
- Any lighting approved through Site Plan Approval
- EXISTING STRUCTURES SHOULD BE EXEMPT
- This entire thing is a waste of taxpayer money
- All property types not listed above.
- Forcing a change on existing residential could be onerous and these properties should given a considerable amount of time to make changes - i.e. 10 to 15 years for upward glow.
- Existing businesses 5 to 10 years since it's easier for them to budget for that expense. It makes no sense to only address new builds when the problem already exists as a result of the lack of earlier standards. Communication of timelines is important to reduce excessive enforcement efforts. There should, however, be no such restrictions on lights casting a glow on neighbouring buildings. These should be dealt with immediately and I don't see a cause for any exclusions.
- Nighttime outdoors emergency work, i.e., downed powerlines, etc.
- My position is that this whole dark skies issue should be given no consideration and completely dropped.
- Do not enforce light pollution where there are 10 or fewer units
- Any lighting regulations proposed by the City must align with any CPTED concerns for ALL property types.
- The current standards re: <10 units is just fine.
- If there is no light trespass I see no reason for enforcement.
- Can you restrict by time e.g., by-law in effect after 10 pm?
- Why are we focusing on building types? My concern with this approach is that it will essentially require people with visual impairments or other accessibility needs to ask for permission to go outside of regulation rather than simply building accessibility in from the beginning. No burden should be placed on someone with accessibility needs to find exemptions. For this reason, focusing on light trespass rather than all lights is the better approach.



- No those that might service vulnerable or under-represented groups. Disabled, homeless, elderly, etc.
- Residential areas should be safeguarded from noise and light.
- Any business that is closed specifically should not be lighting up their signs etc.
- Perhaps move the property limitation downward to say, 5 or fewer or units or something to that effect. The point would be to reduce light pollution as well as to not increase the problem from where it is at as much as possible. Since it will become an exponential problem as the city grows.
- Maybe no one has found that buildings with fewer than ten units have a tendency toward light pollution, but it could still happen. 1) For fairness, all buildings should have the same care (calling it 'enforcing light pollution' doesn't seem logical) and same rules when it comes to what's allowable for bright nighttime lighting, and 2) If light pollution is a known issue, why wouldn't we apply similar restrictions to everyone and build smarter when we build new?

**Excessive or inappropriate light when discussing light pollution can mean different things to different people. What lighting qualities should any proposed regulations address? (Select all that apply)**

	#
Lights casting an upward glow	467
Lights casting a glow on buildings on other properties	434
Lights casting a glow above the ground	368
Quantity of lights on at a property after hours	345
Temperature of light (limiting lights in the blue/cold range)	266
Skipped question	114

**What concerns or challenges do you have (if any) around potential regulations or guidelines developed to address light pollution?**

**Safety/security (125)**

- Mostly just safety but the sooner we get a handle on the light pollution, the better. LEDs are making it far too easy and cheap to light up everything



- Ensuring public safety for vulnerable persons walking at night, safety for residences and businesses
- Lights at night are for safety purposes. If it reduces the safety of an area then this must be taken into consideration
- Security. I have had police recommend having lights on.
- Concerns to ensure there is adequate lighting for safety and security. In some cases, motion sensitive lighting might be enough.
- Personal safety will be a concern if lighting is too dim. Some people will get angry at more government intervention
- Light restrictions in a city that already has crime issues will be intent to cause harm by the City. It would also be intent to cause harm towards each resident as it pertains to their individual property.
- My only concern is that safety is considered. For example, a 24-hour parking garage must have some lighting.
- Personal safety first!
- Human safety will always be a concern. We will need to learn to accept some of this risk if the goal is to consider less damage to the ecosystem.
- Don't sacrifice safety for those working or walking pets, etc. off hours.
- Hope to see a good balance between safety measures required and the amount of light pollution
- I'm concerned that I will not be able to have lights on my property. We leave lights on at all times at the front of our house for our safety and our children's. We've had our cars broken into so many times. Guelph is not safe to be in the dark at night. It's scary place.
- Mobility for seniors and the disabled. More darkness will lead to more crime. Less light will encourage the proliferation of wildlife (coyotes, rat infestations, skunks or raccoons etc.) into our communities. Cost and increased taxes to home owners for enforcement. Lack of visibility for drivers .
- While I do think all of points A - E in Q14 should be addressed, safety in an urban environment certainly has to be high priority. Staff will need to find a regulatory balance.
- Property Theft or damage , accidents/injuries of careless people.
- Safety to see pathways and roads while reducing cast lights above ground
- Safety is my number one priority, not seeing the stars. Keep the lights as they are.
- many people/businesses use lighting as a security measure and to ensure people's safety which must be balanced with the need to reduce light pollution



- Security of buildings must be maintained.
- Inadequate lighting to deter crime, or reduction in feeling safe during night time travel for those walking or biking within the city. Parking lots too dark for company employees who work during dark hours of the day/night.
- Challenges: property owners, business, etc., etc. will argue that the more an area is lit, the fewer crimes people will commit. There is no evidence that bears this out.
- Health and Safety exemptions / allowances
- Restrictions should ensure that lighting needed for safety is reasonable. ....possible monitoring could determine whether infrequent need means lights could be motion sensitive but not just turned on by wind. Light used for security purposes needs to be justified ie backed up by research.
- Lighting does provide a benefit to property security. This lighting should be strategically placed and utilized to minimize casting onto adjacent properties, and skyward
- Resistance to by-law from folks citing safety concerns. Appropriate messaging about acceptable aiming of lights could alleviate this.
- Safety for women
- Security issues in some areas of the city where light is used to prevent crime.
- I still want there to be enough light for safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.
- Property security at night. Bylaw could specify that security lights must be motion sensor activated and possibly infra-red sensor activated.
- The main thing is safety. Parking lots, streets, sidewalks, parks, ally ways, etc. still need to be well-lit. And given the increase in break-ins and theft from residential properties, residents still need to have the ability to install lights for security purposes on their properties (i.e. sensor lights/flood lights/etc.). However, these lights should be installed in such a way as to not shine in windows of neighboring properties, etc.
- I understand the discussion behind light pollution but I think we must also think of the safety of Guelph citizens. Public Parking lots, and sidewalks need to be lit up as well as park paths. There is no good reason why our parks paths are dark at 5pm in the winter and unusable. These are safe places for pedestrians to walk and commute off of the roads. I also think it's interesting that there are street lights, despite cars having ridiculously bright lights but we do not provide light for pedestrians on sidewalks and paths. Though these comments may not pertain to this light bylaw questionnaire, there is a large part of Guelphs' paths that cannot be used in the darker months from 5pm-



7am as there is not adequate light. These paths do not need to be lit from 11pm-5am but low lights allowing residents to utilize these paths are necessary.

- People will complain. Safety must be a priority. A reasonable balance must be found.
- May be perceived threat of theft in dark areas.
- I wouldn't want to compromise safety, so if there is evidence based decisions to limit light without compromising citizen safety I would be more in favor of regulations.
- We need lights at night to protect employees in parking lots and citizens from all the drug induced thieves roaming the streets and backyards at night. Guelph needs less of municipal rules. The focus should be on building new homes with less restrictive measures. The more measures used dramatically slows down things. Please don't be an enabling city to dark crime at night. Let's protect our citizens and resist criminal activity. Make our streets safe please
- Crime prevention massive amount of residential theft will only be exaggerated by low light
- Security
- Safety for residential homes / housing
- Safety when it comes to walking alone at night.
- Security
- I understand the initiative and purpose, however, light can give a measure of safety, and as a woman living down town, I feel safer when areas are well lit.
- Some will say that reduced lighting makes areas unsafe, for example, pedestrians walking at night. If the lighting is controlled from beaming upwards there should be more lighting cast/directed to where there are people walking.
- concern: safety and vandalism - light is used to deter crime - maybe only allow lights that are motion sensed and not on all night
- Less security
- Ensuring safety
- Presumably property owners will resist due to concerns around security - I don't feel this way but a large subset likely will.
- Night time safety - there needs to be adequate light in public areas for safe movement, and security.
- Less lighting makes it easier for criminals to do their business.



- Would need to be reasonable in the sense of still being bright enough for safety. Lights having an upward glow and projecting onto other properties especially.
- Safety of individuals at night. Lights help people to feel more safe leaving work or walking, especially in parking lots or in the DT core
- If it is too dark it could be a safety concern for people walking at night.
- My list follows for whatever it is worth it has been shown that unless one agrees with your agenda, they are dismissed: Eye - People with diminished vision not being able to see properly at night. Crime - Increased because of darkness. Driving - failure to see people while driving, particularly people on bicycles
- We have to balance light pollution concerns with safety and security concerns. Well lit areas make it safer for residents of Guelph to be out and about at night, walking or cycling.
- I believe as long as the safety and security of buildings/people can be maintained there are many improvements that can be implemented. Less light pollution would help the environment and wildlife.
- Striking a balance between reducing light pollution and ensuring public safety can be challenging. Some outdoor lighting is essential for security and safety reasons, and regulations need to consider these aspects.
- Crime; Woman are less safe when surroundings are darker
- Less safety and security.
- My concern is if we don't keep properties and buildings light vandalism will go on the rise
- We do need enough light in the neighborhood to allow us to see what is happening on the street side of properties during the night., and, businesses do need to be able to effectively detect inappropriate intrusion into their yards and premises during the hours of darkness..
- Concerns about safety and security for people who work at night
- Higher crime
- Safety
- Light pollution sucks but we still need to keep safety and crime deterrence in kind whatever the outcome of this effort. If we reduce the amount of lighting available at night we are likely to see an increase in crime in the areas most effected by the light pollution guidelines/bylaws.
- There will be more crime if things are dark. It is just human nature. If you cannot be seen, you will take advantage of situations and break in more readily.





- Love the alien UFO - nicely done. Obviously there are some concerns around safety + lighting. Major streets/walkways need to be lit. In general we should trend towards following more strict lighting limits. I trust bylaw on this you folks do a good job.
- safety
- As a single woman who must walk her dog, no lights increases my concern for safety. With a very concerning increase in theft or personal property I see only the thieves will benefit from this bylaw.
- Will neighbourhoods be safe if they are darkened due to a bylaw of less lights? Will there be more automobile accidents or pedestrian casualties due to lack of proper lighting in neighbourhoods and through ways? There are uneven sidewalks with yellow lines on them in my neighbourhood, that still require fixing. Darkening the neighbourhoods won't fix this problem.
- Criminal activity
- Lighting is for safety and is also a deterrent for vandals. That needs to be the primary consideration.
- Higher crime rates. Unsafe for pedestrians at night
- Since the new street lights installed you can barely see pedestrians or street numbers - they only light up directly underneath and does not seem adequate for visibility. Providing information on how you can reduce light pollution and offering a monetary incentive will have more affect on all types of properties than mandating an all or nothing rule - that way businesses and residents can decide if any solution works for them. Given crime, theft and homeless are up I am not comfortable walking around a dark city and prefer to have lights on my property. Safety is my number 1 concern seeing as we can't punish individuals who break the law unless you catch them in the act - video proof means nothing these days...
- Street lights required for safety and visibility
- Petty crime will definitely go up
- I hate light pollution, but safety for those walking at night, especially women, is still important. I don't know how you balance those two things. I do walk at night. I appreciate some light -- but it doesn't have to be ugly, bright LED lighting. I prefer the old style lights, or soft LEDs. One of the worst offenders in Guelph for light pollution is a bar downtown that uses revolving portable lights to draw people and advertise itself. I would like to see them banned from using those.
- Public safety.
- Public safety and comfort



- Light keep us safe
- There would be more crime in the darkness. We need light for safety reasons. This is a waste of our tax dollars
- Getting rid of lighting creates a dangerous atmosphere for people and property.
- I prefer personal and property safety to any regulation on lighting. Too much crime in Guelph at present, especially property B&E, and lighting reduces some risk
- A darker city means more crime
- A darker city means more collisions
- Reducing lighting will reduce safety for residents. Reducing lighting will increase personal and commercial crime.
- Theft, or invasive persons
- If this bylaw is passed, then home and business owners will be exposed to more theft and break ins as light deters such activities. Making homes, businesses and streets dark will make citizens feel less safe and encourage more unlawful behavior.
- Sufficient lighting at night makes it safer to be outside preventing falls/ hopefully discouraging criminal activities from occurring . If it is too dark easier for more crimes to occur as the thieves think they can get away with the crime if unseen too much crime past few years in city especially with inflation and resulting homelessness and increased mental health and addiction issues not being managed well
- crime
- Common sense being used and safety issues being at risk
- Darkness leading to damage/vandalism, liability from injury in poorly lit spaces.
- Safety. I don't want to park somewhere and walking in total darkness and get attacked. It's just an invitation to get mugged or raped.
- People's safety. Street level violence due to more cover of darkness (other than teenagers). Animal safety, hit by cars due to low light levels.
- Increased crime. I live close to the downtown (Sunny Acres area), where we've seen an increase in theft at night (unlocked cars being rifled through; sheds and garages being broken into; porch pirates ... etc. So, as much as I support the idea of clear night skies, I'm loathe to see bylaws put in place that limit night-time lighting (which, I'm hoping, is a deterrent to theft and vandalism). I also have two dogs ... which means evening dog walks. During



the winter, when it's dark out fairly early, I feel much safer walking in well-lit areas.

- I think lights used to increase safety, that is lights above doors, windows and exteriors of building are OK. Perhaps they could limit blue lights, perhaps use motion detector lights.
- Safety concerns by restricting light pollution.
- Lights needed for safety
- Cutting down on light pollution sounds like the right thing to do, until you look at public safety. I don't want my children or grandchildren to walk through a park at night with the lights turned off. Walking home from the bus stop at 10:00 pm after work without street lights would be terrifying. Still, many car sales lots have enough candlepower to be seen from miles away. The direction the light is focused seems important.
- Maintaining some sort of balance so that community safety is not jeopardized.
- Parking lots etc. need some lighting for safety issues.
- Balancing the need for safety lighting.
- My concern with a light bylaw is that there is a potential increase in crime. As with less light, it will be more attractive for criminal activity to happen, as it will be harder to identify the person.
- I am concerned about safety of person and property if we have less lighting at night. I live in the East end and we constantly have people in hoodies and knapsack checking our car and house doors. My older kids walking home with less light and their safety is concerning. Less lighting at night could potentially increase the crime rate in a city where many are feeling more unsafe each year.
- I worry that if lights were regulated in public spaces and around residential buildings that they would be less safe after dark.
- Balance reduced lighting with safety.
- Inequitable application of any bylaw directed toward controlling light pollution, especially when bylaws tend to be enforced on a complaints basis. Excessive bylaws could result in a reduction in sense of safety. I believe there is social research demonstrating a greater fear of dim lit places at night in females and those in sexual minorities. Bylaws to control light pollution may result in unintended effects that only reinforce these fears.
- Balance between safety and problematic lighting
- After hour lighting is a safety issue. YOU can be seen by motorists but more importantly you can see others as they approach. Businesses are protected



after hours. I do NOT see this as a city wide problem and any issue that does arise should be treated on an ad hoc basis. Any attempt at a broad brush policy will create unforeseen side affects

- We still need lights to make certain places safer. I wouldn't say remove lights, but they should be better colour temperatures and not aimed high. And possibly better use of motion sensors/timers on homes and businesses outdoor lights.
- Personal safety, walking in unlit areas, vehicle / property safety in dimly lit / unlit areas
- Safety security
- I feel there should be enough artificial light to provide safety for people but cast downward and not into other buildings and to limit light projecting into natural corridors or habitats for animals and insects.
- some concerns about safety on walking / biking paths. But believe current street lighting is more than is necessary at the moment especially on highways.
- Safety is a huge issue. Parking lots, public spaces and residential areas need to be safe for walkers and bylaws restricting lighting would be harmful.
- we need to ensure we strike a good balance between reducing light pollution and also ensuring safety of pedestrians at night
- Safety will become an issue if you start interfering
- I'm concerned about safety. Currently when the lighting was changed in our neighborhood there was an increase in safety issues at the park and school.
- safety-public and or employee, increase in crime,
- I feel if you reduce light pollutions the night walkers (criminals breaking into cars and so on) will have better chances of stealing from properties, vehicles and businesses
- I believe that as a private property owner, there should not be any involvement with the city to limit the light pollution. As we look towards a sustainable future within Guelph, making the outdoors a safer place can encourage more people to be using public transportation, walking or riding their bicycles. Reducing the light can impact more crime in a given area and limit the ability for people to feel safe in the community.

### **Enforcement (51)**

- The difficulty in endorsing the guidelines and the amount of individual surveillance needed.
- How will it be monitored and enforced



- Over-regulation. Not enough regulation. Unwittingly taking the side of developers.
- Implementation
- Who is in charge of enforcement, where does safety of pedestrians factor
- Enforcement. Best practices need some level of education program and enforcement, which cost money and resources that are always constrained at the municipal level. Individual residential shouldn't be the initial focus - use existing mechanisms for site plan control on new/redevelopment to start.
- Too subjective, too difficult to police.
- Concerned that no regulations will be implemented and enforced.
- hard to enforce, likely only enforceable by complaints but the lights casting an upward glow (as some sports fields I've seen in other jurisdictions) can be a problem and not identified through complaints so the bylaw would need to be focused on new installations or repairs/replacements. Streetlights also cause upward glow if not designed to prevent it so the city needs to take a leading role.
- Too subjective, too difficult to regulate and easily over reached.
- Enforcement problems
- They will not be enforced
- Enforcement might be an issue.
- There are not enough by-law officers to enforce it so what is the point. Ask HOMEOWNERS and the businesses that pay the taxes if they are in favour of another tax increase to hire another by-law officer. Most will ask why the city is even spending staff time on projects like this.
- How will the regulations be enforced?
- Resources to facilitate education, compliance and enforcement. Public Acceptance.
- They won't be properly enforced. That would mean wasted time and money.
- 1.The obvious one would be enforcement of offenders who are already shall we say non compliant, and all subsequent new construction. 2. What code(s), would be impacted and needed to be changed for all new construction whether they be residential commercial or industrial? 3. What forms of remediation would be appropriate, i.e a fine/ticket/ warning? 4. As with anything, there are residents who would simply not care and break any new bylaw made which would be enforced by a complaint process in all probability. Like the loud music, loud backyard parties at 3 am, noisy cars with modified mufflers speeding through your subdivision at 3 am, police do not have any of



those on their agenda any more. No patrol policing on any of those issues any more.

