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ABSTRACT

The rapid urbanization of land and the associated growth of the 'city' have created an unprecedented demand for living and work space throughout this country and the world. The problems that are arising from this process should be examined.

Sign proliferation is one of the factors contributing towards the overall effect on the character of the city. The main controversies have centred around sign appearance and location based on their presumed ugliness and effect on their surroundings. Private advertising zeal, or misplaced public priorities are often the cause of these physical problems, which lead to public and private conflicts of interest.

The basic aim of the thesis is to examine sign regulation in order to determine its effect on the urban environment, as well as analyse the problems of physical appearance, public and private interests and other resulting problems of regulation.

The basic assumptions taken for the study are: it is desirable for man to seek and demand an environment which will contribute towards his well-being; the concept of the public interest is both valid and useful; and planning in the form of sign regulation is useful and possible in our society, with some optimum is possible.
As a basis for this investigation it is hypothesized that

The aesthetic purpose of sign regulation results in a conflict of public and private interests, that is being resolved by the adoption of diverse municipal sign regulations.

With the assumptions in mind, the investigation comprised a review of the literature, which was most useful for the establishment of techniques and general requirements for an effective environment, as well as information from a questionnaire directed to several cities in Canada which have undertaken sign regulatory measures with the ensuing problems. The hypothesis is examined specifically through the use of sign legislation of several cities and municipalities in British Columbia.

The City of Victoria B.C., one of the cities studied, exhibited many of the typical problems encountered when stricter control over signs is attempted. The process of adopting sign regulation, amidst public and private interests, is aptly illustrated by this example. Another City, Ottawa, Ontario, displayed many of the same problems. Here, sign regulation, as one of the ingredients of a beautification scheme, contributed much to the pedestrian atmosphere and urban environment, as well as showing the relation of improved sign regulation to an overall program of environmental improvement.
The most significant observation in the study was the variation in contents of sign ordinances. The many types of regulations presently in use, leads to the conclusion that sign regulation today is complex, with many problems still unsolved. Sign control applied by local government presently could be any level that is achieved in light of the ensuing problems within the community.

The basic recommendations are that local government and private interests collaborate to achieve the desired objective. Although this joint effort may lead to diverse regulations, the ultimate goal should be controlling the direction of the developing environment. This can be obtained in part by controlling and regulating signs. Local government, through its delegated power to control street furnishings in the public right-of-way should provide the atmosphere and leadership necessary so that private enterprise may from time to time initiate actions for urban improvement. Subject to the limitations placed on the study, the hypothesis is considered valid.
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CHAPTER I

SIGN REGULATION AND THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

Introduction

Demographers show that each year the world's net population increases by about 48 million; each day on the average, by 131,500; each minute by about 90. During the last century and a half, urban areas have been created faster than in any previous time in world history. (See Illustration I)

At this rate according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and Canadian economist Dr. J.O. Firestone, more than 35 million Canadians will be located in our urban environment by the end of the century.

To be more meaningful, visualize this Canadian example: "By the year 2000 A.D. ... there will be virtually no agriculture left in the Lower Fraser Valley, or in Southern Ontario between Cobourg and London, or in the Lower St. Lawrence Valley between Cornwall and Three Rivers ..."

This rapid urbanization of land has created an unprecedented demand for living and work space throughout this country and the world as a whole. Simultaneously, this process has created a disconcerting side effect. Edward Higbee calls it "environmental leukemia" and names urban decay, suburban sprawl, rising taxes, clogged highways, disappearing recreational space, as some of the ills of this process.
ILLUSTRATION I

URBANIZATION OF THE WORLD'S POPULATION

The whole concept of cities is changing today, and at the base of it is this pressure from urban growth as well as man's desire to continually "improve and intensify the quality of life". There is little place for a built-up city to grow but on the periphery, and with the automobile giving greater freedom of location to the householder, patterns of new growth have been generally irregular and dispersed.

The wide range of facilities and services available in the central areas is exemplified by St. Louis, Missouri, and described by its City Planning Commission as the principal retail, wholesale, finance, business, professional center for the metropolitan area. It provides entertainment and cultural activities for the region and is the center of marketing and trading. It is the largest source of tax revenue, and is the largest employer. Major department stores, investment houses, banks, offices, government houses are situated there as well as the main terminus for vehicular, rail, and air traffic. These characteristics, to some extent, can be applied generally to all cities.