- Violators difficult to address
- Enforcement may be a challenge
- Enforcement - I imagine budgetary constraints would make compliance hard to enforce on a regular basis.
- Will be viewed as simply more “red tape” preventing development. Very difficult to measure/enforce. Light pollution is a vague concept that will mean different things to different people.
- It seems like an unnecessary project. Who’s going to enforce this? How will it be measured? Will this be a complaint-driven bylaw?
- Enforcement of such regulations
- I expect like other property bylaws that bylaws won't be enforced
- Regulating
- Will it be enforceable?
- Regulations require resources to develop and manage...the city doesn't have the budget for this.
- Enforcement would be a problem for homeowners. A voluntary check-off would be an idea on a property tax form. The city could lead by example and likely start in pilot and demonstration areas.
- Enforcement will be a challenge. Perhaps a grandfather clause/sunset clause or application to new development only would-be concessions. Looping in hardware stores, contractors and the local building industry would ensure better compliance
- The problem with residential enforcement, which is why I didn't select it for mandatory, is that units are so closely tied together it would be exceptionally hard to prohibit any light from "trespassing". But I also don't think people should leave bright lights on 24-7 at their homes either, particularly really bright lights. People have strong concerns about personal security, both at home and e.g. walking streets - have to be clear about levels permitted, that safety is still taken into account (e.g. lights that face downwards to a limited area).
- Concerned about neighbours snitching on each other.
- If by-law is enforced via complaints, the onus is on citizens to take action -- rather than everyone being sensitive to the harms of light pollution
- Would it ever be enforced and at what cost. Taxpayer dollars could be better spent elsewhere.



- Enforcement, and any changes required to residential buildings would have a very negative impact on the residents. The focus should obviously be on commercial and industrial spaces, as well as city fixtures.
- Concerned that it might encourage nuisance calls between feuding neighbours. That there wouldn't be enough options or education. That stores could still sell products against our light bylaws
- Ensuring adequate personnel for enforcement of whatever bylaws are in place.
- Penalties for people who aren't able to retrofit to fit the guidelines.
- It is difficult to foresee any level of enforcement as this requires additional resources that I would guess do not exist in the municipality.
- Too hard to enforce
- Seems like an enforcement nightmare, and would likely be challenged with a good probability of success should a fine be laid.

### Cost (33)

- Cost to tax payers
- There are not enough by-law officers to enforce it so what is the point. Ask HOMEOWNERS and the businesses that pay the taxes if they are in favour of another tax increase to hire another by-law officer. Most will ask why the city is even spending staff time on projects like this.
- The bureaucracy in Guelph, and the resulting tax load, is getting out of hand. We should put a pause on anything, like new bylaws of doubtful merit, that will put more of a load on the by-law workers and eventually lead to having to add more staff to the by-law department.
- Challenges: Cost?
- Extra cost (additional city employees) to create, monitor and enforce new regulations.
- More bylaws need more city administration with a 10% tax increase, we have to put priorities on the woke
- My concern would be the cost to create and enforce regulations at this time. The funds I am sure could be much more useful in other areas such as addressing the needs of the homeless.
- Costs for small businesses or non-profits.
- Cost to taxpayers to develop. If you need help, simply copy the guidelines from LEED NC 2009 credit SSc8.
- In addition, this will inevitably be expensive - as all government programs are. Action on this matter should not extend beyond the development of





guidelines (which will also cost taxpayers' dollars to establish and, no doubt, to constantly review and revise).

- That the city and staff stop wasting Guelph resident's tax dollars and stop raising taxes AGAIN to an excessive amount. City and staff will go to extremes, excessive, extravagant and insane methods to do what they want. We don't need fat-cat, oh-so-privileged city and union employees wasting our tax dollars. We don't need a Dark Sky by-law. We didn't need a new library. We don't need Waste Collection it should be contracted out. Scam Guthrie and city council kisses ass with senior union and their nepotism friends who work at the city making +\$40 / hour plus benefits. The automated speed enforcement cameras are a CASH GRAB and FIASCO for Guelph residents! When there is no school the speed limit should be 40 kph and 30 kph during school hours. Guelph residents are outraged. Low-income, families and seniors cannot afford to pay \$80 for going over the speed limit by 1 (one) kilometer. SHAME on Scam Guthrie and city council.
- Cost to taxpayers.
- Cost of changing current lighting (type of fixture, bulb)
- Cost to homeowners and businesses. Needs education and a phase in period.
- Cost - regardless of the statement the only cost is for the bylaw there is still a cost which we CANNOT afford.
- Cost of enforcement
- Regulations require resources to develop and manage...the city doesn't have the budget for this.
- The unexpected cost to private home owners will pose a challenge to them.
- Cost to implement
- That the city and staff will waste Guelph resident's tax dollars and raise taxes AGAIN to an excessive amount. City and staff will go to extremes, excessive, extravagant and insane methods to do what they want. We don't need fat-cat, oh-so-privileged city and union employees wasting our tax dollars.
- There are so many other important things to concentrate on other than lights. This will need, I presume, a paid employee to monitor the situations and answer complaints. No more new hires to do this!
- Cost of program
- Resources to facilitate education, compliance and enforcement. Public Acceptance.
- very very expensive to enforce and monitor
- The initiative is praise worthy from energy conservation and naturalist standpoints. But, wow, trying to manage all of this (bureaucracy, manpower,





creating specific criteria, cost of changing existing lighting, various other conflicts, etc.) seems daunting. A number of years one of the Guelph high schools enhanced its outdoor lighting after a staff member had a dangerous experience in the parking lot when leaving the school late in the evening. Depending on how an up-dated bylaw is designed, the school board could now be required to measure/evaluate all of its outdoor lighting. Then quite likely change some or all of the lighting at most of its schools / properties. The board would likely have to change some portion of its outdoor lighting facilities. The board would have to bear the cost of this, and it would come from deferring other maintenance or perhaps reducing staff (since the board won't be able to access a revenue stream to pay for this). The task of managing all of the outdoor lights in the city seems like a daunting task for the city to manage all of this with its current budget and staffing constraints.

- If it makes life more expensive, burdens households, creates higher taxes.
- The costs! If we were bathing in money, maybe introduce it. It is a slap in the taxpayers face to spend ANY resources on needless crap like this.
- Adding Laws will cause Labour distraction and added Cost to the city of Guelph when there is much more pressing issues.
- Wasting tax money on more regulations and restrictions on the everyday citizen
- Cost of enforcement and cost of having new regulations. This should be an efficient, straightforward bylaw but I don't have confidence that the city can implement it without the cost becoming greater than the benefit. I DO NOT
- Your intervention will be an extra cost to businesses and consumers and will chase business away from the city...increasing unemployment levels and contributing to homelessness if not done wisely
- That the city is wasting more money.
- Waste of tax dollars

### **No concerns (27)**

- I don't. I think it's a great idea. My only concern is those who won't accept the bylaw and protest it. Lots of backlash online already. Disappointing.
- No concerns no changes to any lighting issues
- None. please do it. it is long overdue.
- None right now, but these concerns will likely emerge with more information about what the city will do or wants to do
- As of this writing, none that come to mind. Light pollution in general is not addressed as a major or at times even a minor concern in many metropolitan



areas. The mere fact that this survey is trying to address even the temperature of the light is a great thing. For example, while walking or driving, blue light destroy and hinders night vision more than red/orange. Of course this is just a small example where lighting should be taken into consideration. More so if we are trying to avoid light pollution. LED lighting can be a positive factor in this, if we are talking about blue light. There are other factors that can hinder the quality of sleep in people as a whole, since lights even if not pointed upward will inherently reflect towards the sky when in mass. All we have to do is look south-east to see this effect in action. "

- None at the present time.
- None that I can think of
- No concerns
- I don't have any concerns as long as all light pollution gets regulated.
- None. Dark is better.
- None really.
- I think it's a great initiative. In my neighbourhood, there are so many outdoor lights, string lights, flood lights, a newly installed one at my neighbours is now casting light right into my bedroom. I think sometimes new installs are motivated by theft/security concerns, but also to create ambiance (like with those string lights). Thing is, I rarely see my neighbours actually sitting outside in the evenings in the summer or even now in the winter, yet their lights are blazing away. We used to see fireflies in our yard, but not any more, not sure if that's linked to the amount of artificial light but it seemed to coincide with influx of new lighting being installed and left on at night.
- Community safety for pedestrians, as well-lit areas are often considered to be safer than dark areas.
- My concern is increased opportunity for crime in areas of less lighting - transport truck thefts, various opportunistic crimes targeting people, vehicles, property, pharmacies, much more. We need lighting.
- We need to ensure that areas around structures and near roadways and sidewalks are adequately lit for safety and security.
- Minimum lighting for safety regulations.
- Concerns for safety of individuals, especially women, who leave work during late or early hours.
- I don't see the need to control lights. Lights prevent crime

### **Lack of compliance/Push back (18)**

- Non compliance.



- Difficulty in defining and measuring non-compliance
- Where to get compliant light fixtures
- Non-compliance
- Willingness of the populace to co-operate and understand the importance of limiting private property lighting. Excessive lighting hurt both human and animal communities
- Businesses would rather pay fines than adjust lighting.
- It won't be followed
- Business use 24/7 lighting for advertising so they will push back. They don't have a right to affect neighbours and others. Lit advertising should be restricted to only opening hours, or 11 pm max. Some business will say it's for security, but tell them that motion-activated lighting draws more attention and today's security camera technology picks up images in the dark.
- The slow adoption of the regulations by anyone, or immediate rejection of the regulations by business owners. Security risks will be the biggest concern for business owners (e.g., "less light would encourage vandalism and illegal activity") and I think that it just needs to be made clear to business owners what risks would or would not transpire if their property was subjected to the lighting regulations.
- I expect that some businesses may - in an effort to postpone the costs of retrofitting to meet new standards - try to find loopholes and/or pay to get out of meeting new guidelines. In the winter, road safety and personal safety are always a greater concern than in summer because of ice/snow and longer dark time. Snow may also cause greater light pollution effects because of reflection of snow into the sky. Maybe public lights can come on for longer but be less bright, in order both to address the hazard and to reduce light pollution problems.
- People ignoring the bylaws (leading to disputes with neighbours etc.)
- Existing businesses etc. attempting to avoid complying due to the cost (say of retrofitting lights) or else due to security concerns. Both are legitimate to some extent but perhaps a compliance window (of time) could be established in some instances. Of course new builds would not have this problem.
- Bylaws not accepted by citizenry, backlash and lack of compliance.
- Availability of "dark sky compliant" fixtures in major retailers.
- I worry citizens will ignore bylaws until they are fined.
- The businesses will hiss and moan that they need all the lights to drum up business



- I think there would be push back from developers. But they never have the interest in the wellbeing of nature. This is a great initiative and I will fully support a bylaw limiting light pollution.
- Adherence to the regulation (should not be a guideline that can be interpreted in different ways) and thus, the consistent administration of and enforcement of said regulation

### **Over-reach (17)**

- We have too much over regulation. We have other problems that require attention and resources.
- You should not be telling people what to do. This is a free country...
- Governments at all levels seem to have an insatiable appetite for control over citizens. Adopting the strategy of regulations/bylaws around lighting just opens up another endless and irresistible list of rules to enforce.
- Government overreach
- This would more overreach by a city council that is already too controlling. We do not need more government. The only new bylaw worth passing is for indoor air quality. Either do IAQ or do nothing. Stop wasting our time and money on stuff like this.
- Too subjective, to difficult to regulate and easily over reached.
- Excessive government oversight can cost tax payers extra. In todays Economic climate, we should be looking at spending less on regulation
- Infringement of peoples rights as to how they may choose to illuminate their homes for security or ascetic purposes.
- Infringement on peoples Rights to choose what they want for lighting
- More governance and bylaws. Go worry about real issues in our city.
- No more bylaws
- One less choice to live my life as I choose taken away from the government!
- The overreach of regulations by a few people impacting many
- There should be no regulations. City government should allow me control over the property I have paid for and continue to pay taxes on.
- Micromanaging of residential
- That extremes would be crossed by the city.
- Too much government control.



### **Unnecessary/focus on other issues (16)**

- I have a concern with how city council wastes tax payers money on things that aren't an issue.
- Bigger issues in the city to address besides this . This entire project is yet another waste of tax dollars
- There does not need to be a by law for light pollution.
- City is wasting our tax dollars on this nonsense is unacceptable. Just stop!!
- I think there are way more important issues to deal with.
- I think the whole idea is an incredible waste of time, money and resources. Again, this City has very real problems. Perhaps spend your time focusing on those.
- Doesn't seem to be our biggest issue in Guelph. I don't support my tax money going towards this issue right now.
- A dark sky bylaw is not a priority for staff efforts.
- We have other more important things to spend time and money on.
- There is not a lighting issue or a dark sky issue. When living in the city of our population some light pollution is to be expected.
- Taking focus away from other challenges facing our city.
- Spend my taxes on something useful, like snow removal in a timely manner
- I am opposed to this issue needing by law enforcement
- I don't believe Guelph has a light pollution problem. With all the other problems the city has this is a nonissue.
- My concern is this lighting issue should be the least of this city's concerns. Why hasn't the city sent out surveys asking about what to do with the growing crackhead and methhead issue that rapidly growing within the city?
- IM concerned that its a none issue and we are making it one.

### **Education (13)**

- Public education on "the why" will be needed. Ways for people to report a neighbours who have excessive night lighting in their front & backyards.
- People just may not understand impact if light pollution
- Too many bylaws and the public "rebel". I think you have to convince the public that reducing all light sources is in the best interest of the earth and wildlife.
- Cost to homeowners and businesses. Needs education and a phase in period.
- Generally the hardest obstacle to overcome will be the change in perception to how people view this topic. Many may not see the benefit directly, and view it as another opportunity for government to over regulate. A focus



should be on both the benefits to the environment, as well as the building owner/occupants - especially where a grant program may be utilized to retrofit or replace antiquated lighting fixtures.

- I would like to see the City explain “why” and what the benefits are, as opposed to a heavy or authoritarian approach. ie encouraging darkness allows insect activity to continue; discourage the notion that dark means “evil” and unsafe.
- Ensuring that the transition is smooth and achievable to minimize reactionary backlash. Educating people on the benefits, such as for sleep, migratory birds, energy efficiency (show people how much they'd and they city would save), etc. Also propose alternatives for security such as motion activated lights.
- Lack of understanding about why dark skies are important. Challenge of education and communication.
- Clarity and ease of interpretation. Rationale.
- Resources to facilitate education, compliance and enforcement. Public Acceptance.
- Lack of education about the importance but also the ease of implementation. There is likely a risk of people seeing this as "the government controlling what we do" sort of thing, but it is really a greater benefit - human health-wise and ecologically. How does that get communicated effectively? "
- Guelph citizen should be educated on light pollution i see no work has been done on this. people should know the impact of the light that they are installing outside to the nature and global warming.
- Recommended to have a phased approach in regulation. Also, to get more buy in from the community and business owners, the primary initial focus should be on educational outreach while long term ensuring that there are specific exemptions in place for things such as seasonal light displays and low intensity lighting which contributes only marginally to light pollution.

### **Christmas lights (12)**

- Christmas lights are a challenge, as they are generally not too bright individually.
- I can't enjoy holiday lighting.
- We love the coloured lights on buildings in the downtown core. Also seasonal lighting - timers restrict use to appropriate hours. We would hope things like that would continue. Security concerns are over the top.
- Don't want to significantly limit personal property lighting -particularly seasonal/holiday



- Christmas or holiday decorations, how do you allow for joyous cheer on a miserable and stressful time of year - including colours of lights as white and blue are a popular combination
- Let's not wreck Christmas, let's still have a vibrant downtown club scene.... but let's get all those wasteful lights off. Empty buildings let up for no reason, just causing climate change and harming the night sky.
- What about specific holidays (e.g., Christmas).
- Christmas lights should be exempt.
- That it would get ridiculous about holiday lights, whether it was Diwali or Christmas etc. and stipulations around how long they can be up or on.
- Ensuring that this doesn't extend to things like Holiday lighting or personal decorations people have on their home property. This type of lighting provides happiness and joy to people in an otherwise very dark and gloomy time. I feel like the emotional and mental health benefits outweigh concerns of light pollution as it is being described here.
- It would also prevent residents from celebrating religious holidays such as Christmas and Diwali.
- Should not affect Christmas / holiday lights

### **No action/insufficient (7)**

- That they won't be sufficient. Some might say such lights are necessary for security, but there needs to be a balance between security concerns and impacts on neighbouring properties.
- They don't go far enough.
- Strong regulations preferred
- Only that they will not be strong enough to limit lighting.
- I am only concerned that no regulations will be implemented. It is important to protect residents from exposure to excessive light levels. This affects quality of life and health.
- I only hope that there will be strong regulations. I am concerned about light pollution for multiple reasons - for the invaluable human connection with the night sky, kids' ability to know the stars and constellations, our quality of sleep due to streetlights and external property lights shining into windows, and the effect on wildlife, including trees and plants.
- My greatest concern is that the city will shrink from this responsibility in the face of criticism from property owners or business lobby. This is a very important issue and can only be addressed at the municipal level.





### **Streetlights (6)**

- Streetlights
- I hate the new street lights - they're too bright. If you have your curtains open at night it's like a baseball field.
- City street lights need to be brighter.
- The LED streetlight opposite my house, which causes me to use black out curtains to sleep
- Bedrooms should not be exposed to direct light from street lamps
- Need to consider street lighting. Lack of technical expertise and need for design support from the City. Powerful spot lights aimed at the sky.

### **Wildlife (4)**

- Concerns mostly are over lighting and its affects on birds and other wildlife. Lighting from neighbours encroaching onto your property and shining into your house yard etc.
- Light pollution is a problem for wildlife
- Wildlife - encouraging wild life intrusion, particularly coyotes
- People will complain that this is a waste of time to legislate, but light pollution is incredibly harmful to insect populations which are foundational to birds and the rest of the ecosystem we humans are dependent on.

### **Accessibility (3)**

- Accessibility - for those with low vision and/or financial limitations, their needs need to be held at the fore of any planning to ensure equity in policy.
- accessibility
- I'm concerned that accessibility is not being built in to this processes.

### **Colour/brightness (3)**

- Re: 14. Excessive or inappropriate light (e). Colour temperature on excessive light sources may disrupt and/or increase insect breeding cycles. Blue light effects on humans: retinal damage, psychological and hormonal regulation.
- It is important that lighting used after dark should be of a warm colour temperature (2500-3200k) and as low intensity as possible. Light spilling onto other properties should be restricted.
- Specific and enforceable brightness levels should be addressed.





## Other

- I live downtown on the 7th floor of a condo overlooking the city. Light pollution has been growing over the last 6 years. I first noticed it with the lights at the courtrooms, where it is so bright I had to install blackout blinds because it was like a flashlight shining in my window. Second my own building put in lights that are too bright. They definitely affects the growth of plants. They also make the areas that are not directly in their line into a darker area. I have gone down too an area of the building and had someone say hi, and I didn't even see them because the lights behind me were so bright! This has the potential to be dangerous late at night.
- That spot light downtown.
- There are more important types of pollution than light.
- Allow a grandfathering period and provide discount incentives to residents and businesses to retrofit lighting.
- Have lights set to go on only when an object passes by . Motion sensor.
- Building and all business should have their indoor plus outdoor lights off after they close
- need to enforce for all buildings, not just new construction, but need a reasonable implementation timeline
- I am not quite as worried about light pollution in Guelph however am aware of the excess energy lighting use when not needed takes. For example office buildings that leave lights on when closed....
- Only if light casting into neighbouring property that has an effect of on occupants. I.E. casting light into the dwelling
- Why does this not exist already?
- A measured, informed approach should be implemented.
- Would new development require light studies, to ensure that design is peer reviewed? How would this policy or by-law be enforced? By Property Standards, By-Law or Building Officials and would it require added tax payer costs, ie. the hiring of additional staffing resources or equipment to measure excessive lighting?
- My main concern is that control of stray light might end up being weakened to the point of being useless.
- The populace will probably not understand why they should address this issue since so few of them look up. It will be difficult to win people over when they are told that their light fixture has to be changed to something that doesn't shine up.



- Outdoor recreation (lighting at outdoor rinks) would be a challenge with a bylaw.
- The height of light posts is a significant factor in how light impacts residential settings
- This whole light pollution is ridiculous
- This is just another make work empire building debacle. We have far more important deficiencies in the city than worrying about too much light. Have you driven at night, partially lighted roads, people in dark clothing, for seniors it's a nightmare!
- Support more taxes to implement new bylaws.
- Maybe make a better deal with your speed camera provider so the city isn't a cash cow for a private company. That is an example of why I do not have confidence this won't become a make work product for city staff at the expense of hard working taxpayers.
- Big problem in Guelph and world wide. Nice to see you take control. The lighting around and on new houses is unnecessary
- You will be facing a myriad of challenges from existing property owners.
- Pool lights
- I'm concerned the city will exempt public lands from their own bylaws on light pollution
- It would be difficult to change existing homes and businesses so most of the effort should be on new builds. Perhaps a push for lights with lower lumens might help.
- 1. The "right to decide" by owners. Many may say they have a right to do what they want on their properties. 2. Clarification of Regulation (law) vs Guideline (optional to perform) 3. Candlelight power of lights to be used 4. Cone Down availability at a reasonable cost 5. Timer or motion-centred lighting for commercial; municipal; residential 6. Subsidies by corporations, government levels as an incentive to support this movement 7. "Enforcement" will be an issue because of personnel needed (By-law officers) 8. Transition timelines for implementation in stages to be created and clear 9. Removal of "fireworks" and laser light shows 10. Outdoor concert venues 11. Downtown festivals that utilize bright and non-dark sky lighting. 12. Commercial business signs. Seek alternatives. 13. Airports may have a rationale to be exempt and other locations too. 14. Surrounding communities do impact neighbouring communities. I think this should be a Waterloo-Wellington directive. I see lights from Cambridge, Fergus and KW all the time.



- The material in this survey seems to be rather concerned with residential, as opposed to commercial or municipal, lighting. Yet, residential lighting is not a problem, or at least not a very big one. This makes the initiative look like some bureaucratic tool to harass homeowners and the like. Is this really wise on the part of the city government?
- The belief by other condo owners that lighting saves them from being burgled. The idea that everything should be like daylight so that no one or the condo entity gets sued.
- IT needs a step-by-step Plan so Information can be given continuously and accepted by citizens.
- Too many Karen's in the city, wouldn't be able to keep up with the B.S. complaints.
- I wear my sunglasses at night
- We shouldn't have to regulate this, we don't have the budget. Personal responsibility and attention to sustainability is more appropriate.
- Neighbours having lights so bright I've had to put extra fence on deck
- I'm not a fan of too many governmental restrictions on life (i.e. too many by-laws) but I don't think such "dark sky" restrictions and by-laws would cause any problems for industrial or City/government properties. I don't believe the main problem with light pollution is with individual households - I believe the biggest problem is with streetlights, followed by parking lots, and public/government buildings which should shut off their lights at night. I recently read that over 90% of outdoor lighting in the United States (so probably Canada, too) illuminates roadways and parking lots. And a full third of that light is wasted. In Quebec alone, the estimated annual cost to taxpayers of misdirected or wasted light is \$50 million. That said, residential lighting can become a problem when Christmas displays get out of hand (as you can see on the TV shows). But people would inevitably go berserk if you required them to put up fewer Christmas lights. That said, some information about the harm they are doing to animals, birds, and humans should be presented. Perhaps they could just light up the inside of their homes during the Christmas season (with curtains closed - don't put up lights to show off, do it for your family's pleasure!)
- Just keep other people's light out of my bedroom.
- not sure, I am mainly concerned about light trespassing but agree all lighting should be regulated because I find it excessive



- The only concern I have is that ignorant people who think only of themselves will be so vocal in their opposition that the City will end up creating another toothless policy that does little to mitigate this serious environmental issue.
- Our economy is in a mess. People are struggling to make ends meet. Taxes are getting higher and higher. While it is great to look at light it is better to pay attention to what people are struggling with.
- Designs and controls of lights made before any by-laws were enacted
- My first concern is the use of the term guidelines. If the objective here is to develop guidelines, then give it up now. If guidelines are what we end up with, I'm confident that the "Freedom" Convoy set will tell you in some detail what you can do with your guidelines. This needs to be a bylaw or regulations (I confess I am unclear on the distinction between the two) that the city is willing and empowered to promote, support and enforce. My hope is that this would eventually be part of the building codes or other relevant standards.
- I am unfamiliar with potential regulations/guidelines
- Light the ground.
- as usual people that go overboard
- Need a verifiable standard that can be objectively measured
- The people of this city don't need any new ways to be fined. You've already made it impossible to afford to live here. Stop wasting time and resources on stuff nobody complains about.
- On "D" above some is fine, too much is not. Not sure how to quantify amount but suspect somebody has done this somewhere
- What is degree of light is considered to be on another property. What is the percentage of degree of light that is allowed to be omitted in A,B,C,D,E. Will the law change for people outside of clustered residences (country). Will automotive vehicles be included in this list. What about the safety of humans, more likely to stay indoors at night. Higher chance of crime to be committed during night. What about homeless people, they may need light to function when dark. How will the city measure the amount of light produced at a residential and business level. How will the city enforce the amount of light produced at a residential and business level. Will the money being produced from a tax be included back into research about technologies with lower emitting light?
- Inform us what the city is doing for their areas of responsibility
- Our motion light is triggered by waving tree branches - would love to know how to fix that! Streetlights shining into bedroom is not good. Commercial advertising at night is a waste. Office buildings w lights on all night is a waste.



Guelph should become a Bird friendly city first which would address some of the light pollution issues.

- Challenges: property owners might say, "hey! get your by-law off my property!" Maybe let them know that their neighbours and motorists would appreciate that their outdoor lights have those things on them that focus the light towards the ground (or to a small radius) - I forget the word for that!
- Challenges: PARKING LOTS - but perhaps compromises can be made - have 50% of the lights on. (This was suggested at the Zoom meeting)
- Bring unreasonable. Allowing for petty neighbour complaints. Affecting things like patio and holiday lights which tend to be less bright.
- Some homeowners have very bright eg soffit lighting
- There are many challenges. Availability of lighting units that are inappropriate as per bylaw (too bright, not directed etc) should be restricted/ curtailed. Concerns about "security" should be addressed using facts, ie. bright lights do not automatically create safe conditions. Way too strong car headlights will be a bigger challenge to regulate. Check other cities - Paris, France- that require special gold coloured headlights for cars in the city. Makes a big difference!
- What a waste of time this is. Does council not have anything better to discuss? I personally am afraid to walk alone during the day let alone at night and afraid of people breaking into my property. Why would we keep lights at a minimum during darkness, when this city is RAMPANT with crime!!!!
- that certain industries/institutions will fight to be exempted (eg, auto sector, university of Guelph).
- We actually do not have enough lighting in our neighbourhood. With the sun setting early and walking our dogs in the evening almost every single night we are almost hit by cars crossing streets, because they cannot see us due to lack of lighting. We wear reflective clothing and our dogs have light up collars. This does not help. We need more lights!
- I am concerned that individuals cast too much light on to neighbouring properties
- Criteria should be unambiguous, measurable (e.g. BUG requirements for city owned property, vertical/horizontal illuminance limits for light trespass, day/night luminance limits for signage, etc.) and linked to current best practices (e.g. existing standards from the IESNA). That way there is a clear path for designers to test their lighting system computationally (to gain approval) and also easy to measure after the fact to make sure rules can be effectively enforced.



- I don't see this as an issue for me. I have lived in much larger cities. Guelph is quite dark at night.
- Perhaps some kind of incentive could be devised (using federal or provincial funding/grants of some kind) for existing businesses to retrofit their lighting. I am referring to larger businesses with big buildings and often bigger parking lots, which are often very overlit.
- Leave it alone!!
- people may need to change their outdoor lights.
- INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES NOT NEAR RESIDENTIAL SHOULD HAVE NO REGULATIONS
- All of it. This is opinion only and who is going to decide this
- There should be some amount of house and street lighting allowed, but I think we have far too much light at nights and it has a significant impact on wildlife. We don't need so much nighttime light.
- This survey is not necessary and is an example of why are taxes are so high.
- Fairness to existing buildings
- Major lighting should be designed to direct light downwards
- Focus on addressing issues while in design and construction phases.
- Get a bylaw in place. I'm a downtown resident who's been a victim of having flashing lights into my living room and bedroom in a downtown condo from a downtown bar. I have no rights to stop it because there is no bylaw. The city was kind enough to make the business aware of the hard but at the time same it didn't always work. And at times bylaw officers will say sorry we can't do anything as there is no bylaw on it.
- Anything done to address challenges need to be robust yet not unenforceable. Residential and commercial building owners should be allowed some 'protection' from the added visibility without them being on throughout the night. Motion sensors or timers can be a way to limit light pollution while permitting lights on properties.
- People don't understand the import of having a dark sky. I changed my mind after visiting Flagstaff, AZ a dark sky city. Dark skys do not equal crime increases or anti-social behaviour.
- It's never dark. Unnecessary energy usage.
- None. There must be a bylaw to turn lights off by a specific time at night and that can fluctuate if you live by conservation land or bodies of water - wetlands where it should be earlier.
- I would hope that the bylaw would be flexible enough to accommodate where there is an actual need for more lighting, as opposed to being one size fits all



- I have multiple lights shining onto my property from neighbors. It's excessive
- Regulations limiting lighting to the extent that it could cause CPTED issues leaving residents and businesses vulnerable.

### **Aside from City guidelines or a bylaw, are there other anti-light pollution actions or interventions you would like to see either from the City or elsewhere in the community?**

#### **No/None (79)**

- None! Stop wasting time and resources (my tax money) on this subject. There are far more significant issues to work on!
- Not at this time
- No. I don't see this as a major problem. I do think it's good to have on the radar and you could develop guidelines, best practices, and do what you can to limit issues with light pollution.
- No - a dark sky bylaw is not a priority for staff efforts.
- No. This is ridiculous
- No, save our tax dollars for something else
- No guidelines or bylaws
- No interventions
- NO. NO. NO. Too much government interference in our lives.
- No. Actions and interventions are just more encroachment on people's lives. We don't need or desire more government surveillance. Speed cameras and red light cameras are quite enough, thank you very much."
- No actions are required.
- No concerns no changes to any lighting issues

#### **Education (62)**

- Educate us. Why should we care about our impact on birds, bugs, foxes, trees, etc.?
- Education - most people have no idea that it is a problem for the environment and for people
- Education will be necessary to help people appreciate any bylaws/guidelines. I would love to see 'intro to astronomy' events/workshops held for free, so that anyone who wants to can experience the night sky, whether through telescopes & binoculars, or even the naked eye. I attended one such event at the Arboretum years ago, and it was profound.





- Demonstrations of how to do it correctly. Education to businesses who supply/spec lighting products.
- More education.
- Broad-based education/awareness campaign
- Encourage people to close their curtains at night - that too is light pollution! Look into flap.org (Fatal Light Awareness Program), a Canadian charity protecting birds from building collisions, esp with bright open windows at night. Join the IDA (International Dark-Sky Association). Perhaps include an info brochure with property tax bills, telling people about the advantages of keeping their properties dark at night and of using yellow/amber lights outdoors. Perhaps there could be a by-law stating that only yellow/amber lights can be used as outdoor lights beside people's doors and garages. There is a house in our neighborhood with a light so bright (and on all night) that it outshines not only a full moon but the streetlights as well. Absolutely not necessary! Also, could Guelph Lake be a small Dark Sky Preserve? Probably too close to the city but maybe... Perhaps an Observatory out in the countryside. Encourage people to join Globe at Night - especially its Adopt-a-Street Program to provide brightness measurements in your area - the data is used for research on the effect of street lighting on wildlife and human health.
- Public education
- awareness raising
- Raise awareness of the issue, and the consequences of over-illumination. Help folks understand that MORE lighting is not necessarily BETTER lighting, and that well-planned and well-designed/engineered lighting can be SAFER lighting, and much more enjoyable. You HAVE to answer the "what's in it for me?" question.
- Education for residents, retailers of lighting fixtures, builders, small contractors. There may need to be retail guidance about appropriate products that could be sold within proposed restrictions
- Success stories in other communities
- Educational material
- Share actions individuals can do. Once a certain level has been reached provide community achievements, like a dark-sky neighborhood, etc.
- There could be an educational campaign to spread awareness of the damage of light pollution and how people can minimize it. Perhaps it could be modelled from the anti-littering campaigns that were successful, like "Don't Mess with Texas".





- Educational outreach and promotion of the importance of reducing light pollution should be a priority.
- Possibly the promotion of the cost benefits of led lighting, and encouragement of existing properties to replace fixtures with conforming fixtures with led sources.
- Educational campaigns
- Promotion of light fixture replacement with conforming fixtures with led bulbs, for cost benefits.
- An awareness campaign might be useful
- Education on what light pollution is - not many people understand or know of the concept.
- Education would be a good place to start, in relation to excessive lighting's effect on both humans and wildlife (not to mention the potential strain on resources - 'the grid' as it's called). Education, along the lines of 'did you know?' might result in some voluntary reduction in light pollution, as well as some word-of-mouth communication of the issues involved. Ideally this would precede the introduction of any bylaw. Residents would be already sensitized to the issues, and possibly more mentally prepared to make changes to their habits. They might also put pressure on businesses to consider reducing their light pollution as well.
- Pamphlet information sent to every business , industry and home. Including apartments
- 3 articles per year to increase awareness.
- Raise awareness of the issue and the broad impact light pollution has on people, wildlife etc.
- I think education is key.
- education
- Education can change behaviours as well, to complement rules put in place
- More awareness of the need to reduce light pollution - lots of people just don't know.
- Advertising and education
- There should be a strong educational component, because it appears that many people do not appreciate the need for a reduction in light pollution.
- **\*\*Community Engagement:\*\*** Involving the community in decision-making processes related to outdoor lighting. Seeking input from residents, businesses, and organizations can help create a sense of ownership and commitment to anti-light pollution initiatives.



- **\*\*Public Awareness Campaigns:\*\*** Launching educational campaigns to raise awareness about the negative effects of light pollution and the benefits of reducing it. This could include workshops, informational materials, and community outreach programs.
- education needs to go with regulation and enforcement of excessive lighting
- General educational campaign to citizens in partnership with GRCA. There are massive environmental implications with excessive light pollution.
- Information on lights that don't interfere with the night sky but still provide security e.g. in a car lot.
- Stick with education rather than regulation.
- A community education piece. Letting people know the negative affects of light pollution highlighting all the positives of having a darker sky. (better sleep, better for animals and night bugs, safer for pedestrians etc).
- Public information campaigns to increase awareness of problems due to light pollution and benefits to dark-sky.
- Education is key.
- I would like to see the limiting of LED lights, which pollute in more colors/frequencies. I would also like to see some information distributed about the effects of LED lights on safe driving. For the latter I realize the City of Guelph does not wield power of auto manufacturers, but aggressive LED lights can absolutely create treacherous driving conditions by affecting the vision of drivers in oncoming traffic, especially on dark roads around the city such as Wellington Rd 31, and I believe education about that type of light pollution from the city can be helpful in keeping us all safe.
- Education on beauty of dark sky lighting
- Education - especially via school aged children for payoff of changed behaviour in later years
- Education around why light pollution is harmful to wildlife and humans
- A public awareness campaign before regulation to make people aware of the benefits of a dark sky.
- A campaign to explain issues with light pollution and the values that would result from curtailing it.
- Lots of communication and educational materials to accompany the by-law to help people understand the impact of light pollution on birds, bats and other wildlife... not to mention humans.
- Promotion and education of light pollution affects and what is appropriate.



- It would be great if groups supporting Dark Sky actions could run information sessions to help inform people. The Arboretum, various tree and native plant groups, Pollination Guelph and insect groups, wild animal groups etc.
- Perhaps education is the best remedy for now.
- Education campaign and incentives for change to existing high light emitters (rebate programs?).
- More education about the effects of light pollution on people and animals is important. Judging from the social media backlash, people don't understand how significant a threat this is to ecosystems. We are so used to night lighting that it feels part of life – but it's not. I understand there are safety concerns as well. But studies show that lighting doesn't prevent crime. There is some evidence that it increases crime. See this article:  
<https://darksky.org/resources/what-is-light-pollution/effects/safety/>
- Public education
- Education at the LIBRARIES! Posters (not pamphlets - those just get chucked out) about the deleterious effects of light pollution on EVERY LIVING THING. A display at CITY HALL!
- There should be information on and access for citizens to alternative types of lighting products (new type of lights, timers, etc.) that can be used to meet the regulations that are not cost prohibitive. Partnerships with companies providing these products should be cultivated.
- Education to explain the issue of light pollution. There seems to be limited understanding of the impact of excessive lighting on the environment, on insects and birds, etc.
- I think there should be a public awareness campaign to help those who may be unfamiliar with the negative impacts of light pollution to understand the importance of mitigating it.
- Education about the benefits of dark skies
- Promotion of anti-light pollution as a benefit to the environment - insects, animals, plants while also addressing any safety concerns that arise from too little light at night with certain buildings.
- Education on importance for sleep health (circadian rhythm), outdoor plants being able to grow properly & healthily & migratory birds not being disrupted. Options provided or suggested to make things lit up to be safe, but not causing light pollution.
- Educating the general public about the "why" behind regulation, like being a good neighbour by not flooding others' property with light, but also the impacts to nature.