Yet in spite of these functions, many central areas are dying and decaying, victims of ugliness, inconvenience and obsolescence. President Johnson of the United States warned in 1965 that the American City had come to "its time of crisis."

Our society will never be great until our cities are great. In the next forty years we must rebuild the entire urban United States ...
Three forces have been held responsible for the evolution of cities. They are:

1. The Enormous Growth of the Cities. The City of Vancouver is a typical example. "The growth of the metropolitan area has been similar to most North American cities: The central city remains relatively static while the surrounding municipalities continue to grow rapidly." (See Illustration II)

2. The Growth in Number of Automobiles. Of particular interest is The Buchanan Report which refers to the British situation:

... the assessment of the future number of vehicles can proceed only by the projection of past trends and considerations of the recent experiences of the United States ... so what is involved is a doubling of numbers within ten years, and nearly a trebling within twenty years. 11

In a preliminary preface to the Report, Sir Geoffrey Crowther further qualifies the preceding forecast. "... the United States and Canada are about a generation farther into The Motor Age than we are. The stage that we have reached now they reached some thirty or thirty-five years ago." 12

Toronto, Canada experienced a 100 percent increase in registered vehicles from 1953 - 1964, compared to a population growth of only 50 percent for the same period. The following table shows the rate of increase in vehicle registrations in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>511,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>541,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>560,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>584,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>616,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>657,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>705,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>767,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>818,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Report of the Motor Vehicle Branch For 1966
British Columbia from 1958 to 1966. It shows a sixty percent increase for the period. (See Table I)

It can be seen that adaptability to and around the automobile is imminent, in terms of living, working and shopping. The automobile has contributed towards this change in cities, by providing to the householder the means of relocating outside the city, as well as creating congestion and overloading obsolete street systems which in turn double the cost of automobile operation while undermining the urban environment.

3. Way of Life (Life Style). With the 'affluent society' quite in evidence for the past generation, there has evolved on this continent a new way of life, in which the people are experiencing an unprecedented period of wealth and opportunities. "The ordinary individual has access to such amenities as foods, entertainment, personal transportation and plumbing - in which not even the rich rejoiced a century ago." The tremendous growth in middle income groups, together with shorter working hours and longer leisure time, has resulted in an increasing demand for goods, services and facilities. With this has come a new style of life which can be linked to the flight to suburbia.

Thus, urbanization has brought an image totally unflattering to the senses. It is what Ian Nairn has called "Subtopia, the annihilation of the site, the steam rollering of all individuality of place to one uniform and mediocre pattern," and leads others to state"... most American cities
are ugly..."

**The Problem**

The proliferation of signs is one contributing factor towards the overall effect of the city. Most of the resulting problems centre about the size and character of business signs, their location in respect to the buildings and public property to which they are attached, as well as the general effect upon the aesthetic quality of the surrounding area. As one observer states, the existing sign system offers "... a bewildering medley of messages of all types - some demanding action, others urging attention, and many just offering information." There is not only a lost of visual impact, but often the loss of priorities necessary in sign selection. These are the physical aspects of the problem.

Elected officials, often businessmen themselves, know how vital a role advertising plays in the economy. The Canadian-born publisher, Lord Thompson, before a meeting of the Advertising Association stated that "Advertising is the great leveller and the great promoter of social equality." Competitive enterprise, therefore, advocates the idea that signs should not be prohibited or unduly pinched by rules that would destroy their usefulness. This attitude contributes towards the difficulties of sign control by introducing the problems of public and private interests as well as legal and administrative problems.
It is gradually gaining acceptance that advertising is essential to the mass production techniques of industry. Many organizations have flourished from immense nation-wide advertising campaigns to push and enhance the commodities of every day life. John Kenneth Galbraith with his book "The Affluent Society" has contributed much towards the understanding of stimulated 'wants' and 'needs' through the use of advertising. For example the Standard Oil Company of California employed a private research company to investigate their corporate image in seven western American States. Over four thousand people were included in the sample. The results showed

68 percent of those who knew the Company very well have a very favourable opinion of it. Conversely, only 14 percent of those who know little about the company tend to give it a 'very' favourable rating. This shows the value of being well known. 20

In defense of advertising, private enterprise states that North America consists of democratic countries, which entitle the individual certain freedoms of speech, belief and the right to be seen. Therein lies a substantial part of the problem. In pursuit of higher earnings, advertising when carried to excess may well ruin the character of city, town or village. However it should be realized that advertising in the form of signs show the conflict between individual freedom and the common good at its crudest. Signs, like the car are not bad things in themselves, they are just other means to be used or misused.
Objectives

The objective of the study is to investigate sign regulations and practices and their effects on the emerging urban environment, in what may be called a typical North American setting. Primary examples are drawn from Canadian areas, with some outside sources, chiefly America and Great Britain, included to provide greater depth for discussion.