### **Timing/duration/after hours (17)**

- Business that leave many lights on overnight
- Condo buildings that leave lights on all night in their facilities that shine into nearby buildings. They should be turned off at night. No one is using the space.
- There needs to be more work done to reduce the reflection of light into the sky and ensure it's focused where it's needed. While parking lots need light for safety, I'd like to see some regulations that limit full lighting to when there are people using a parking lot (as in driving or walking in it). Just like automated lights in a washroom, they should dim at the very least when not in use and become bright when there is activity.
- Minimizing the amount of lighting on in large commercial parking lots when the business is not open. The lights could be reduced to only illuminate enough for security purposes.
- Parking lot downlights use a ton of power and throw light everywhere, maybe mandate them to be off on a schedule between 1-6am or something
- Certain large businesses might consider less interior lighting after office hours.
- Commercial indoor lighting during unoccupied times should be included
- Christmas lights should not be left on all evening.
- Public buildings, schools, University campus buildings etc. to switch off office lights after work hours! Should become bylaw.
- Any businesses when closed have to close all interior and exterior lighting.
- Recommendations for what is reasonable/appropriate, and perhaps some time limits/recommendations ex. Turn off exterior lights not actively in use after 11pm
- University of Guelph is always bright looking from the East End. Why are the football field lights on so much in the winter and for so long?
- Christmas lighting should be reduced to a particular time and duration. (timers for daily use and duration dates of use).
- Empty parking lot lights shut off or dimmed, after business hours- ex. stone road mall.
- Regulations regarding lights remaining in office space after hours. To meet City's objects of net zero emissions.
- That outdoor lights be used only for limited night activities while occurring and for safety during designated hours.
- Office lights - some offices leave too many lights on after hours.



## Streetlights (16)

- The new street lights are way too bright, why would the city choose these while also addressing light pollution?
- Yes, the street lights on our street were recently changed and they are extremely bright. Much brighter than before. Shinning unwanted light into our house and into our backyard. This will be very unpleasant in the summer when we want to enjoy our backyard.
- Maybe make light standards shorter to reduce the glare in windows, etc.
- Street lights (municipal) that dim when there is no "traffic" nearby, i.e., motion sensors.
- I would like to see the city regularly check for burnt out street lights and other lights for safety NOT the public phoning in to get the city to change the lights when it's convenient for them
- I'd like the street lights to be less flickering and have more of a red shift.
- Street lights and highway lights casting light on buildings.
- Street lights too bright
- I think the new streetlights are too bright and too harsh. I have astigmatism and I've noticed they've made it harder for me to drive at night. Plus they are harsh on my eyes.
- Lower street lighting on residential streets. Cars don't need street lighting on residential streets. Lighting should target sidewalks, and not large areas.
- New street lights. General awareness of impact on light pollution on birds and insects.
- Streetlights - the new LED lights sometimes seem too bright.
- Less bright street lights with warm glow not the harsh light that is there now.
- Review of LED street lighting to ensure light is not encroaching onto residential properties.
- Lowering current streetlight intensity

## Dark Sky Community/events/area (11)

- Guelph should strive to achieve a Dark Sky Community designation, as awarded by <https://darksky.org/what-we-do/international-dark-sky-places/dark-sky-place-types/>
- If there was an area on the outskirts of town to make a dark night reserve, that would be realistic.
- \*\*Community Events:\*\* Organizing events like stargazing nights, where residents can experience the beauty of the night sky and learn about the importance of reducing light pollution.



- Support for community 'dark sky' nights (e.g. temporary dimming or delay of streetlights around parks on select nights for astronomy).
- I would like to see the City adopt becoming a "Dark Skies Community" as an official municipal goal with a deadline and task staff with accomplishing it.
- There should be a dark areas within city
- The idea of encouraging less use of lights at night and how-to-achieve is a great idea! How can we embrace the anti-light night life?!
- A chapter from Darksky.org or similar organizations should be encouraged in the community. There is currently none in Ontario
- I don't know if it is possible being our proximity to other cities if there was the possibility of having fewer or no lights in a specific area to be able to see the stars and meteor showers that occur seasonally. Certain times for certain event? Just a thought. Guelph Lake or another suitable area?
- I would like to see a dark space created for use by photographers and sky watchers. Maybe more than one . Cars and trucks are worst light offenders and you can't enforce them to turn off lights!!'
- Hosting dark sky nights as a public event to highlight the benefits of darks skies

### ***Guidelines/policies/advocacy (9)***

- **\*\*Public Lighting Guidelines for Developers:\*\*** Providing clear guidelines for developers and architects to follow when designing outdoor lighting for new constructions. This can ensure that new developments adhere to anti-light pollution principles.
- **\*\*Green Building Certifications:\*\*** Encouraging or requiring adherence to dark-sky-friendly outdoor lighting practices as part of green building certifications for new constructions.
- **\*\*Integration into Urban Planning:\*\*** Integrating anti-light pollution measures into urban planning processes. This includes considering lighting designs in new developments and retrofitting existing infrastructure to meet dark-sky standards.
- **\*\*Model Lighting Ordinances:\*\*** Developing and promoting model lighting ordinances that cities and municipalities can adopt. These standardized guidelines can streamline the process of implementing effective anti-light pollution measures.
- **\*\*Policy Advocacy:\*\*** Advocating for regional, national, or international policies that address light pollution. Engaging in discussions and



collaborations with other municipalities and organizations can help create a broader impact.

- **\*\*Outdoor Lighting Audits:\*\*** Conducting regular audits of outdoor lighting in public spaces and commercial areas to identify non-compliant fixtures. Providing feedback and recommendations for improvement can help ensure ongoing compliance.
- Lobby the provincial government to update building codes to consider light pollution - e.g. restricting upward lighting.
- The city should adopt more severe restrictions and requirements for any site plan approval process. At this stage of development, it would be crucial to identify the expectations and relevant studies to be included with S.P.A. submissions.
- Guidelines for how long your outdoor holiday lights should be left on, could be helpful.

### **Car headlights (9)**

- Love for car manufacturers to stop using such freaking bright night vision killing blue tinted white light headlights. We can have the efficiency of LEDs with the colour correction of the old lamps VERY easily with appropriate lenses.
- Headlights on vehicles. The LED headlights are blinding and dangerous.
- Headlights on cars are increasingly being modified, or swapped out, where re-pointing is not completed. This floods properties, homes, and other drivers with inappropriate light, which is a safety issue. Probably not, car lights make a huge impact on overall light pollution.
- We should definitely get rid of headlights I can barely see as it is after a 12 pack
- Brightness of car headlights and height of lights, e.g. not pointing high enough to blind oncoming or leading driver's eyes.
- The biggest source of light pollution that affects me regularly is from vehicle headlights. I have no idea why auto-makers have made them so bright. It's like everyone is driving with their high-beams on. Addressing that would be the biggest win of all.
- I would like to see the limiting of LED lights, which pollute in more colors/frequencies. I would also like to see some information distributed about the effects of LED lights on safe driving. For the latter I realize the City of Guelph does not wield power of auto manufacturers, but aggressive LED lights can absolutely create treacherous driving conditions by affecting the





vision of drivers in oncoming traffic, especially on dark roads around the city such as Wellington Rd 31, and I believe education about that type of light pollution from the city can be helpful in keeping us all safe.

- Blinding headlights on new vehicles
- Well I think very bright LED headlights are a problem, but that's another issue. I think so far this is a great start from the city.

### **Incentives (9)**

- Perhaps incentivize the appreciation of the night sky, without light pollution via awareness-programs. Many people grew up away from cities and in environments where light pollution was less of a concern or a problem. Guelph is a city that prides itself, and rightly so, by focusing on environmental initiatives over other cities. I see no reason as to why Guelph cannot be an innovator in this field and lead by example. Especially in the GTA and Golden Horse Shoe.
- Rebate programs for residents to switch to warm coloured LED lighting, lighting with timers, dimmers, motion sensors
- Perhaps incentives?
- Guidelines would probably not be enough for businesses to comply but perhaps some sort of program where the City gives out accolades based on changes made by different companies in their night-light habits - some sort of 'Save The Night' program; little certificates that The City of Guelph is grateful to ??? (whatever business) for their work in changing their light effect.
- Perhaps a rebate program like 'Royal Flush' for dark sky approved light fixtures.
- Offer rebates on motion sensors to incentivize change.
- Perhaps there could be low wattage LED cool light bulbs offered for free at first and then discounted. Lighting systems recommended by experts and installation discounts.
- **\*\*Incentive Programs:\*\*** Implementing incentive programs for businesses and homeowners who voluntarily adopt dark-sky-friendly lighting practices. This could include tax incentives, rebates, or other benefits to encourage compliance.
- Environmental impact of office lights being turned off at night should be considered and potentially encouraged through incentives





### **Timers/sensors (9)**

- Encouraging use of timers, sensors; turning off lights especially during migratory bird season.
- The use of technology (sensors/timers) to automate a reduction of brightness similar to bathroom lights that turn on or off based on movement. This should be considered for both roads and all businesses, business parks, parking lots, etc.
- Using motion sensors.
- I would like to see the city start buying motion activated street lights for new areas and replace old ones with them.
- Christmas lighting should be reduced to a particular time and duration. (timers for daily use and duration dates of use).
- Include more motion sensor lighting in businesses and office spaces.
- Security lighting should time out shortly after being triggered. It should only shine down at the door or where a security camera is pointing, not at neighbours' property.
- Use of motion detecting lights to provide security is appropriate
- Lights out inside on all unused areas. Motion lighting is a great tool inside hallways , stairwells , doorways, garages, side yard access for saving hydro and safety but not always outside where some outdoor lights are so motion sensitive that they are on constantly. This makes it hard to sleep at night, incurring extra expenses on blackout curtains.

### **Wildlife/birds (8)**

- A concerted effort to encourage turning off of lights during bird migration.
- Insects and by extension most wildlife require darkness to thrive. In a city where we want to protect pollinators, less light pollution is vital. As well, fewer lights helps people sleep and creates a calm atmosphere.
- Take steps to have Guelph recognized as a bird friendly city which goes hand and hand with lightning control
- Migration paths of birds should be considered in any decisions and discussions. Light pollution has an enormous negative impact on birds and animals, many of which are nocturnal. Insect survival is profoundly impacted by artificial light.
- I want to see the city become a leader in limiting bird deaths from birds crashing into brightly lit windows, and limiting lights left on in office buildings at night when no-one is working.
- Decreased outdoor lighting during spring and fall bird migration



- Bird protection
- Have Guelph become a bird friendly city to help especially during migration times

### **Direction of lighting (8)**

- Street lights should be directed onto the streets and sidewalks - NOT ONTO HOUSES OR TREES BEHIND THE HOUSES (on both sides of the street)
- I have seen very tall light standards used to illuminate parking areas, featuring BRIGHT WHITE lamps at the top, that shine light horizontally as well as downward, and they are visible for miles during the overnight hours. Example: A large building to the South of Clair Road, south of the Fire Station and School. Way too much light in that case.
- Light shades that focus lighting downwards (for example on streetlights)
- Property lights shining into the eyes of drivers, ex. home hardware on wellington- lights are bright for cars heading on to the south bound ramps.
- Addressing the angles that lights should point
- Window light from businesses should not directly or indirectly shine on residential properties.
- There needs to be more work done to reduce the reflection of light into the sky and ensure it's focused where it's needed. While parking lots need light for safety, I'd like to see some regulations that limit full lighting to when there are people using a parking lot (as in driving or walking in it). Just like automated lights in a washroom, they should dim at the very least when not in use and become bright when there is activity.
- I would like light direction to be factored into the regulation. For instance, a floodlight pointing from ground up to illuminate the side of a building cause a lot of light pollution, and the same floodlight could have been pointing down from roof line to the ground for the same illumination. Maybe also consider area lighting designs, as glass domes leak light upwards and could be reflected down to where we need it.

### **Conservation/efficiency (8)**

- I think we should look at optional guidelines that inspire residents. We should also bring in the element of energy conservation. Unnecessary lighting or higher intensity lighting causes waste of energy in addition to night sky pollution.
- Neighborhood groups advocating for energy conservation



- Environmental impact of office lights being turned off at night should be considered and potentially encouraged through incentives
- I'd like some focus put on the efficiency of lighting at the same time as light pollution. We have a chance to reduce energy demand here too.
- The City could lead the way - reduction rather than elimination. It could be spun into a conservation ultimately a money saving option too.
- Promotion of LED lighting to save electricity in addition to minimizing sky lighting.
- Energy reduction could be implemented in all city lights including sidewalks by using timers or motion sensors overnight.
- This should be tied to climate change work. Let's cause less pollution as we cause less light pollution.

### **Spotlights/floodlights (5)**

- Make it illegal to use an aerial searchlight -- there is a business. downtown that does this and it is visible 5 kms away.
- No big spotlights
- Limits to things like searchlights being operated by business for promotion
- No bright yellow floodlights on stores and in small plazas.
- Floodlights. The only limit should be to floodlights.

### **Collaboration (5)**

- Support of Alectra (Guelph Hydro) for this community; municipal, provincial and federal support of various kinds, including a continuation of alternative sources of power; corporate support for the invention, creation, production and distribution of alternative fixtures for all of these dark sky lighting ideas.
- Signage. Cooperation with city's businesses that sell lights, asking them to promote low-light fixtures and discourage bad ones.
- **\*\*Collaboration with Stakeholders:\*\*** Collaborating with UofG astronomy department, environmental organizations, and other stakeholders interested in reducing light pollution. Partnerships can enhance the effectiveness of anti-light pollution initiatives through shared resources and expertise.
- Can you work with Guelph Hydro to offer short-term subsidies to reward retrofits (reduced cost/kw-hour?).
- There should be information on and access for citizens to alternative types of lighting products (new type of lights, timers, etc.) that can be used to meet the regulations that are not cost prohibitive. Partnerships with companies providing these products should be cultivated.



### **Safety (5)**

- Provide research on whether lighting prevents robberies or intruders. Research on what level of lighting provides a safe walking environment.
- Lights keep us safe
- No crime
- Safety lighting is necessary for people vs. over-lighting areas to prevent theft or loitering. People and animals impacted by light are more important than property, each and every time.
- City street lights need to always be on to help prevent break ins and to help keep someone safe when out walking in the evening

### **Brightness/colour (5)**

- Replace existing bright lighting with low level off white lights is Quebec Autoroute system and the use of yellow/orange lights,
- Find a better light colour that produces less pollution. Change the spread of the light to have less reflection off the surface.
- Bans on excessively high lumen lighting availability (wattage/lumens should be restricted for specific uses)
- All exterior LED should have a color shift warranty from the MFG, if it shifts in color its warranted. The biggest lighting issue we are seeing is degregation of Low quality LED that is being sold in many of the new industrial parking lots in Guelph. Im happy to share findings/ photos we have done with DRONES at night so you can see.
- I have seen very tall light standards used to illuminate parking areas, featuring BRIGHT WHITE lamps at the top, that shine light horizontally as well as downward, and they are visible for miles during the overnight hours. Example: A large building to the South of Clair Road, south of the Fire Station and School. Way too much light in that case.

### **Not sure (5)**

- Not sure (2)
- Don't know
- I wish I knew more about the subject to give you a proper answer here
- Sorry, not well enough educated in this area

### **Research (3)**

- **\*\*Research and Innovation:\*\*** Investing in research and development of lighting technologies that are energy-efficient and minimize light pollution.



Supporting innovation in the lighting industry can contribute to sustainable solutions.

- All actions and interventions should be at the advice of experts and researchers into light pollution, and how it affects the natural world.
- Research in low-emitting light technologies

## Other

- I look out my window at 2 am and it is never truly dark in my backyard. My neighbour uses spotlights around his house. I asked him not to direct them towards my house, he has complied, but it is still bright enough that I need to tack up a scarf to block the night.
- Smaller government. Less over reach from government. Lower government salaries. Less business subsidies
- That the city and staff stop wasting Guelph resident's tax dollars and stop raising taxes AGAIN to an excessive amount. City and staff will go to extremes, excessive, extravagant and insane methods to do what they want. We don't need fat-cat, oh-so-privileged city and union employees wasting our tax dollars. We don't need a Dark Sky bi-law. We didn't need a new library. We don't need Waste Collection it should be contracted out. Scam Guthrie and city council kisses ass with senior union and their nepotism friends who work at the city making +\$40 / hour plus benefits. The automated speed enforcement camera is a CASH GRAB and FIASCO for Guelph residents! When there is no school the speed limit should be 40 kph and 30 kph during school hours. Guelph residents are outraged. Low-income, families and seniors cannot afford to pay \$80 for going over the speed limit by 1 (one) kilometer. SHAME on Scam Guthrie and city council.
- Lights that focus on the ground should be led and save money.
- Light in natural areas and near rivers
- Are there rules/by-laws for bad landlords who do not have adequate lighting for tenants safety ? Could this help in reverse with quality of lighting ?
- Unfortunately due to working commitments i was not able to attend the in person or on line meetings held earlier, therefore I do not know what other options or impacts there are.
- YES .. enforcement for draining pool water into our sewers it is happening all over Kortright Hills and many other areas. These residents don't care and should be fined! It is NOT being enforced!
- Fireworks need to be more regulated - for wildlife and pets (noise and light).
- I would like to see the city take it head out of its own ass.



- Show people how much money they will be saving by reducing lighting
- Sure. Downtown in the encampments, because THEY SHOULDNT BE THERE.
- We actually do not have enough lighting in our neighbourhood. With the sun setting early and walking our dogs in the evening almost every single night we are almost hit by cars crossing streets, because they cannot see us due to lack of lighting. We wear reflective clothing and our dogs have light up collars. This does not help. We need more lights!
- There does not need to be a by law for light pollution
- Suggestions are enough. Bylaws are punitive and unnecessary.
- I don't want to as see any anti light pollution restrictions brought into effect. Your question here is poorly worded and confusing!
- This is a poorly worded question .....confusing
- Why not have legal repercussions?
- Greenhouses with super bright lights at night in the outskirts of the city
- Light that trespasses into neighbor property or shines intensely into another's home should be an enforceable bylaw infraction.
- This should be enforceable to municipal buildings as they always seem to be exempt.
- It would be nice if we could bring back the use of more curtains and blinds in residential buildings and lights out in commercial buildings.
- Glaring lights should not be allowed in neighborhoods
- Increase cost of hydro for off hours (over night) if business wants to leave lights on
- Having the city set an example - I think they do this already in many cases - the water tower used to be all illuminated and is no longer, street lamps replaced etc.
- People have a lot of outdoor lighting in order for security cameras to capture activity, so there could be pushback from that perspective. Being as specific as possible about every type of lighting will help so there isn't any grey area.
- It might be helpful to have a baseline by ward of what the light pollution level is and it's negative impacts as part of the education piece. There is no doubt a cost savings argument to make as well if lights are not left on.
- Would it be feasible to approach this on a ward by ward basis? For instance, do a scan of each ward to see where the hot spots are, tailor an intervention/awareness plan to the needs of that ward, then move on to the next one and so on?
- Yes the illumination project. perhaps it is a good idea for the downtown but when theses lights were put on the covered bridge they were a distraction



from the beauty and calm of the park and for people who like peace and calm on their walks. Even the beautiful downtown historic buildings stand out beautifully on the town with just the accent of street lighting. Why does everything have to have so much bling .

- These bylaws need to be upheld by the City
- The city should worry about not increasing taxes. Seems like studies like these contribute to tax increases.
- Stars
- The city seems to feel the need to get involved in things that pertain to the property of others. There is a law that protects a person's property. The city and its employees are public servants and should focus on what they are put in place to deal with and that is services. You are wasting the residents of Guelph's money on these surveys and on any meeting when proposing by-laws that pertain to anything but services.
- Anything would be an improvement
- Yes, fast food drive through screens are blinding (worst offender I've seen is Tim Hortons, I can't even look at the screen when it's dark out).
- The electric billboard at Victoria and Elizabeth is a nuisance.
- Yes commit to be the example. Tackle it in a phased approach ie A, B, C and D. Not sure about E
- I have mostly been referring to exterior lighting in my comments, but there are instances when bright interior lighting (travelling to the outside) can be problematic as well.
- Just an experiment to illustrate: Photograph using a manual camera, above and over a streetlight. Do not include the light source. This illustrates the source light's upward spill.
- A commitment regarding all new insulation of streetlights/outdoor lighting for city infrastructure and properties.
- Muskoka has excellent regulations
- Based on the weaknesses of this one, maybe the fewer the better.

**We want to know what success looks like. When the next generation looks up into a clear night sky in Guelph, what would you like them to see?**

***Stars, moon, darkness, planets, creatures (274)***

- Stars , planets, darkness, bats, birds and other creatures.





- Stars, many more stars and other constellations that cannot currently be seen on a moonless night.
- As many stars as possible on a clear night.
- More stars.
- I would like them to be able to see the stars. As years go by and there are more lights in the city, we can no longer see the same number of stars that we used to.
- I would love my children to be able to look up and see the stars, and not have to drive miles out of town in order to see a meteor shower. I would also like the community's wildlife to benefit from reduced light pollution. Given that light pollution has been shown to have negative affects on wildlife.
- The stars!!!! Billions of them.
- More stars!
- See the stars and moon. Bugs flying around
- Stars! Lightening bugs in gardens and city parks.
- They will see stars.
- Darkness!!
- Something other than the black we see now! I want my kid to see stars without having to take a road trip
- More than just the moon. Stars and aurora borealis, when weather conditions are right. I remember as a child, being awakened and taken outside to see those one summer night.
- Nocturnal animals/birds
- Stars
- Stars
- Stars
- Stars
- STARS! Please! We cannot forgot there is an actual sky with actual stars above us. It is so sad that we are losing that.
- when I can see the stars at night again.
- Stars, planets, an occasional aurora borealis. Also, no space debris - but that is outside of the scope of your project.
- I would love to see the Milky Way but in reality more abundant stars would be good. We have fireflies in our yard and more dark sky would help them become more abundant
- Just what they see now. A night sky with stars
- More Stars!
- the stars, and birds migrating





- To see the Milky Way!
- The milky way. I want them to be able to see major and minor constellations, and get excited for meteor showers
- More stars, no matter where they are located in the City.
- Stars.
- Being able to see the stars at night connects us to the larger universe. We need more connection to nature.
- I would like them to see the Milky Way, our Galaxy. Other points such as the Big and Little Dipper and other familiar astrological signs. Perhaps even the Northern Lights as I saw many years ago on Stevenson Street North.
- Should be able to see a full starlit sky, meteorite showers that you don't have to leave the city to see.
- Stars, and not just the main/brightest ones....
- The ability to see more stars, not just count the same 10 on a "clear" night. No massive overcast glow over the city at night (as seen on foggy nights, that's what exists every night into the sky, but those nights it's reflected back)
- Being able to see the stars!
- Moon and Stars! No light intrusion from neighbours as we have had to address with City bylaws help!"
- The magic of natural un disturbed sky
- The stars! It would be amazing to be able to see the stars at night while walking in the park!
- The milky way would be nice
- More stars than is currently visible from within the city.
- I would like the skies to be at least Bottle Scale 3 / show stars of around 6.6 to 7 apparent magnitude.
- The stars!
- Stars!!
- Stars
- Stars (can currently see these).
- It's not going to be a dark sky preserve. But if we could aim to add 50% to the number of visible stars, that would be pretty great
- a significant increase in starlight/star visibility, residents should have the ability to appreciate natural beauty.
- Stars, I would like the next generation to look up and be able to see the stars from anywhere in Guelph.
- Some stars, not just satellites.



- I would like them to see the SEVEN stars of Ursa Major (for sure!), at least THREE stars of Ursa Minor, Cassiopeia, EIGHT stars of Orion, at least FOUR stars of Pegasus...basically, I would like the next generation to CONTINUE to see and identify the constellations that we can see RIGHT NOW. And the planets that we can see right now. There is already an "orange haze" that comes from Toronto, but I guess there's not much we can do about that. Let's try to limit OUR contribution to the orange haze.
- Stars, the moon and the international space station drifting through.
- Stars, stars and more stars.
- Stars
- The stars
- Stars, Native Species
- I would like the next generation to look up at the sky and see the Milky Way galaxy from almost anywhere in the city. Being able to see the multitude of stars and the galaxy in which we are situated in is inherent to our experience as mammals and has only been taken away in the last century. We need to reverse this.
- Stars, the occasional airplane, the moon and occasional close planets.
- all of the stars!
- Stars, special night sky meteorological activities
- A lot of stars.
- Darkness, stars, northern lights, planetary spectacles
- Stars, shooting stars, moon and owls, bats, moths, night jars and all the night creatures. I hope we will accomplish this sooner than next generation! I'd like to enjoy not being blinded by neighbours' lights all night in near future.
- All the stars
- Stars, the milky way, possibly bats etc.
- Stars!
- Go out to parks! to see the stars! More open spaces! support saving the Zold Zreformsgory!
- The stars and planets.
- Lots of meteors and stars!
- The stars, the Milky Way, comets!!
- stars
- A prestigious member of the Chinese Academy of Sciences once marvelled at how wonderful it was to see the stars again. We were stepping out after a conference at the University of Guelph. Imagine his present world for a minute. The near future generation should be able to eye and track satellites



with aid from handheld devices. They should experience the aurora borealis at home. Imagine understanding moonlit nights need no flashlights. Beetlejuice or Betelgeuse? They should see both.

- Stars!! Peace! Happiness!
- Stars!! Wouldn't that be amazing? And fireflies. And bats.
- Stars!
- Lots and lots of stars like what you see when you are in the country. I shouldn't be able to walk between the university and downtown reading a book the whole way by streetlight at any time of night like I can now.
- The stars!
- My light pollution concern is for migrating birds flying into buildings. So any reduced lights especially from buildings would be great. And to be able to see a clear sky at night with the stars visible would be great!
- Being able to see meteor showers, especially in the summer, find stars that make up our night sky, see more stars than we do now.
- Full night sky
- Stars
- All the stars!!! Shooting stars. The Milky Way and all the details of the moon.
- The Milky Way!
- Stars - millions of stars.
- Stars!!!!
- The Milky Way, the Big Dipper, shooting stars!
- Stars
- As many stars as can be seen with the naked eye. The actual milky way. Comets. Everything celestial!
- So many stars!!! It's wild how big a difference in star gazing you can experience from 2km of downtown Guelph and the Ignatius Jesuit Centre
- The Milky Way. If that is at all possible!
- Stars, the moon
- I would love if they could see the stars and constellations from their own yard or balcony, without light trespass from neighbours.
- Stars. And nocturnal animals need to regain the night.
- Our skyline backlit by more stars than other cities.
- Clear view of the night sky that is not impeded by a glow of artificial light.
- Stars and satellites, clouds and the abyss behind them.
- Stars! And bats.



- The Milky Way. Like here:  
[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1us4s8XK\\_Xl2V16EQQ885WylfjcxGMfRG/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1us4s8XK_Xl2V16EQQ885WylfjcxGMfRG/view?usp=sharing)
- More stars!
- Stars! And fireflies again
- I would like to see tracked data on the effect on wildlife, particularly migratory and local birds that navigate by starlight. A roaring success would include there being at least one hike/park/other natural environment from which the next generation can see the Milky Way, or at the very least a sky full of stars (not just the occasional constellation)
- Stars, owls , comets, etc. Not a bunch of pollution from sky scraper lights.
- stars planets northern lights comets and owls....
- Stars! Moon! We don't need artificial light in the sky. If I had my choice the number and size of satellites would also be regulated.
- Ideally, the milky way.
- Stars, difficult to see many in Guelph even on a clear night.
- STARS
- I would like them to see the stars on a clear night. I don't expect them to reach a level where we can see the milky way but at least see a little more than we currently can
- Stars
- The Milky Way however I am also concerned about the effects of light pollution on nature on the ground and the importance of creating a more favourable environment for turtles, owls, amphibians, night flying insects, moths etc. This is probably even more important for our children than being able to have a dark sky. Land light pollution is equally if not more important.
- More stars
- Stars and very strong Northern lights.
- stars
- Beautiful night sky, stars, moon, etc.
- So many stars!!?
- I would like it if we could see a LOT more stars than currently. There are city street lights that have been shining into our front bedroom window for 34 years. I would like to see them eliminated or at least dimmed.
- Stars ideally, but given the growth plan for Guelph this may not be realistic while also balancing security/safety.
- The stars, the sky at night



- Every now and then, I hear about an incoming geomagnetic storm that would be powerful enough to cause an aurora above us. Not only would I like for our next generation to see that. \*I\* would like to see that.
- stars
- The Milky Way, no Starlink satellites from SpaceX (Elon Musk) etc.
- Stars
- The stars and the moon.
- They should see as many stars and planets as possible in the night sky.
- The Stars.
- Aliens
- stars, stars and more stars
- As many stars as possible
- Stars
- The stars my friend the stars!
- As many stars as possible. Not a glow of clouds illuminated on a overcast evening. You can see where the city is from quite a distance away. This should be reduced to a shorter distance away.
- Stars, more than just the brightest ones!
- the milky way. so many stars. so many stars.
- Fireflies, and the way the sky should make you feel when you look up into the inky darkness and can zillions of stars hanging all around you.
- Stars!
- The stars on a clear night. Ideally, the Milky Way, too!
- Moon, stars, birds and bats
- Dark sky and stars, not the glow of buidlings.
- I'd like them to see stars. Guelph should strive to have the darkest sky possible, while still maintaining active life after the sun goes down. This means being intentional around what light we allow to shine and where.
- I would like them to be able to make out the Milky Way, from dark backyard or a park in the city.
- Stars! The northern lights when they're visible this way. Not this constant dusky light that harms our natural world and places many of us in a near-constant place of wakefulness.
- A beautiful night sky filled with stars, the ability to use a telescope without needing to travel an hour or more outside of Guelph, the chance to connect with nature and feel soothed by the night sky.
- Stars on a clear night
- Stars



- The stars and a darkened sky
- The stars and the moon
- Actually being able to see the Milky Way would be amazing. :P
- Be able to see the stars. There is good inspiration in places like the Bruce peninsula.
- Nothing. It should be dark.
- The stars on a clear night.
- All the stars
- All the stars, not just the brightest ones.
- A sky full of stars.
- Stars, northern lights, other planets
- Stars
- Ideally they would be able to see the aurora borealis when they shine.
- Opportunity in our community to actually be able to see the night sky
- The sky! Not light pollution
- A starry sky, of course but not at the expense of safety and religious celebration.
- At minimum the milky way
- THE STARS. In the last ten years, stars in Guelph/KW, Wellington area have become very difficult to spot. We used to sit on our back deck for hours but as more neighbourhoods sprawl around us, it has made this activity impossible. Skywatching is now near impossible in Guelph, and I can't believe I'm saying that in my young lifetime.
- Stars
- It would be amazing to actually be able to see stars in the night sky again
- Love it if we could see the sky. I do not need to turn any lights on at night because it is bright enough to see without any extra lighting
- stars. the moon. limitless imagination
- a semi-dark sky like in rural areas
- Stars. Northern light?
- The big Dipper
- I want people to see the stars at night. I had a child say to me, as a recent immigrant from Pakistan, "Why doesn't Canada have any stars at night." Let her child see the stars.
- A dark sky. Citizens concerned about energy consumption.
- Stars! The beautiful night sky.
- STARS. When I moved here 19 years ago I could see stars and little to no lights .. now residents leave lights on all night!



- A sky filled with stars that are visible to the naked eye, creating a sense of wonder and connection to the broader universe. The ability to see the Milky Way, our galaxy's band of light, arching across the night sky, providing a breathtaking display of cosmic beauty. Occasional visibility of natural light displays like the auroras, which might not be as visible in areas with high light pollution. Clear views of celestial events such as meteor showers, eclipses, and planetary alignments, allowing for an enriched stargazing experience. Recognition of constellations and their patterns, fostering an appreciation for cultural and astronomical heritage. An environment conducive to astronomical observations, enabling amateur and professional astronomers to pursue their interests and contribute to scientific discovery. A night environment that supports the natural behaviours of nocturnal animals and preserves biodiversity. Minimized glare and skyglow, ensuring that artificial lights are directed and shielded to prevent unnecessary upward illumination. Ultimately, success would be measured by the restoration of a dark-sky environment that aligns with the principles of responsible outdoor lighting, creating a sustainable and harmonious relationship between human activities and the natural beauty of the night sky in Guelph.
- be able to see all the stars
- The stars. Birds that are able to migrate without being thrown off by light pollution Many migrate at night.
- It would be nice to be able to readily see the stars and planets as well as the moon, if it is visible that night. At the same time, we need enough street surface lighting for safe (and secure) movement of people on the surface.
- More stars :)
- The natural night sky
- Stars and stars only
- The Milky Way!
- The stars.
- More stars.
- The stars and moon.
- Clear definition of sky
- Stars
- Stars, planets.
- The stars
- More stars!
- being able to see the stars
- as clear a sky as possible and practical





- Stars!!! More than just satellites :( Jupiter at night, venus in the early evening...
- more stars within the city limits
- Stars!
- That I can see the stars again
- stars on a clear night
- stars, constellations
- Stars
- Airplanes, birds, stars.
- Major constellations (at least) visible from most areas around the city.
- More stars! I remember being in rural New Brunswick and seeing the Milky Way! It was marvelous, though I know that isn't possible in cities.
- the galaxy you showed in the 2003 blackout photo in the powerpoint.
- A stunning panoply of stars.
- more stars in the sky!
- The stars, moon, clouds...
- Stars
- Stars with no light pollution
- As many stars as possible
- Stars, planets, meteors, Aurora, migratory birds, native insects, darkness, calm
- Stars. Or at the very least, something that doesn't require blackout curtains to sleep at night.
- Stars, moon and constellations, clear air and night skies with bats, bugs etc
- Stars and planets. Clear night sky. Look to Sedona Arizona for details. They are successful.
- It would be good to know that plants and animals are being protected from artificial light. And for residents, it would be wonderful to be able to see the night sky as our ancestors did. We have lost the night sky, to our detriment.
- Primarily, it would be great to be able to see the stars again - albeit with a smattering of satellites getting in the way.
- It would be great for everyone to see stars in the sky everywhere in Guelph, but this is not possible as it would make those less safe.
- A clear night sky should mean that you can see stars, planets. Maybe not that clearly to the naked eye but they should still be visible to some extent.
- Stars
- More stars.
- Stars
- stars



- The milky way
- 10,000 celestial bodies at once. Occasional Milky Way band and Aurora.
- I want them to see the stars so they are inspired to wonder and work together to see what is out there.
- The stars!! But also I would love them to grow up without seeing that huge glow in the sky that indicates that you are approaching Guelph from anywhere outside it.
- Ideally, I'd like them to be able to see the stars. I'd like them to see that they live in a community that understands the importance of connection to the natural world. A community that's brave enough to foster that connection even when faced by detractors who say the whole thing's a waste of time and money. I suspect you'll get a fair number of survey respondents who criticize the City for pursuing this issue. And I am truly sorry that my own survey responses aren't strongly supportive of this initiative. The truth is there is a conflict between what I would like (a clear night sky) and what I've witnessed in my own neighbourhood (darkness as an opportunity to commit crimes). I don't know how to reconcile that conflict. So here's a case where the survey responses do not actually reflect what the survey respondent wants. I am so proud to live in a City that understands the value of clear night skies. Thank you for making this effort to improve everyone's quality of life. And I sincerely hope that you're able to come up with a solution to the conflict I've outlined.
- The sky
- I want the next generation to be able to look up and see the Milky Way and fireflies at ground level in their backyards and our parks.
- Stars.
- Stars
- More stars, less taxes
- I would like them to see the stars and planets and the moon clearly. I want them to know the colour of the dark sky. I want them to be able to see the difference between stars and planets. I want them to be able to catch glimpses of the milky way.
- The stars!
- I don't know if we'll ever get to the point we can see the milky way again, but it would be nice.
- Stars
- The colours of the night skies, the constellations. The moon.
- The sky.
- Stars in a dark sky! The Big Dipper...



- A clear view of the Milky Way in a dark sky.
- Stars
- Major constellations! It is probably not feasible to reduce light pollution entirely but there is room for significant improvement to be made.
- success means i can see stars from within the city, a clear view of night sky without going out of city.
- The stars.
- I'd like them to see the stars, billions of stars
- Stars
- It would be awesome if some stars could be seen on some evenings. Maybe planned lights out policies. Or half the street lamps on, every other day or so.
- More stars. Less glow from urban settings.
- Dim planets like Saturn, the M clusters, and ursa minor...all its stars.
- It would be wonderful if they could see a few more stars to go with that moon.
- Stars
- More stars than we see now.
- As many stars as possible
- Stars, northern lights, milky way. When they drive into the city, they shouldn't see a city halo.
- The night sky and all that it has to offer. A renewal of healthy wildlife that can cope with a renewed, natural dark sky. This might also reduce the amount of noise pollution since light promotes some levels of noise. People have to get used to reduced lighting for such things as festivals and concerts.
- Stars
- As full a scope of the stars as possible
- Starts, moon, the milky way.
- More stars.
- Stars
- Stars, the moon and planets. Fireflies, if it's summer.
- tons of stars
- Stars!
- Stars.
- I'd like them to see beyond the stars...bats, birds, pollinators and a community that understands the importance of saving energy.
- Stars
- Stars constellations a clear sky
- The Milky Way. The ability to make out constellations



- i would love the next generation to be able to see constellations, i would also like to know that there are still species that are most impacted by light pollution.
- The stars! Maybe a bit of the Milky Way and an occasional glimpse of the Aurora Borealis. And if they were to look DOWN upon the city, about 50% of the current light pollution.
- Stars. Sky colour that is black. Less glare at grade.
- See the night sky. Experience true darkness.
- Stars. I see stars now in Guelph. Population growth may take this away from us.
- the stars.
- Constellations, Milky Way, comets, meteor showers etc. without having to drive out of town.
- stars
- Stars
- Stars
- The major night sky features should be visible including the planets of the solar system as well as the bright stars of the milky way.
- more stars!
- Enough stars to see the constellations.
- Stars! Lunar eclipses! Northern lights (when active)! I am sick of driving out into the middle of nowhere in the middle of the night just to be able to witness these phenomena, which all humans on planet Earth have the right to experience despite "taxpayer" concerns.
- the stars
- Stars of different brightness.
- Stars or dark night
- The Milky Way!! Many, many stars!! Bats, moths, fireflies. Many birds, migrating at night. The total area occupied by cities is expected to double over the next 30 years. Currently, almost 25% of the earth's land is exposed to artificial light at night. In North America, 99% of the population is exposed to artificial light at night. Very few people know what a real starry sky looks like anymore. So what will it be for the next generation if we don't make changes now? I am VERY happy to see that the City of Guelph is addressing this issue. By the way, where does Guelph rate on the Bortle Scale of light pollution? It'd be great to have a "before and after" report (as in, now versus after changes are made).
- Stars.