By delving into the physical (appearance, aesthetic, proliferation etc.), the political (private versus public interest) and the legal problems faced by various governmental authorities to control, regulate and prohibit the use of signs in urban areas, it is hoped to gain better insight into their existence. The formulation of legislation for sign control is investigated, hoping that recommendations can be obtained for future regulatory methods, which can enhance environmental conditions in urban areas. Presumably, verification of the hypothesis undertaken in this study would then be possible.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study it is assumed that: It is desirable for man to seek and demand an environment which will contribute towards his well-being. The concept of public interest is both valid and useful. Planning in the form of sign regulation is desirable and possible in our society, and that some optimum is possible. There will be no interruption in our
economic expansion and population growth that will upset our present sprawling habits of urban life. No technological or social break-through will radically change outdoor advertising in the form of signs.

Planning Perspective

Hypothetically, regulation of signs in any community is of major importance. To control the environment of man should be one of the chief aims of planning, in order to create the kind of amenities that would benefit mankind. This fact alone can be the best justification for controls.

In a democratic society, any controls on designs of a comprehensive planning nature must be accepted by the majority of the public in the long run as being in the public interest, that is, benefiting the maximum number of people rather than a privileged few. The concept of the public interest is one which always confronts the planning profession.

The central problem for the planning profession will always remain - to reach a satisfactory interpretation of the public interest in relation to land use in general, and in relation to the distribution of power and initiative by which land is developed. The public interest must also include the process and shaping toward these goals.

The general subject of this paper - sign regulation, is one in which the problem of the public interest is increasingly important. Public, and private interests are highly
conflicting in this field.

It is difficult to ascertain what the public will endure in order to have certain "amenities," when monetary values are part of the stake.

Recent concern over urban beautification by President Johnson, 1965 and the Canadian Centennial Commission, 1967, points out that sign regulation and its associated problems are only one facet of the immense goal. Without an adequate planning approach, these problems can only become more severe and thus contribute negatively to our environment.

In summary, "The broad objective of city planning is to promote the welfare of the people in the community by helping to create an increasingly better, more beautiful, convenient, efficient, and attractive environment." 22

Organization of Thesis

The introductory chapter is an attempt to establish through a documentation of the literature the problems evolving from urbanization and its effect on the city and the urban environment. The introduction of physical deterioration within the city leads to an increased awareness for planning appearance, of which the regulation of signs as one element of the problem is emphasized. Chapter Two traces the history of signs to the present, attempting to define 'signs' and showing significant problems within the media. The following chapter is devoted to existing sign regulation methods and practices and the
ILLUSTRATION II

RELATIVE GROWTH OF METROPOLITAN VANCOUVER: 1921 - 1983.
problems of implementation. Chapter Four analyses the contents of specific cases of sign ordinances which show the diversity of effective sign control. Cities which have adopted sign regulation as a contributory element towards a more viable urban environment are then previewed in Chapter Five. The last chapter of the thesis offers a review of the study, an appraisal of the assumptions, an evaluation of the hypothesis, as well as recommendations for sign regulation which would contribute towards the desired physical surroundings.

Hypothesis

It has been generally agreed by planners and urban environmentalists that signs are necessary, that decisions to permit the control of signs in the long run effect the character of the district, property values and aesthetic considerations. In a recent report, the American Society of Planning officials took the view that, "In central business districts... signs are not only proper, but they frequently form an integral part of the character and flavour peculiar to the area."23

F.J. Osborn, the noted British planning authority and estate manager of Welwyn, the British New Town, has stated, "... I accept the proposition that some outdoor advertising is essential to the business life of a community. ... The advertisement panel is one of the many features which have to be welded into the overall design."24
The need for some control has become paramount to most governing bodies by the emergence of garish eye-stopping signs, their outstanding size and design, as well as their multiplicity. On the basis that an investigation is warranted, it is hypothesized that

The aesthetic purpose of sign regulation leads to a conflict of public and private interests that is being resolved by the adoption of diverse municipal sign regulations.