- stars
- STARS and lots of them!
- At least some of the Milky Way. Reduced light-related bird mortalities.
- The stars! And more than just one or two - e.g. the Big Dipper - do you see 2 stars, 7 stars... And see e.g Northern Lights. See the moon. See astronomical phenomenon. Also, I want them to be able to "see" moths and other nocturnal creatures (or at least know they are there). Ditto for daytime - many diurnal creatures need darkness to survive. So I hope future generations have a healthy ecosystem around them. Less light pollution is better for human health too!
- The Milky Way galaxy, the Andromeda galaxy, and the Orion constellation.
- The Milky Way
- More stars
- I would like Guelph to be dark enough that it no longer can be seen lighting up low cloud cover from Fergus. And I would like to be able to see shooting stars.
- Star-dotted ink with a shadow of the city
- While seeing the Milky Way clearly from within any city limits would be unrealistic (short of a blackout) seeing many more constellations beyond the Big Dipper, and Orion would be a start. Being able to start reaching for more deep sky objects like galaxies (say naked eye identification of the Andromeda Glxy.) and globular clusters would help educators and enthusiasts alike.
- stars
- Stars lots of stars with wildlife able to move about
- On a clear night it would be ideal if residents could see the stars in the sky.
- Many more stars & constellations than we currently see. Shooting stars. A feeling of humility at something so vast.
- Stars, planets, Milky Way, birds migrating
- The ability to recognize (see) the constellations and to visualize why we call our galaxy the Milky Way.
- Stars obviously.
- All the stars that can be seen very far from cities now
- As many stars as possible? There are maps of light pollution for areas of Ontario, we should aim to be as dark as possible on this map. We tried to view the Perseid meteor shower last summer by going to Guelph Lake, and even then the light pollution was an obstruction. The light of the city should not bleed into rural areas, as much as possible.
- I would like to see more stars, than just a couple of the brightest ones and two planets. A city that albeit safe, will feel more in tune with nature than always



having to compete against it. This change in direction needs to happen sooner than later in order to be able to not make the problem worse, over time. We do not have to end up like Toronto. One can find light pollution maps of Southern Ontario and I would prefer and aspire for Guelph, to be substantively darker than our nearby cities and more in touch with the nature that we have left. This would mean to not allow for light pollution via growth or urban sprawl to run amok. Another approach as well is to maintain open, green spaces where lights are minimal used. These dark hubs are inexpensive and great additions to our city. As long as crime in these places are not a problem, either.

- More stars!
- Kids in the city should be able to look up and see a dark sky with stars. Kids outside of the city in rural areas should be able to see a dark sky with stars, and not the orange glow of Guelph from miles away. The next generation doesn't just include kids, but migratory birds and other important local animal species whose life patterns depend on light days and dark nights - so success means they are protected from light pollution as well.

### **Safety (14)**

- Nothing different then now. If you reduce light, you will negatively affect how safe people feel in their neighbourhoods especially downtown.
- Safe neighbourhoods. Being able to walk the streets after sunset
- LIGHTS ARE NEEDED FOR SECURITY CAMERAS
- I'd like them to be able to feel safe in their own homes. Success is cleaning up this city to make it safe for the next generation.
- That's not realistic thinking. Do you think the crime wave will go down? I think not. Real planning requires real responsibility for the safety of its people
- I want them to feel safe.
- No crime
- We need lighting for safety.
- This is not as important as safety of people and property.
- I would like them to see the night sky for sure but I would also like them to feel safe. Our long term planning should emphasize leaving more greener spaces within the city that either offset the affects of excessive lighting or provide a space for residents to see and experience night sky within walking or cycling distance.
- Lights keep us safe



- A well lite sky where they don't have to worry about accidents because the couldn't see it coming, or becoming victims of crime.
- Less crime/ homelessness would be nice feeling safe to walk outside at night if you felt like it. Nice to see the sky as nature intended without the fear of being attacked in the dark because of a silly bylaw restricting sufficient outside lights to make it safe to be outside at night
- A primarily dark night sky with street and building lights that provide safe visibility without unnecessary light flooding.

### **Same as we see now (12)**

- The same thing we see. This isn't a problem.
- What they see today as I do not see any problems with light pollution in residential areas.
- No less than what we can see now.
- The night sky in Guelph is already quite clear and there is no dark sky issue.
- Perfect exactly how it is now.
- Exactly what they see now!
- What can be seen now
- This question does not make sense. they will see the sky like they do now.
- What success.? We have all ready succeeded . What we all see now and everyone else who has been seeing since creation. God's handy work.
- What we see now.
- Just exactly what we see now!
- What I see now

### **Less lights/glow (12)**

- The sky. Not spotlights coming from downtown, no excessive uplighting on buildings and trees, no orange glow to the night sky, and light only where it is needed for safety.
- I'd like to see less of an urban lit night sky. Perhaps the by-law / program doesn't need to be all encompassing - just something applied to new parking lots where the lighting is directed downwards (but then, what methods will be needed to prevent the light from then reflecting upwards).
- Less artificial light allowing them to watch the night sky
- Streetlights are on as needed, lights are pointing downwards with scones, parking lots have reduced or no lighting, future generations can look up and see more than Venus and the Moon.





- I will assume it won't be stars, but it would be nice to not be such a blight on the landscape and for neighbouring lights not to shine into my second storey windows.
- A big reduction in sky glow around the city and surrounding areas so it is possible to actually see a clear night sky.
- Less glow on otherwise clear nights. Industrial and commercial areas, especially parking, should be dark after 11 pm.
- I highly doubt we could ever reduce it to the point that you could see stars from within the city, but maybe at least get it to the point that the city doesn't glow as you approach it.
- A night sky devoid of excessive haze and extravagant glare - a better chance to observe the sky without barriers resulting from poor design and engineering.
- To me, success would be the elimination of all lights casting an upward glow. A bonus would be the elimination of lights shining into neighbouring properties.
- Let people sleep better and reduce the city light glow. Better for animals. Better for us
- Parking lots will be lit with low levels

### **Accountable/considerate community (5)**

- A city that cares and understands about the environment. light pollution affects wildlife, insects and pollinators that are vital to the health of the environment and the next generation.
- A community of individuals that took accountability as individuals and did not require policy to do the right thing.
- A community that acted on this environmental pollution and on respect for their neighbours.
- Success would be residents and business owners considering excessive light pollution without regulations.
- Neighbours who listen to, dialogue and care enough about others enough to take the easy steps.

### **Realistic expectations (4)**

- I would like them to see what they expect to see when 150,000+ future Guelph residents share a relatively small land space. Quite frankly, expecting a large population to have diminished night time lights is akin to going to a desolate area and saying it is too quiet.



- Clear night sky will be impossible in most of Guelph that isn't on the edge of Guelph but neighboring communities (arkell, Marden, aberfoyle) should not be impacted because of our light pollution.
- Night sky light pollution is unavoidable in a city. Even if everything was down-lit, there would still be reflection, especially in the winter (snow). It's not realistic to have a goal of "seeing all the stars" at night in the City.
- See the sky but realistic enough to understand that light in the city is for safety. You want to see the Milky Way, constellations, move to a rural area.

### **Natural light (2)**

- Natural light
- Natural or passive illumination.

### **Other**

- I have seen cities in other places (Arizona comes to mind) where bylaws have been set to limit light pollution. It made a remarkable difference, and I learned all about light pollution. It seems like an important endeavour.
- A family that can eat and sleep comfortably in a home they can comfortably afford.
- Less crime & homelessness when they look down.
- Not having to use black out blinds to keep parking lot light out of children bedrooms
- The only Guelphites staring into any sky will be upper class, rich folks, after the city forces out the middle and low class, which has already happened or is happening. The middle and low class will be working 2 or 3 jobs to survive and will be seeing no night sky.
- Success is not prioritizing drafting dark sky bylaw.
- Scam Guthrie and oh-so-privileged city and union employees dismissed from the city payroll.
- Scam and Rachel Guthrie and their NEPO babies out of city hall.
- No regulatory interference. If you live in a city you expect light from buildings and street lights.
- A healthy balance of adequate lighting to ensure visibility and safety, as well as allowing for aesthetic use of light, while also ensuring artificial lighting does not impact wildlife or the natural circadian rhythms of the people of Guelph.
- That we did everything in our power to save our diversity of wildlife. So, as dark a skyline as possible while still maintaining property and personal safety.



Our eyesight is very adequate in most instances in the dark. I go out every night to walk my dogs and the amount of light sources is too much.

- When my children look up to the sky from their home in a tent, they will dream of the day when we used to own a home and could afford the taxes. This clear sky project is going to cost tax payers. Stop spending tax payers money on projects like this. Start listening to the people who actually pay the taxes.
- A roof over their heads
- Specific criteria for success need to be an integral part of any light pollution proposal. They now seem totally absent, leaving me wondering what this is all about.
- Are you serious?
- Less street sighs
- Space ships coming to take liber bureaucrats and liberal politicians to another planet.
- Tell people it's a free country... And can do what they want....
- No homelessness encampments. No looters and riots from government protecting criminals. More government employees being prosecuted for theft and abuse of powers
- Give me a break, what about the debt for our children, the homeless the crime the housing shortage and you are worrying about seeing stars, get a real job!
- No!
- Honestly, this sounds nice, but I am more concerned with air pollution and all the littering and garbage.
- Keep it how it is
- They would be looking from a park that has low lights pointing down allowing them to use the park and they could look at the night sky.
- The lights in the city are expected to be on at night and it is unreasonable for the city to stop it.
- Success looks like spending tax dollars on something that matters. If you want to see the stars move to the country or STOP building houses!
- No pollution-light or otherwise!
- Success would be the city not focusing on anything but reducing taxes. This study and effort is a major make work /boondogle effort for people with nothing better to do.
- We have a cottage in Tobermory which prides itself on being a dark sky community. Granted it is a smaller community, but the impact is enormous. The wildlife move around more easily. And we discover that the sky is, in fact,



not dark, but bright with a million visible galaxies. Kids would also be proud to belong to a city that has done something to protect birds and wildlife.

- If you want to live in a city then lights are mandatory at night. They provide protection. One of the services the city provides is protection from crime. As mentioned it would be intent to cause harm should the city follow through will any light restrictions.
- That life is beautiful; An opportunity to explore
- Change the color of street lights similar to Hawaii for star viewing. Limit light trespass so people can control the level of light on their own property and through their windows, reducing nuisance lighting through windows.
- Thanking the lord that they are alive and have resources to live from and not wasted on non-issues like this
- As people get use to more or less lights at night, they become the norm. I'd like people to remember how beautiful the sky is when you walk outside your home at night.
- Yes
- Unless you eliminate or turn off all lights you will not get a clear sky view in a city. For that we need to go out to nature, outside the city.
- above certain levels, dark skies, and less light pollution that extends far beyond the city into the areas surrounding Guelph.
- Minimal government intervention
- This question is biased
- No spotlights
- Success has already been achieved, perhaps if it becomes a much much larger issue it can be addressed further. I would rather like the the next generation to not know poverty and to not see friends and family living in the streets. I realize that light pollution causes some living issues and environmental impact, however, with limited taxation funding, the dollars, time and attention could be better spent in other areas of concern. Fix them first and come back to light issues. You have lots on your plate, please prioritize basic levels of living first.
- They choose to live in a city???
- My concern for the next generation is to be able to find a job after attending a secondary institution, whereby they will be able to feed, clothe and house themselves affordably. A clear night sky is not my concern when families cannot pay their bills. The cost of living is more important to me right now.
- Reflection of a safe, illuminated city that balances its socioeconomic needs.



- I would like them to see a huge middle finger pointing at city of Guelph staff and 90% of the city's councillor's.
- Nothing needs to be changed.
- Honestly I don't mind light... but I don't want it coming in on me when unwanted and disturbing my own personal pleasure.
- Houses will not have unnecessary lighting under the soffit around the outside of the whole house
- ???
- Does lighting all of a sudden stop you from seeing the sky ?
- There does not need to be a by law for light pollution
- It's too late to see the sky
- They need to look ahead not up.
- If you want a dark sky then go to the countryside for a night visit or move to Arizona where I have been to an actual dark sky park.
- No
- I think this is a naïve question. Light is primarily for safety and security. Companies aren't going to build/maintain/power industrial lighting if it wasn't needed. As the City grows so too will its light emissions. Success to me is that residential users have a bylaw to protect them from a company or individual shining a light directly into their property.
- We've already changed out the street lights in Guelph to reduce light pollution and energy use. Beyond this, I don't think light pollution is a rampant problem.
- I don't think there's a problem with the way it is now. I enjoy seeing downtown city buildings lit up with different colours. Holiday lights and displays bring life to the community and overall I don't think of Guelph as having an excess of light compared to other cities. If I want to go star-gazing or be in full darkness, it's just a short drive to Guelph Lake or a spot just outside the city limits, which I don't feel is unreasonable, and have done multiple times as an adventure with my son. But if I wanted to live in darkness I would move to the country. A city needs lights. I think it's reasonable maintaining that we don't have bright interactive billboards, or businesses with excessive flashing/strobe type lighting.
- This question should be removed from the survey as any answer would indicate approval of a bylaw.
- This is an inappropriately engineered question to solicit a desired response. Guelph is not a remote/rural area



- Unless they can get their eyes off their phones, they won't know what they're looking at. There are a number of things being overlooked. You're overlooking the amount of cloud cover in this area due to our proximity to three of the great lakes. Also overlooking location and proximity within the city to tree cover, street lights and man made structures.
- As far as I'm concerned, if a person wants to see a clear, starry sky..... Move to the country. Last I'd checked, this is a CITY.
- City lights because they chose to live there
- Advertising
- I live near Riverside park I have no problems seeing the stars and when I was a child I looked forward to taking a drive out to the country to see the stars even better that's called memories
- I haven't seen a clear night sky in quite some time due to the chem trails! Stopping chem trails should be the priority right now not light pollution.
- Huh? This question makes it clear you have your mind made up and regulation is coming.

## **Please share any other comments or thoughts you have around what we should do to address light pollution in Guelph.**

### **Not an issue/priority (70)**

- This initiative might be considered frivolous as the city has other more critical priorities as we are being expected to agree to 2024-2025-2026-2027 tax increases beyond reasonable.
- The city ought to leave the matter of light and the made up idea of "light pollution" alone. Soon enough we will not have enough electricity to run excessive lighting anyways.
- I do not believe the City should be involved in this proposal.
- Why is the city addressing this issue? Response requested.  
Bob.armstrong1@gmail.com
- I think it's a non issue. Leave it alone.
- Leave it alone. there will always be some light pollution from a populated city. If you want less light you have to drive out to the country. We are taxed to much and because of the wasted money and resources already going on in the city we don't need anymore. Enough is enough!
- Based on the numerous issues this city is currently facing (property tax hikes, homelessness, addiction, affordable housing solutions for families, etc.), this



discussion is an absolute waste of time. Our resources need to be priority focussed. Let's get the tents out of downtown, enable tourism in our once beautiful city, and then we can discuss the night sky.

- The biggest problem I have right now is the timing, our taxes have gone way up, housing, wasting money on new rec center and a downtown Library... Our taxes are sky high and right now this light thing is NOT a high priority. People are losing their homes over high interest rates & taxes. Guelph is way over top to other cities in our area. This is NOT a thing we need as a taxpayer to pay for right now. Housing for the homeless is really at a standstill... they need mental health programs for people... timing is very bad for this to worry about now. Lower interest, lower taxes and lower mortgage rates... first things first...
- I feel like this is a real waste of city time and tax payer dollars. Time and money is better spent on proper city planning and projects planning. Not creating stupid bylaws, like this one.
- I think we have other major problems to deal with in this city, and this would not be a priority for me. More rules and regulations about this seems like your creating another problem
- There aren't any problems... Leave people alone.
- Leave it alone
- Leave this alone. I'm sorry - I know people have put time and effort into presenting this project - but there are so many more pressing concerns in our city. This feels like meddling. There are already regulations meant to protect residents if lighting from adjacent properties becomes invasive. It's enough.
- If you go ahead with it, don't use more than \$20,000 to create the by-law. This is not a high-profile issue, and I don't want staff and council spending a lot of time on it. Time is better spent figuring out how to reduce City expenses.
- There are bigger, more important issues in this City than a "Dark Sky By-law" and regulating "light pollution". Absolutely asinine.
- Please do not spend money on this.
- This is totally a waste of taxpayer money. Stop this!
- The City has much higher priorities to deal with. Please do not waste my money on this survey/study
- Does city staff really have nothing better to do?
- Nothing. The only pollution is the fact someone got paid with my tax dollars to make this survey. Walk downtown at night and tell me if you need lights
- Unbelievable. This is completely unnecessary.





- no one cares.
- This is ridiculous
- Guelph wastes too much money on tidy things like this.
- Surely we have more pressing matters to contend with rather than the elevation of a light pollution focus. People should be able to live their lives without the threat of overarching and intrusive regulations bylaws and how much light is legal.
- I don't consider light as being pollution. So let the light shine.
- I don't think there's a problem with the way it is now. I enjoy seeing downtown city buildings lit up with different colours. Holiday lights and displays bring life to the community and overall I don't think of Guelph as having an excess of light compared to other cities. If I want to go star-gazing or be in full darkness, it's just a short drive to Guelph Lake or a spot just outside the city limits, which I don't feel is unreasonable, and have done multiple times as an adventure with my son. But if I wanted to live in darkness I would move to the country. A city needs lights.
- The city has far more important things to worry about. This is just one more thing to waste money on.
- I think there are a lot more important issues than lighting in our city. If one wants to look at the stars they can drive out of town 10 minutes to the country
- Stop spending our money on frivolous things
- I do appreciate the concern, but please again focus on the issues where a basic level of living is granted for people in our community.
- Really? Light pollution? I can't believe this is an actual issue. My tax dollars are wasted again.
- Drop this
- Leave it alone
- It seems to me that this is a waste of tax payers dollars. The pollution created by the wearing of paper, disposable masks during the pandemic was horrific for the environment. I think lighting is necessary to promote safety in the community, much like we thought the masks were doing.
- At this time it is not a significant issue. Citizens can address their light issues by investing in themselves accordingly. This should not be a public policy issue as most built environments are built to the OBC
- I honestly don't think it's a problem. I think with the rise in crime in Guelph we are going to see more lighting on houses whether they are on all night or motion activated. I think money spent in this area could be put to better use.