The validity of this hypothesis is discussed in the final chapter.

Scope and Limitations

This investigation is intended to provide information for use in Canada, therefore sources from Canadian examples have been used as much as possible. However, since much information from outside sources are available, the scope of the thesis includes examples from the United States, Britain and others. The scope is further defined by the methods used in the investigation: a review of the literature, questionnaires, and personal interviews.

No attempt is made to itemize and investigate the full range of problems in sign regulation nor their implementation and enforcement in governments.

The method of investigation imposes a limitation
to the study, particularly in the questions asked in the questionnaires, the availability of literature for review, and the specific and particular problems of various urban areas.

**The Elements of the Environment**

To investigate sign control and its effect on the urban environment, an understanding of the latter is of utmost necessity.

This statement gives some understanding to the elements of the environment and the shaping of 'appearance'.

Today the final criterion of the quality of our physical environment must be the relation it establishes between three primary elements:

1. **Structure** - buildings, streets, roads, highways, parking areas, utilities above ground.

2. **Open Space** - for pedestrians only.

3. **Nature** - represented by ground forms, rocks, water and plants.

Eckbo goes on to state

It is well known that the process of urbanization tends to maximize the first, minimize the second, and eliminate the third. These tendencies develop in the absence of adequate foresight, control and organization. 25

This statement is principally aimed at the physical interpretation of the environment, but as shown by others, "appearance" has other considerations. Victor Gruen in his
concept of appearance states:

... appearance takes in the sum total of the physical and psychological influence of an environment on human beings. 26

This is supported by Kevin Lynch who adds:

Nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of the events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences. 27

From these opinions, it is concluded that appearance takes in the sum total of physical as well as psychological elements within the total environment. It is these psychological elements which makes it difficult in turn to define "beauty" in appearance.

Physical Appearance. The form that the natural manifestation of this quality assumes is primarily the formal relationship of solids to voids, of bodies to space, of buildings and urban furnishings to the spaces they occupy. In the evolution of towns and cities, the harmonious grouping of dwellings and other parts of the town around the market place (an open space) was influenced by the classical traditions of planning, as shown by Hippodemus, the Greek planner. Many European examples typify this in the period prior to the New World.

Structures, mostly buildings and other man-made
objects such as roads and street furnishings, have been
controlled and regulated under various ordinances, such as
zoning, subdivision and building codes. Zoning which was
established in 1926 by the Euclid case in the United States,
was defined by A.B. Gallion as:

The regulation by districts under the police
power of the height, bulk, and use of buildings,
the use of land, and the density of population.

Subdivision control regulates the division of land into parcels,
and provides for the existence of roads and public utilities.
The building code governs the standard of erection. However,
there are as yet no restrictions on physical appearance per se.

Many planners have long recognized that attractiveness
of design and outward beauty of buildings have a definite
bearing upon the happiness and comfort of the inhabitants.
Architectural control has been tried, but up to the present
time there has been little significance, with notable exceptions,
of course. It has been left mainly to civic pride, education
and architectural competitions to raise the level of building
appearance.

Yet "appearance" not only involves buildings.
Buildings, because of their size and bulk are the overwhelming
factor in any discussion on the urban environment. A study on
the problems of downtown Nashville, Tennessee considered the
following items:
1. Appearance of individual establishments and attitudes of proprietors about the appearance of:

   (a) Store fronts and windows
   (b) Lighting
   (c) Signs
   (d) Litter
   (e) Smoke
   (f) Natural features, such as landscaping and trees.

2. Conditions of sidewalk and curbs

3. Protection of pedestrian from inclement weather

4. Location of utilities.

In carrying out this program, it is assumed that a value judgment is justified in appraising the conditions of the terms in the program. The attitudes of both the proprietor as well as the interviewer would have to be considered as a prime influence on the appraisal of the existing surroundings. At this point, the psychological effects, as mentioned previously, would have a bearing on the results of the survey.

**Psychological Appearance and Beauty.** In this modern era of technical city planning and efficiency in municipal government, the aesthetic improvement of the city is often relegated to a minor role. Public officials and citizens alike often desire efficiency and economy more than they want beauty. Economy and beauty are not necessarily contradictory, but in a
city, where nearly everything is man-made, beauty seldom comes naturally and is usually considered an expensive luxury.

Another reason for the lack of attention given to the appearance of cities is that beauty is subjective. "Beauty is not measurable in any objective way." It cannot be legislated. Consequently it is impossible to assemble a public consensus as to what constitutes beauty, knowing the opinion of one person may be contradicted by the opinion of another. Thus enters the psychological differentiations of the biased individual. Those having different opinions "... can only be referred to other people who have made it their business to be trained, informed and sophisticated about such matters - in other words, to men of good taste."

In a democratic and business-oriented society, where the ethic holds "The survival of the strongest," this laissez-faire approach to the appearance of the city is bound to affect the overall design. It may seem odd to argue that wealth, respect for the tastes of individuals, and democracy has made the urban environment ugly, but the evidence is easily found. The cities of the Old World were beautiful, because they were planned by monarchs, nobles, and prelates who had absolute power, who cared not for the convenience or welfare of the ordinary people.

Yet, there is a growing awareness that the antithesis of beauty, can be identified and can be corrected, prohibited or regulated, in spite of those who find that aesthetic standards of any sort get in their economic way.
Numerous studies have been done in which the streets of the city have been analysed and compared to the ceiling, walls and floor of a house. This 'outdoor room', like its indoor counterpart, contains 'furnishings', many of which have been placed by private and public owners for utilitarian use. Some of these are sculptures, fountains, light standards, kiosks, parking meters, hydrants, street signs, hoardings, arcades and outdoor benches. They are either called "bread and butter furnishings" or "curbside admonitions." Others go a bit further and identify them as "Goop, the goulash of environment."

We know that furnishings are part of the visible townscape and thus part of the environment. They have been identified as an element of 'appearance' and often serve to punctuate space and make one more conscious of it. According to Nairn,

Identity is given by the total place - buildings and the spaces between them, and all the objects in the spaces. Often, the objects in the spaces are more important than the buildings: a street lamp or a sign or a traffic island can completely alter the character of a particular place. 38

With this in mind, street furnishings are of utmost importance. They are, regrettably, treated with contempt by most designers and planners, because of their disconcerting habit of interfering with the environment and creating disorder. This is
what the urbanist calls "clutter".

Clutter invariably occurs when street furnishings are placed in the streets by private and public agencies without regard to place or number, thus contributing to an unpleasant visual atmosphere. (See Illustration III)

A report by the San Francisco Planning Commission classifies 'clutter' into three general groupings:

1. Store-front clutter, which consists of awnings, marquees, overhanging signs, banners and window displays competing with one another or in over-abundance.


3. Street clutter, including light standards, hydrants, street signs and indicators, transient signs, transit poles, transit wires, police and fire boxes, parking meters, newspaper stands, letter baskets, and curb railings. 39

From this, it is observed that signs and their associated forms are an important element of clutter. From a review of the literature, most of the reasons for dissent are based either on the appearance of furnishings and/or their placement.

Lynch states "Design and placement of these details is normally left to hazard," and Eckbo has the opinion that "one hundred years or more of functional engineering design ... is quite similar in quality, if not in precise detail, wherever we go." The placement of furnishings are dependent on when they
PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE INTERESTS

Note public signs competing with private signs for attention. This results in street "clutter".
arrived at various strategic locations, and what authority erected them.

One of the worst offenders in this category are signs, either erected by the public authority in the form of traffic signs, legal notices or governmental orders, or those maintained by the private sector for advertising or business purposes. Gygorgy Kepes pointed out "the hopelessness of trying to separate the problem of street signs from any other city-planning problem, of separating the sign from its building and its street ..."

Signs, and their regulation, are only part of the problem of clutter, but for the purposes of this exercise, greater emphasis will be placed upon their character and existence in the urban environment, for it is a proposition of this study that by controlling and regulating signs, it is possible to contribute towards a better environment for our cities.
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CHAPTER II

SIGN HISTORY AND DEFINITIONS

Introduction

The methods of conveying ideas to prospective purchasers have been improved, but the intent and purpose of increasing sales of commodities or popularizing them have not changed. 1

Advertising in the form of signs is essential to competition. Therefore no one should have any quarrel with the aphorism that "competition is the life of trade" just as it is equally true that "every man's rights end where those of his neighbours begin". Man is basically business-oriented, for "the chief reason for the coming together in the cities is for the purposes of manufacture and trade," 2 which is, "... the reason for their (the cities) continuing existence." 3 Signs, therefore, should be considered as a vehicle of a pragmatic society.