- What a colossal waste of resources the city has spent on this survey. No fucking wonder we're looking at 36% property tax increase in the next 5 years. Shameful these guys gave themselves a huge raise for the worst job done in the history of the city.
- I am a personal safety expert. Lighting is critical for safety to all residents. This has no value. Move on to more important issues.
- Not a concern. Stop wasting tax payers money on the subject.
- You should do NOTHING!!!!
- Mind your business and stop wasting tax payer money!!!
- Seriously, worry about real issues and quit throwing our money towards crap like this survey.
- Nothing. Stop trying to regulate us to death.
- Stop wasting tax payers dollars!
- This entire thing is a waste of tax payer money
- There does not need to be a by law for light pollution in Guelph.
- Please just stop, this is wasteful. The last thing this city needs is MORE bylaws and regulations.
- Stop wasting our money on left wing pet projects.
- Don't address it. We have bigger priorities as a city, especially homelessness and affordable housing, crumbling roads, crime, need for a second hospital, etc. . Wasting more money on research, policy development and as usual hiring some outside company to do that is ridiculous and a misuse of community money. If you have that kind of mob to waste then make a policy to redirect those funds to community essentials first.
- The city does not need to do anything to address light pollution in the city.
- I do not believe Light pollution is a problem. Seems like another dumb idea to make the masses comply and lose more freedom of choice
- The city's time should be better spent rather than adding yet another useless bylaw.
- This is a waste of resources pursuing an objective that is both low in priority and impossible to achieve. I know of no true Dark sky cities, it is an oxymoron.
- Nothing go help the homeless!
- Stop wasting tax payers money on stupid shit like this
- There going to do it .That's what they do here ...waste money
- Do nothing. Nice idea. Completely unattainable.
- Do nothing. This is a City, a City that gets larger and more populated with each passing year. Guelph tries to be the City that starts trends. Other Cities do not do this. This is from the same minds that wanted a 'pedestrian only'



downtown. Another unrealistic idea if you ask me. Read the comments on Facebook regarding this issue. 99.9% of the people agree with me. One of the dumbest ideas this City Council has concocted. With the abundance of crime in this city, you want to limit lighting to give them carte blanche to commit these crimes with a reduced risk of being seen. Yeah,,,,, THAT will work. Give it up.

- Nothing. This is a waste of time and money.
- This is a really stupid idea and honestly a waste of our money.
- This is utterly ridiculous. The housing crisis and homeless numbers are increasing daily, there are families with children and working parents that can't afford a roof over their heads. Have you tried getting a parking spot at Guelph Hospital recently? I was there on Tuesday and circled the parking lot for an hour without luck trying to visit my father who was having critical heart trouble. I ended up having to leave and come back later! It's insane to me that we are building a massive new incredibly expensive library, when we have several perfectly good satellite libraries already. It's an absolutely colossal waste of resources. I just don't get it... leadership in this city has its priorities out of whack. So incredibly disappointing
- I honestly think this is a waste of time and I can't believe this is even being considered. The taxpayers of Guelph expect more from the powers-that-be than putting this much time and effort into something so ridiculous. The City of Guelph should focus on things that taxpayers actually care about.
- This isn't a big problem right now, just do what you can to make sure moving forward it doesn't become an issue. Focus on real issues like cost of living, out of control taxes, housing, air pollution, and littering.
- Soooo ridiculous to be even addressing light pollution when families are struggling. Not a dime should be spent on this.
- Do not prioritize drafting a dark sky bylaw.
- Instead of finding ways to reduce property tax hikes, you are assessing light pollution. Please do get your priorities straightened out.
- although I feel it would be lovely to have a 'closer' to dark sky, we have so many more pressing issues to deal with at this time in the City of Guelph. The cost would be crazy high to enforce.
- Try not to waste too much time on this.
- Nothing. Build affordable housing NOW, double the monthly Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program benefits so people can eat, sleep and find a job.



### **Awareness/education (30)**

- Creating awareness of the impact of casting light upwards and sharing information on how this can be mitigated.
- Highlight images of Guelph skies at night when it's dark. Show residents that this is feasible
- I have no blanket solutions. Education and supporting by-laws would be a step in the right direction.
- Light reduction is in the best interest of all mankind as well as wildlife, for our planet's existence. Public education is vital.
- Can we help educators with dark sky resources?
- Education is a good place to start
- Need to persuade people that this effort and change is worth it for so many reasons. Part of changing the planet for the better while reducing the harm of human activities.
- Education!! Get people in to schools to educate young people who will educate their parents and grandparents
- I would be very happy to see education around the need for dark skies and enforced bylaws.
- Education around overlighting our gardens, yards and houses. thanks.
- Education. Let's talk about the use of security lights on residential properties for example. Is there no limit on how bright these lights can be? And directed at a level? Similarly, while understandable that people want to decorate their homes with lights in the holiday season, it has gotten way out of control due to the fact that LED lights are extremely cheap and energy efficient . Some people have decided to just put up as many as they can, without any consideration of impact the light has on the environment .
- Education should be key - instead of forcing people to do something and then they are mad about it - educate them on why they should turn off outside lights at night.
- Education for the public about why this is important- for birds/night sky/etc
- Education, awareness and optional signs to engage the residents. By-laws to restrict may be too excessive.
- Education.
- address naysayers to the proposition; explain the importance and why it is important for quality of life standards for both human/natural communities
- More community outreach and information material for the citizen of Guelph.
- There should be a strong educational component, because it appears that many people do not appreciate the need for a reduction in light pollution.



- Create awareness campaigns that encourage good practices around light pollution.
- If you publish some of the negative effects of light pollution on human health, you might get more buy in.
- Education around exterior lighting and how to reduce, and choice of temperature of light
- Improve awareness.
- More education about the issue that inspires rather than regulates change.
- Public promotion of the benefits of this initiative.
- We have a property on the Bruce Peninsula where they have a dark sky program. most homes don't really know about it so constant promotion is critical. People should be told about the stars and birds and bats. They won't care about the birds and bats, but maybe the stars
- Education is key. I suspect there are residents who don't understand why this survey is being conducted.
- Education is always helpful around issues such as this. It might be harder to make changes to existing residential areas, but an education campaign might get some people to change their habits without needing strict bylaws.
- Just wanted to share that light pollution can be really harmful to insects and animals and advertising this would be helpful.
- Education around why it is important, what the benefits are to individuals and the community, how it can be easily implemented, where it is most needed.
- I think it's important, but rolling it out will have to be careful, as there is little public appetite for more "rules"/restrictions, especially with "bigger" issues. (As not everyone realizes that this actually is an increasingly big issue). Show people maps of light pollution levels and how Guelph is now one of the "bright white/grey" or "darker red" (depending on the app) areas of light pollution, becoming as bad as many other urban centres - and give examples of how that has changed over time.

### **Gratitude/support (28)**

- Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts.
- Thank you for addressing this. As our city grows, it is an important issue, however, one only clear regulations or bylaw can address. In my professional experience, guidelines do not work :)
- Thanks
- Thank you for thinking for the next generation.



- I think that this is a good start. Please don't give up. Ensure that everyone knows that this is a benefit and not an inconvenience. We humans need to be kinder to the rest of life on our planet. Thank you!
- I am happy that City of Guelph is considering implementing bylaws around Light in the skies!
- Thank you for consulting the public. It is more democratic and I am very happy about these types of consultations.
- Thank you for this amazing idea. I hope its successful!
- I am glad the City is being pursuing mitigations to light pollution!
- I wish I had more ideas. Thanks for this initiative.
- This is an important initiative and novel for the municipality and also difficult to bring the community along to see the importance... bravo for the initiative.
- Thank you for asking Guelphites our opinion.
- Please proceed on this. It is a valuable initiative, aimed at improving quality of life for all (as is the fundamental purpose and goal of government - in case anyone has forgotten.....).
- I think this is a much needed initiative.
- Thank you for bringing such an important issue up! The sky belongs to all of us, and we should all be actively working towards preserving that access for future generations in a safe and sustainable way. With that in mind, I think it's crucial to make sure the voices of First Nations, Inuit and Métis residents of Guelph and its surroundings are included in this process and taken extremely seriously. As a settler, I would love to see an initiative from the city of Guelph to actively reach out to our Indigenous neighbors and include ancestral dark sky traditions of the people whose land Guelph is on in the process.
- Kudos for taking this on. I wholeheartedly support the initiative!
- I think this is a really interesting initiative; I would like to see this come to fruition
- I would like to be more involved, it is a very interesting topic. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of any assistance. [carleenpaterson@yahoo.com](mailto:carleenpaterson@yahoo.com) / 226-979-4423. Thank you for providing the survey.
- Thank you for addressing light pollution! I have trouble sleeping because of my neighbour's security light shining in my window.
- thank you for doing this - light technology is amazing when used well.
- I think this is a great idea. Thank you for keeping our city beautiful
- Thank you for taking this initiative. I have thought about light pollution for years and saw the obvious impact of it years ago while on a friend's farm near Peterborough where I could see a huge area lit up by a new car sales/car



dealership lot. I could see from kilometers away the totally unnecessary upward glow of the bright lights presumably protecting the lot from nocturnal birds and bats or lighting it so astronauts could see their cars. I've seen similar lights at sports fields. I understand the need for lighting but not for lighting areas where there is no need and/or that is disruptive or detrimental to the environment.

- PLEASE take up this Initiative. It is important to the physical and emotional health of our population.
- thanks for raising this concern light pollution is a big concern for us today.
- I really hope something can be done for both the environment and human comfort.
- A calmer, quieter, healthier city comes when we can mimic the natural day and night cycle. Let's support life, diversity and calm and reduce light pollution.
- Glad that you are doing this!
- Commend the City for at least considering this proposal.

### **Safety (22)**

- There is no light pollution. We need lights to see while we drive, walk, play and appreciate each other. Lights provide safety from criminals and from people who want to steal personal property. Controlling light darkens everything and is not safe for the community. As people get older, their night vision is reduced and without light it is very difficult for the elderly to get around.
- I am a personal safety expert. Lighting is critical for safety to all residents. This has no value. Move on to more important issues.
- I think this is a waste of tax payers dollars. A darker city will be more susceptible to crime
- LIGHTING IS A SAFETY ISSUE. DON'T GET CARRIED AWAY.
- Find a balance between security, being safe, and helping nature and enjoying the night sky. Maybe be it's not this or that type of choice, but this for a short season then another thing for a short season.
- A common misconception is that a site must be well lit at night to avoid potential criminal activities. There are ways to properly design a site that addresses this concern/misconception. The technology and equipment is available now and has been for some time.
- Safety, particularly in public spaces, should be paramount. Adequate lighting on campuses, in parking lots, etc., is essential. However, lighting in residential





areas is increasingly becoming a concern, particularly with fluorescent lighting.

- There has been a rise in crime, especially at night in the city. Appropriate lighting can be a significant deterrent, and encourage people to be out more in the darker hours (especially in winter). The downtown parkade is a prime example - many people avoid it (especially women) because it is dark and feels unsafe.
- Furthermore, cyclists and pedestrians are at more risk when there is not adequate lighting, as they are not easily seen by motorists.
- Light is for safety.
- Expect backlash to this. Lots of people are afraid of the dark and will be afraid of an increase in crime. Find if there is any correlation between dark sky cities and crime increase, so the City is ready to persuade people it's okay.
- Please have more information communicated to city residents. If I wasn't on Facebook groups, I would not have known about this new initiative.
- Ensure does not restrict pedestrian level lighting to keep people safe when walking at night
- Should address the crime in the city
- Be careful. There are not enough police to take care of the city as is, and if you drop it into darkness, it will be very dangerous.
- Safety is the a concern in Guelph and as such I believe less lighting would not deter this and would only make things worse. There are far more concerning issues for the city to address than light pollution.
- Lights keep us safe
- Limit the strength of a light or how far past a property limit a light can go. But every business and home owner has a right to feel safe and seen.
- A common complaint against reducing lighting is safety, but there have been many studies indicating that the relationship is not that simple. Any guidance will need to clearly address this.
- Safety and security are priority
- light pollution stops criminals from stealing it's easier to get caught be dash cams and house security systems. I think some lights are very bright on houses maybe reduce how bright instead of eliminating
- Lights that are meant for safety should not be considered pollution. If my property is at risk due the constant break ins, and I feel safer leaving a light on overnight for my kids working late shifts, then that's my prerogative and not the city's business. Lights that interfere in another's property, for advertising, or not needed for safety should have bylaws.





### **Timers/sensors (14)**

- Maybe have lights with timers and sensors so the light comes on when it is needed? Some kind of sensor network with wifi or something so they turn on 30-40 feet in front of a car, dog walker or prowling raccoon.
- Stadiums and fields should not be lit after midnight.
- Parking lots should only have lighting while in active use.
- I would also like to see indoor lights, with uncovered windows, from businesses and institutions turned off at night.
- When shops close for the day turn off lights indicating the business titles.
- parking lot and industrial lighting can be motion sensor. low level until there is motion.
- I would like to see the issue of excessive outdoor lights on residential homes addressed. Some individuals have an extraordinary number of lights that are frequently left on for extremely long periods of time. These lights appear to be for aesthetic purposes only and serve no specific function. Undoubtedly, they interfere significantly with patterns of birds, insects and other animals.
- Instead of fully on/off guidelines, maybe limit the lumen count total per building after certain hours, ideally not more restrictive than 11pm to 6am. This could be a reasonable balance to reduce pollution but not sacrifice safety/security.
- Maybe a timer for industrial or retail business but would then need security to monitor properties?...
- please please please do something about the automall.
- Large industrial buildings being built( along Hanlon pkwy) lights off at 8pm. Low lighting on 'new roadways ' and parking lots off. Lights OFF inside those in progress buildings. Existing businesses only have lights on inside where people are- for example shift workers or cleaning staff. Lights off when they leave with only 'emergency' low lights in halls /stairs
- Definitely no lights on after hours for businesses. No lighted signs. Only necessary safety lights (perhaps on a motion detector).
- Motion sensing street lights.
- Time limits when residential backyard/patio/pool lighting must be turned off.

### **Direction (12)**

- A bylaw that prevents lights from shining into mainly residential buildings disturbing owners.
- Flashing lights and search light type restrictions in place



- I just wish you luck and that the apartment building beside me has to change the lighting above the doors so that they do not shine into the night sky and into my 6th story bedroom window.
- I particularly want to see the City stop the business owner downtown who repeatedly uses a rotating spotlight pointed at the sky outside their businesses even though they have been told repeatedly about the concerns.
- Directly deal with the spotlights being used downtown.
- Lamp posts often cast light toward building. City lampposts should direct light downward as much as possible.
- Everyone has to buy into the idea. The correct directing of light is the goal. This should also allow the intensity to be reduced. Bigger and brighter isn't what is needed. Sell the idea of economy for electric bills and the good to the environment and nature.
- Point all street lights down.
- No spotlights for marketing purposes
- Lighting is an important safety issue and light should be focused downward to provide that. Radiant light should be restricted so that building interiors remain private. Technology today can walk that fine line
- The direction of the light beam of EVERY street light should be pointed at the street and NOT include toward properties and buildings. If the light beam cannot be restricted to the street, then a blinder/shade of some sort needs to be added around the fixture.
- Focus first on worst offenders (e.g. Cowboy's spot light, upward facing facade lighting and poorly designed parking lot lighting).

### **Wildlife (11)**

- Please take it seriously and work on it so as to avoid any more loss of the wild life who fly at night.
- I will be writing to my counsellor soon about another bylaw to protect wildlife...a Bylaw to keep cats INDOORS. KW has a Bylaw. Guelph needs to do the same. Could Guelph set an example and start educating by protecting birds from window strikes by immediately lowering lights in buildings and covering windows with protective decals?
- Just wanted to share that light pollution can be really harmful to insects and animals and advertising this would be helpful.
- Intra-urban biodiversity comes into play here. Example: Grand River Raceway Elora, lighting upgrades significantly reduced caddisfly, stonefly and



lepidoptera populations in the adjacent Wilson's Flats trout fishing area on the Grand River. sorry nothing published, general fishers knowledge.

- Also, you didn't mention the effect on animals, especially birds. Even if you don't care about seeing the night sky, the positive effect that regulation of stray light would have on wildlife makes it worthwhile.
- For me the biggest concern with light pollution is the animals that are nocturnal. The light pollution can affect their ability to hunt, migrate, etc so ultimately their survival. Limiting flood lights people have on trees (a beautiful, but completely unnecessary and harmful light) would be the biggest thing I would hope to discourage/remove.
- I've cared about this subject for years, and only accidentally stumbled upon this survey. I would like to emphasize that I don't feel this is a small potatoes issue. Of course, I selfishly want our stars back, but in a world that's increasingly less hospitable to our animal friends, light pollution is no joke. Our wildlife need all the help it can get, and tackling light pollution is one way to do that.
- Addressing this issue is good for native ecosystems and migratory birds, good to combat climate change, good for mental health of the humans who live and work in our city, and fosters a connection and caring for our planet and the natural world.
- Measures to prevent birds from flying into windows.
- We should ensure the light pollution does not harm wild life.
- This bylaw should be intended to address the impact of light pollution on natural ecosystems and living things, and not to address any real or imagined impact between neighbouring houses, businesses, or other human structures. If at all, a "good neighbour" light bylaw could be addressed at another time - this effort should focus on the damage light pollution does to the natural world.

### **Colour/brightness (11)**

- If an area can be lit by red/orange light, please do it. Anything "cooler" messes with our circadian rhythms.
- Make all street lighting in the warm 2300K colour range.
- Many LED lights being sold today are much too bright. My neighbor has an extremely bright motion sensor light they have on a time that illuminates my entire backyard all night long that I don't appreciate. It shows everything in my back yard to thieves and I also don't want the light for my own enjoyment of the night sky.
- Limit lumens to reduce brightness.



- You know the headlights that new cars have? The ones that look like high beams? PLEASE do not allow these lights to be ANYWHERE. (Well, except for on those cars. Ha.)
- If there is any advocacy around ceasing the new style of car headlights that are blinding, this would be amazing too
- I think it's reasonable maintaining that we don't have bright interactive billboards, or businesses with excessive flashing/strobe type lighting.
- really pay attention to street lighting. reduce it as much as possible. cars have lights. they can see other cars. focus lighting on sidewalks, intersections and crosswalk areas of intersections. focus lighting on pedestrian safety.
- Limit the strength of a light or how far past a property limit a light can go. But every business and home owner has a right to feel safe and seen.
- The lit up outdoor signage with changing displays and very bright illumination is a problem that is increasing in magnitude. it is very distracting, adds to light pollution and is totally unnecessary.
- Try to stop the trend of excessive residential soffit lighting that is becoming popular. These homes are lit up like the space shuttle launch pad.