Historic Origins

Theoretically, lettering is acknowledged as the basic foundation of the Sign Arts. Lettering styles developed by the Egyptians with their split-reed pens, and by the Asians, contributed greatly to the methods of conveying ideas throughout history.

In the earliest civilizations of Asia, jewellery, pottery, silks, drugs and other wanted commodities were
merchandised in bazaars, which created a need for advertising. An emblem of the trade soon appeared, to compliment merchandise placed in specific rows. As trade increased, signs became more necessary, and took shape as painted and carved clay or stone. These were imbedded in building walls, and consisted of pictures and symbols, as few could read at that time. For example, Roman tradesmen painted or carved replicas of tools and wares on their establishments, and upon death had tombstones carved with the same symbols of their trade. When these carvings and paintings were used to advertise gladiator combats, animal and slave fights, and theatrical presentations, they were known as 'albums', the first posters of their kind.

The first street name signs were used in Rome and Pompeii. They were illustrated with pictures and decorative designs.

In the Dark Ages that followed, reading and writing were restricted to those scholars and clergy who retreated to the protection of remote monasteries, for the Church controlled most of the aspects of life, and until the middle of the twelfth century monopolized science, letters, art and culture. Constant warfare unsettled the conditions of the time and craftsmanship was consequently at a low ebb. It was during this time that heraldic crests and coats-of-arms were developed. These were to appear later in England and the Continent during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on signposts of taverns and shops. Many such signs exist in England today, being
retained through many generations. For example, the Bauer family (1743) changed their name to Rothschild and adopted the red shield coat-of-arms used by their father. This family became world renown bankers, and recognized by their adopted crest.

With termination of the great power and influence of the Papacy, craftsmen reappeared and by the end of the fifteenth century, announcement signs were to be seen throughout Europe, especially in England, Germany and France.

**Industrial Changes and Modernization**

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the introduction of the outdoor sign reached huge proportions. London was literally darkened with numerous swinging sign boards of every description. In America the 'billboard', a listed and protected service for bills appeared. Its counterpart in England was called a 'hoarding', which was derived from the rough board enclosure surrounding construction work. Theatre playbills and announcements were commonly posted.

The invention of the electric light in 1879 by Thomas Edison and the production of the automobile by Henry Ford gave the sign industry its greatest impetus. Previous to this, candles, kerosene and coal gas jets were used for sign illumination. P.T. Barnum is credited with the first gaslighted advertising in 1840 for his "greatest show on earth". Tobacco, soap, whiskey and medicine soon followed in using outdoor advertising spaces. The practice of 'sniping', that
of affixing signs to fences, barns, trees, to any place with physical possibilities soon blossomed uncontrolled. It was interesting to note that:

It was the fashion, particularly in the nineteenth century to cover every inch of available space in a commercial building with a sign and to use window panes, sills, doors, etc. for the placing of advertising copy. The theory was the greater the display, the most lasting impression on the mind of the beholder, hence greater sales. 7

In 1891, the first electric bulb sign was erected in New York City, which eventually led to the placing of others, until famous Times Square was completed. The tungsten filament bulb, proved durable and cheap and added the necessary lift to an increasingly popular method of advertising.

From the turn of the nineteenth century to the period of the First World War, the sign industry was engaged widely in operating, leasing and lighting achievements. The establishment of some of today's largest sign manufacturing companies and the beginning of organization within the industry itself occurred at this time. New achievements such as flourescent and neon lighting appeared: Neon first in France (1921) then a year later in San Francisco. This method has been the mainstay of electric sign lighting up to the present time.

Today new innovations are becoming prevalent. Reflective materials, such as 'scotchlite' and luminite are invaluable for roadside direction signs at night. Plastics are
presently the favourite of many manufacturers, and it appears that all of the new metal alloys are destined for greater use, because of greater strength and ease of handling. The most recent idea is a mechanized billboard face, that allows four different advertisements in one structure. This has been reported to have cost $100,000 for its design and production.