### **New construction (9)**

- Focus on new construction only.
- Less expansion of residential, more businesses built in North end of city or in Northern Ontario for new comers.
- Essential to regulate all new construction and renovation to exiting that involve a permit.
- Consult with new Dev
- Also, when it comes to construction budgets, lighting equipment is often one of the first items identified as a cost savings measure. Initial design is often sacrificed due to unexpected costs that arise elsewhere during the construction process. An emphasis should be placed on providing a larger contingency for construction budgets, or, looking elsewhere for cost savings measures. Not only does proper lighting lead to a healthy outdoor environment, a poorly designed interior lighted environment can heavily contribute to a unhealthy building for it's occupants.
- There should be nothing more than suggested guidelines with new builds. Anything above that will come at long term cost that will impact the City's budget. Laws create challenges, and those challenges fill the system with unnecessary efforts and cost. Until we get our arms around the excessive spending on bending over for everyone's wishes, then we can focus on issues



like this. There is an urgent need to put horse power within the City to get cost out of the system.

- Design Guidelines for site development will help for anything subject to development approvals, but existing commercial/industrial conditions, public infrastructure and low density residential will still contribute until life cycle changes are made and the shielding requirements through a bylaw will help
- This type of dark-sky initiative is something that a progressive, environmentally-conscious, and livable City like Guelph should be doing. The longer an initiative like this takes to be enacted, the more poorly-design lighting is implemented and the harder it is to retroactively change it. If nothing else, the coming wave of needed new development - driven by the City, province and federal government - should be responding to new standards. Our City should showcase better ways forward and the dark sky initiative is one easy way to do this.
- Easiest to mandate for new construction first, then phase in for existing buildings. Ensuring that there is still room for some accent lighting for private residences, business and public use.

### **Roadways/streetlights (9)**

- Look at roadways, like roundabouts, the Hanlin Expressway- do these need to be as lit as they are? Thanks for asking!
- Talk to Alectra and get them to switch street lighting
- As I mention in other sections, the 'newer' LED street lights that are installed in Guelph are terrible and contribute to a high amount of light trespass - the shades are poorly designed and should only focus on the roads and sidewalks, not shining sideways into people's properties.
- If it could be done, maybe reduce be the number of street lights.
- Remove maybe 1/3 of the street lights. We have far to many traffic lights, remove some and replace with Stop signs.
- Switch of the street lights during the night as thousands of communities do all over Europe, see examples and details e.g.  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/patendernacht/> . Join the next Earth Night, September 6th 2024. You can report your participation:  
<https://www.earth-night.info/report-participant/> You can also order flyers which inform about light pollution and solutions: <https://www.paten-der-nacht.de/flyer-lichtverschmutzung/#flyer-bestellen> English version sample: <https://www.paten-der-nacht.de/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Flyer-Lichtverschmutzung-Englisch-Paten-der-Nacht-MUSTER-2024.pdf> You can



also let print the logo/emblem of the City of Guelph onto the back side of the flyer.

- I like the idea of switching street lights to more energy efficient and less yellow more blue light which could potentially minimize the light as a lure for insects/distraction of bird flight paths etc.
- I could be wrong, but it appears the biggest light polluter in Guelph (and cities) are street lights. If you wish the residents and businesses to reduce lighting, it would be helpful to see the City take the first step.
- street lights and exterior house lights shine into my windows at night. annoying

### **Industrial, commercial, business (8)**

- Costco is a big polluter of light (and sound). Big box outlets need to address light pollution in parking lots, loading docks, building illumination
- Strongly encourage businesses to cut their night-time light use in half. Show them the savings. Actually, that's a good way to get people on board - show them the money they can save. (Because not everyone cares about wildlife or human circadian rhythms. Heathens!)
- Focus on the biggest issues first. For me that is industrial areas with excessive lighting in parking lots and some buildings. Lights that are very bright and not well shaded.
- Enforce harsher restrictions on commercial/industrial properties, especially unused or under-utilized parking lots.
- Eh. Bright indoor lights at a South end Shoppers Drug Mart reflection in residential windows all night long.. Facing Farley Drive.
- I particularly want to see the City stop the business owner downtown who repeatedly uses a rotating spotlight pointed at the sky outside their businesses even though they have been told repeatedly about the concerns.
- The car dealerships on Woodlawn light up the sky when coming in to Guelph. I understand this may be for security but they play a large part in light pollution. Instead, could they be asked to have motion sensor lights after hours instead of being lit up like an arena.
- I think it's reasonable maintaining that we don't have bright interactive billboards, or businesses with excessive flashing/strobe type lighting.

### **Enforce bylaws (7)**

- Enforce light pollution bylaws. Stop these high rise condo and apartment builders from flooding the countryside with light pollution!



- please enforce light pollution bylaws. stop the high rise condo/apartment builders from flooding the countryside of light pollution
- Encode bylaws and have them enforceable.
- Big fines and enforcement!!!
- Give them a warning and if no coop should be fined
- Appropriate level of bylaws and guidelines starting with city lights as an example of what should be done.
- Enforcement will be important. Measurable standards will be required to enable such enforcement."

### **Guidelines (6)**

- When I first researched this 6 years ago I was surprised to see that Guelph/Eramosa had guidelines and the City of Guelph did not. This is long overdue as the number of super bright lights downtown continues to grow constantly. Recently a family member in Guelph/Eramosa had new lights put up by a nearby builder and they were way too bright. You could be blinded by them as soon as you turned on the street from almost 1/2 km away. Fortunately a complaint had it adjusted within a couple of weeks. This is what should be happening. These bright lights are a menace to everything from plants and animals to safety in the areas just outside the brightness. I hope to see some form of regulation soon.
- Consider guidelines or bylaws for multi-story administrative buildings and office spaces to encourage or require office lights to be turned off after work hours.
- I have involved myself recently on this. Having worked in Toronto one only has to see that to understand a fully run away condition of light pollution, waste of resources etc. Guelph needs a framework in place for all future projects as well as to temper (regulate) what some residents believe is necessary, to others how offensive it is in residential areas.
- This should have been addressed a long time ago. I'm happy this is being looked at now.
- Create guidelines and best practices
- I have three adult children (and their spouses) and five (soon six) grandchildren who all live within the City of Guelph. I have worked at the U of G for decades. I am lucky enough to live ten minutes outside Guelph on a dark country road with no near neighbours. My family gather there to see a true night sky, check out the stars, and, now and then, get a look at the





Northern Lights - none of which are on view within the City of Guelph. I would love to see at least guidelines put out by the City.

### **Energy conservation/costs (5)**

- Hydro waste. Unused, empty room or areas do not need to be lit up. Lighting can be a huge personal safety factor. Some areas are entered illegally, lighting can save property damage etc. I have found that unless you make people pay they won't change. Also those who can afford to pay won't change either unless they see a benefit to themselves.
- Politicians and bureaucrats should be focused on how to reduce power bills and block the use of windmills and solar panels.
- To reduce waste (discarding of perfectly functional equipment), consider implementing for new upgrades/replacements only on existing buildings. Also tie to energy efficiency requirements for retrofits - LED or more efficient options only, and consider mandating colour temperature ranges, and explicitly disallow upward facing lights.
- This initiative if done right would also significantly reduce electrical load of commercial indoor and all outdoor lighting across the city.
- Light pollution is highly subjective. Not wasting energy (cost) where there is no known risk to public safety is just the right thing to do.

### **Downtown (5)**

- There's a certain irony to the city undertaking a study of a dark sky bylaw at the same time as promoting the carnival lighting of downtown buildings with colour changing LEDs. Not only do these rainbow effect lights look ridiculous on our beautiful stone heritage buildings, many of them are beaming light directly up into the air all night long. If we're going to have a dark sky bylaw, which I am 100% in favour of, the City needs to be consistent in its priorities and stop encouraging this needless illumination.
- That stupid colourful lights initiative downtown just adds to our light pollution output and is generally tacky. Model positive behaviours, not negative ones!
- We do NOT need to be using coloured lights downtown to "showcase" beautiful buildings. We already know they are beautiful! Let's be putting that money and effort elsewhere, like solving housing affordability.
- I particularly want to see the City stop the business owner downtown who repeatedly uses a rotating spotlight pointed at the sky outside their businesses even though they have been told repeatedly about the concerns.
- Directly deal with the spotlights being used downtown.





### **Incentives (4)**

- Offer funding to help businesses and residents change over.
- Perhaps a rebate program, like the low flow toilets, where people receive a rebate for every outdoor light they replace with one that meets the new parameters.
- Provide rebates for those who need to replace lights.
- Perhaps some initiatives for folks to change to night sky friendly outdoor lighting.

### **Bureaucracy (4)**

- The bureaucracy in Guelph, and the resulting tax load, is getting out of hand. We should put a pause on anything, like new bylaws of doubtful merit, that will put more of a load on the by-law workers and eventually lead to having to add more staff to the by-law department.
- AS already mentioned light restrictions in a city that already has crime issues with be intent to cause harm by the City. It would also be intent to cause harm towards each resident as it pertains to their individual property. Political agendas and advocacy do not belong in by-laws. A public servant is not to determine what one should or should not believe. They are also not here to instil personal thoughts and beliefs into by-laws which infringe on property. It's time the city focuses on what it is here to do and that is to provide exceptional city services.
- We need less bureaucracy not more. This potential bylaw should be squashed now and save the expenditure of installing unneeded legislation.
- How much effort, time, resources are wasted on this very minor issue. It's shameful

### **Leader/set example (3)**

- Perhaps start with leading the way with City lighting (streets, parking lots, buildings, etc.). Change all the lights to amber/yellow and turn off office lights at night (unless they're being used). Inform the public via brochures about the benefits of darker skies in the City. Hold info sessions - for adults and for kids. Publish Guelph's Bortle Scale measurements. Then a by-law for parking lots, industrial sights, apartment buildings (outdoor lights), and public buildings... only amber/yellow lighting allowed. No portable lit signs at night. For public buildings: turn off inside lights at night (unless the room is being used). Only yellow/amber lights outdoors. Talk to the University about changing all outdoor lights to amber/yellow and to turn off indoor lights when the room is



not in use. Make it a project for schoolkids (and adults) to see what they can do to make the sky more visible by using less light at home at night. Do you really need the light you're using? How much light do you need? When exactly do you need it? Can it be yellow/amber (which is also safer - bright white/blue LED lights create a tunnel effect where it's very bright in one spot, then very dark between those spots. The old incandescent lights cast an amber glow over the entire area. And if you're in the middle of a bright white LED tunnel of light, your eyes have a harder time adjusting to see what's outside of that tunnel - beyond the "edge of light.") I know you can't/won't go back to incandescent but at least use amber/yellow LED lights so our bodies and the bodies of animals/birds/insects, and plants don't think it's daytime in the middle of the night. Nothing good can come from that! Nothing!! Encourage stargazing and let people know that bats are moths are beneficial pollinators. And that bats eat mosquitoes! Perhaps people could start installing bat-houses. Let people know that the bright lights are harmful to bats and discourage their presence. Finally, I encourage EVERYONE (City Staff, councillors, the Mayor - EVERYONE!) to read an amazing book about this issue: "The Darkness Manifesto - On Light Pollution, Night Ecology, and the Ancient Rhythms That Sustain Life" by Johan Eklof. It's available at the library - and at your favorite bookstore/Amazon. Also, for kids, "Saving the Night - How Light Pollution Is Harming Life on Earth" by Canadian author Stephen Aitken (also available at the library or your favorite bookstore/Amazon). I am rooting for our City to move forward with - and do right by - this Dark Sky initiative. It is so very, very important! Thanks for "listening"!

- Let Guelph be a leader and innovator in the usually not seriously addressed issue of light pollution in order to continue to improve the quality of life of its citizens. I am very proud that we are taking active steps since the quality of life of people who live here will improve, not to mention also the quality of their sleep in the aggregate. The only way this works is if we take action now and with By-Laws that help minimize this problem.
- Appropriate level of bylaws and guidelines starting with city lights as an example of what should be done.

### **Exemptions (2)**

- Exemptions need to be put in place for businesses so that insurance companies don't penalize them for reduced lighting (aka lawsuits)."
- Make an easy process to apply for exceptions to bylaws, but one that needs proof of acceptance by neighbors.



## **Learn from others (2)**

- Network and learn and share with other communities in the region, even to the level of international levels. Whatever is done, we cannot jeopardize the health and safety of our population, whether human, animal or plant. Why re-invent the wheel?
- Check out the experiences of other cities that have been successful in containing light pollution. We can learn a lot from their experiences.

## **Other**

- I think the title of this exercise should not be about a "dark sky" per se. Guelph is too urban to have a true "dark sky" designation. This public engagement exercise should have been called "Light Pollution" bylaw. It is more about regulating the negative impacts of light pollution (energy use, driver distraction, over-stimulation, obnoxious searchlights, over-lit parking areas, residential impact to neighbours, etc.) than it is about trying to get dark sky designation. Urban light pollution is a huge problem contributing to mental health, bird migration, and energy/climate impact. If we focus on THAT, it would be great to be able to see the stars too... :)
- The time is now to get serious about light pollution in this community. This means: banning the use of excessively bright, animated, and LED billboards; - banning the sale and use of white and bright white LED light bulbs in the city for any exterior application; requiring all commercial properties to cycle down or turn off their lighting systems whenever businesses are closed; lobbying the provincial government to ban bright white LED automobile headlights and passing a by-law against their use in city limits; adding "light trespass" to the online GIS bylaw reporting tool so that citizens can easily and anonymously report transgressions of the light bylaw; halting the installation of the extremely hostile new bright white streetlights and tasking staff to develop a solution for the modernization of the city's streetlight that do not use the high kelvin LED bulbs that have already been installed; creating clear and easy-to-understand regulations for homeowners so that they stop using excessively bright and excessively white bulbs in exterior applications; offering a subsidized trade-in program so that homeowners can replace their exterior bulbs with appropriate ones at low or no cost; lobbying and working with the provincial government to reduce the amount of lighting required on provincial highways (specifically the Hanlon Parkway, which is a significant source of light pollution).



- As much as possible. A major reason we left Toronto to come to Guelph was to escape the light pollution. As more condos and office buildings are built in Guelph, the worse this will get. The money/investment strategies offered by developers and companies will make it difficult to keep community interests in mind. As soon as these business interests grow and take hold of the city, it will only become more difficult to police it later. Do not let these companies try to influence city planning and bylaws because they will over time; the financial gain will be difficult to ignore especially when things like "community interests" are vague and idealistic/philosophical in nature, they don't have as much influence in city counsel when compared to money and capital. The principles and ideals the city wants to uphold will be eroded quickly as business flourishes. This is my primary concern.
- Walk around on the edge of downtown, such as on Yarmouth Street, and Norfolk Street, and look at the light pollution coming from 50 Yarmouth. It can inform you as to what to restrict.
- There needs to be more planning in place about several items that are far more important to the City and its residents such as: Water availability in 10-15 years ( we are slated to hit capacity with our current population in 10 years). Homeless encampment planning so we dont have people living in public areas all over the city. Drug additction and steps to form rehap properties. Lowering city Costs on energy and sustainability by using higher quality materials on retrofits.
- You could provide a graduated light change program
- Encourage window coverings at night to reduce indoor lights glowing outside
- NO FULLY-LIT signs! If you continue to see a lighted square when you close your eyes, a ridiculous amount of electricity is being used!
- 'Come to Guelph & see the Stars' would be a nice message. The university could have a real astrology program.
- When I was young I knew that I wanted to be an astronomer and have maintained an interest in the subject in spite of taking chemistry at university. Guelph is a cloudy place so there are many nights without good viewing. However, all we can see on a clear night is the moon and a few bright stars. You can change that. You can probably save a lot of electricity by not trying to light up the Universe.
- I'm going to look into the Dark Sky Certification that was required on my single family home as it does not seem fare to me?
- Don't make any hast. IT needs time. People must be convinced.
- Hi Ashley!



- Guelph is a very green community with an abundance of green spaces, parks and wonderful trails. A dark sky would put Guelph on the map of being able to promote itself as a dark sky community for residents and tourists.
- Compared to cities of comfortable size, our night sky is doing just fine!
- Free sheets to all residents to hang on windows to protect from the trespassing light
- I don't have any suggestions, I'm just a resident and hobby stargazer, it would be very nice not to have to drive way outside of Guelph to get a decent look at the night sky.
- Here's to the charge of the light brigade !
- I don't know if this is a good time to mention banning fireworks. But they are also light pollution and noise pollution.
- Act on these ideas, as opposed to continually talking about and studying. Do not give in those who fear monger about less light being less safe.
- The opposite! Light up St Georges square like its day time 24/7. I'm sure you'll see your little tent community disappear.
- This doesn't have to be anonymous. Call me anytime. Rob Ireland (519) 767-8453
- Fire government employees and convert government buildings into affordable housing
- We are addicted to outdoor light. It's a shame.
- I own two properties adjacent or near to parks within the city and both are subject to very poor planning related to light pollution. I have spent nearly ten years trying to get the city to change the problem and tens of thousands has been wasted and creating a worse problem. It's a shameful example of how poorly some aspects of the city are managed
- Already the glow from Kitchener is impacting the view from my house on Whitelaw.
- Don't know
- That the city and staff stop wasting Guelph resident's tax dollars and stop raising taxes AGAIN to an excessive amount. City and staff will go to extremes, excessive, extravagant and insane methods to do what they want. We don't need fat-cat, oh-so-privileged city and union employees wasting our tax dollars. We don't need a Dark Sky by-law. We didn't need a new library. We don't need Waste Collection it should be contracted out. Scam Guthrie and city council kisses ass with senior union and their nepotism friends who work at the city making +\$40 / hour plus benefits.
- Ask the public for more feedback.



- We have a light standard outside our bedroom window that causes me to have sleep deprivation if I don't blackout.
- I've said enough already...
- I am an astrophotographer. I wish everyone could see the beautiful night sky.
- I came late to amateur astronomy, but had access to much of the sky even before Guelph started the switch over to LED street lighting (a good start there). Back the my biggest problems were the auto-mall lighting but since then we lost much of the northern sky when Walmart opened and much of the rest when HomeDepot lit up. I would like to see the skies of my youth be brought back for the next generations to enjoy.
- Let's just make sure we don't demonize light in this process.
- Take strong action and reduce the level of public input! Most people don't educate themselves AT ALL before forming an opinion on subjects. The City has a depressing history of giving far too much weight to the concerns of the ignorant majority.
- Industries and residential and retail can work together to make Guelph a dark sky city.
- Require those using outdoor lighting to state WHAT they are intending to light, and HOW they will avoid light pollution from those lighting sources.
- I can't imagine a bylaw restrictive enough - probably some EU cities have this figured out.
- We actually do not have enough lighting in our neighbourhood. With the sun setting early and walking our dogs in the evening almost every single night we are almost hit by cars crossing streets, because they cannot see us due to lack of lighting. We wear reflective clothing and our dogs have light up collars. This does not help. We need more lights!
- Also no mention of encouraging occupants of tall building to turn lights off at night when not needed. This is also important to reduce bird strikes, especially as Guelph gets more tall buildings.
- Why are just talking about light pollution. Weed and rake your lawn to a standard that does not affect your neighbors.