**Historic Regulation**

During the reign of Henry VII of England, it was the law for all who sold ale in the Towns of Cambridge and Chelsea to place a sign denoting this function on their premises with a threat of fines for those who disobeyed. Charles II on his ascension to the throne granted the people of London a charter, giving them the right to erect signboards, for the "better finding out of such citizens' dwellings, shops, arts or occupations". French Kings gave similar sign concessions: (1577) innkeepers were to place conspicuous signs: (1693) all tradesmen were to erect sign prices on goods.

After the Great Fire in London (1666) the English King signed an act restricting signs in size and placement, to control the increasing sizes of signs. Three years later in France "a Royal order was proclaimed prohibiting sign monstrsities which projected beyond reasonable bounds."

Early disproval of sign content was shown in England about 1760 when laws were enacted empowering commissioners to remove all signs or emblems which were held objectionable and
projected into any part of the street. This was followed by a period of sign profusion, which extended into the nineteenth century when it was the fashion to cover every inch of a building with signs.

The turn of the century saw the inclusion of electricity and new sign materials into the regulations that governed sign use. From this time in North America, there was a gradual addition of modern regulatory methods beginning with zoning in New York (1916).

The basis for sign regulation and controlling street advertisements have traditionally evolved around the following points:

1. Advertisements are congruous and therefore injurious to amenities and the beauties of nature.

2. They exploit the street and highway, and the public has no choice but to take note of them.

3. They vulgarize public environment and degrade public taste.

4. They distract the attention of motorists and road users.

Physical planners have tended to use the term 'amenities' when referring to the comfort, convenience and pleasantness of the physical environment. Signs and their contents can contribute towards the lessening of such amenities by their mere presence.

Early exploitation of the streets and highways
began with the introduction of the automobile, thus in every state and province today signs can be found along most major streets and arterials, where their orientation permits them to hold a captive audience.

It has often been said that 'good taste' cannot be defined, that unsightliness was a matter of aesthetics, aesthetics was a matter of taste, and a matter of taste was not important enough in a community to limit any man's use of real property. This was the old common law concept, and kept much of the vulgarities inside of the law. However, the Massachusetts Billboard cases (1935) saw the beginning of a revolution in judicial concepts which was to lead to greater control via aesthetic considerations.

This last criticism of signs, that of the safety factor, has been proven and disproven by supposedly valid research studies. One such study was conducted by the Toronto Metropolitan Engineering Department at thirty signal-equipped intersections: fifteen with overhanging store signs and fifteen without. The resulting accident statistics revealed "... corners where overhanging signs conflicted with traffic volume was accounting for 65 percent of the accidents. The obvious answer seemed to be removal of overhanging store signs."

The municipal authority responsible for the public interest and the private businessman interested in his freedom of expression are to be held equally responsible for the
many regulation problems that exist today. All signs whether placed by municipal authority or not have contributed towards the problem, for it is immaterial whether advertising is for a public or private purpose.

The Definition of Signs

To arrive at a general definition for 'a sign' is near impossible, because of the many interpretations by various ordinances and planning agencies. One noted authority, offers a short concise meaning:

1. A conventional symbol representing an idea, as a word, letter or mark.

2. A publicly displayed notice on a building, office, etc. to advertise the business there transacted, or the name of the person or firm conducting it.

Regrettably, this is inadequate for the purpose of this exercise. The complex problem of definition has been studied by many authorities, and the difficulty is shown by the following statement:

The multiplicity of sign shapes and functions gives rise to problems of definition. Many ordinances go to great lengths to accurately define signs, not only in terms of their physical characteristics, but also in terms of their location and purpose.

Essentially, the problem of definition as indicated, is well illustrated by the zoning ordinances of New York City and
Cincinnati. (See Appendix A). In the former (1961) the definition of a sign gives its physical characteristics, location, and purpose as well as further distinguishing between 'advertising signs' and 'business signs'. The latter definition, (1963) defines signs according to type of message conveyed, the location on the premises or the method of attachment and according to the degree of illumination.

Canadian examples of sign definition similarly show a lack of uniformity. The City of Montreal By-law (1963) states, "The word 'sign' shall include all posters, billboards, signs and placards other than those herein under described:" The by-law then lists fourteen exceptions. The sign by-law of Victoria, B.C. (1963) on the other hand, denotes a separate sub-section for the description of each sign covered in the regulation, which includes its type and location as well as a definition for 'sign' itself. This states that

"Sign", includes signboards, hoardings and other erections of a similar kind as well as any object or thing used or intended to be used for the purpose of calling attention to any person, thing, event or property whether all or any thereof have been heretofore or shall hereafter be constructed, placed, used or maintained and whether or not the same shall be used for the display of advertising and whether the same shall be constructed, used or maintained on or over any public sidewalks or streets or on or over any private land. 17

From the foregoing examples, one sees how difficult the defin-
ition of a sign appears. For the purpose of our study, one should accept and acknowledge some basic definition, keeping in mind the possibilities of other interpretations. Hence, the definition as stated by the City of Victoria may be acceptable for the purpose of this exercise.

**Classification of Signs**

More than half of the 928 cities reporting, or 56 percent, classify signs according to type with 80 percent of the cities over 250,000 population have classification controls.

From the same survey it was found that of 650 cities reporting, 87 percent classify projecting signs, 80 percent wall signs and 78 percent roof signs. 'Snipe' and 'pylon' signs are the most common unclassified signs. From this we can see that regulatory grouping of signs usually fall into three categories associated with the wall, the roof and projections from either of the foregoing surfaces. As a matter of interest, a list of sign classifications follows: combination, electrical, pylon, pole, temporary, roof, marquee, directional, projecting, ground, wall, canopy, snipe and others.

It should be clarified that the definition of 'sign' as accepted in this exercise includes 'billboard'. Some ordinances do not include them in sign legislation.

Billboards themselves have common types or forms. These are classified according to size.
1. Posters. These are sheets of printed paper pasted on the wooden or metal panel. Each poster is either a twenty-four sheet, or a thirty sheet poster; the overall size being 8.66 feet by 19.5 feet or 9.6 feet by 21.6 feet, they are illuminated if necessary, with a posting period of 30 days, thus making 12 changes a year possible.

2. Painted Displays. These are either painted bulletins or painted walls, and are usually larger than posters, but of no standard size. The original painting is retouched twice per year.

3. Spectaculars. Here size is determined by location, but these are usually the biggest and most elaborate painted signs. The largest spectacular exists in Times Square, New York City, and covers the wall of an entire city block.

Sign Function and Criteria

Some of the responses common to those who erect and use signs are unique when stating the purpose or duties of signs.

A sign should vibrate with personality. A sign should set your mood. A sign should create a want. A sign should identify. A sign should change hard sell to soft sell. A sign should clarify - not confuse. 23

Another states

Their big size commands attention.
Their concise message stress brand identification. They are located strategically, so that customers in the major shopping areas receive the crucial last-minute reminder which stays with them to the point of purchase. 24

The sentiments of the previous statements are attributed to those within the industry and biased because of necessity of circumstances. Those who employ accessory (business) signs have more of a pragmatic viewpoint. The sign must do the job as intended and must increase business. As one shopkeeper commented,

The problem was to let as many people as possible know that I was in business and where, without spending more than my budget. 25

The sign, in terms of the desired function or goals of the creator, may be illustrated in part by a study carried out by Eliot Noyes for International Business Machines (I.B.M.) in 1960.

Essentially, the study as conducted, was to lead towards a design program for I.B.M. Signs. In surveying the numerous plants, they found very little consistency and a wide diversity of character at individual locations, mainly because of a lack of any standardized approach. This held true for sign structures which were extremely varied. Other problems of colours, sizes etc. only added to the confusion.

For the basis of his investigation, Noyes adopted
the following goals:

1. Clarity of message
2. Company identity through standardized appearance at all plants or installations
3. Economics of design and sign cost
4. Simplified procedures for procurement
5. Quality appearance
6. Good manners vis-a-vis the rest of the world. 26

By working within these goals, Noyes eventually achieved what he considered solutions for the functions of his signs. "Purpose, duties and actions" are clearly defined within the goals. However a significant factor should be stated. This program for a corporate symbol is in no way atypical for the common sign. Otherwise, the state goals apply generally to all signs, and should give an indication of basic sign function.

Perhaps an applicable contribution to the understanding of signs in the city is the study done by the graduate students at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The study, by urban design students under Kevin Lynch and Donald Appleyard consisted of two team proposals on "all conscious attempts by individuals or groups to communicate with others using the city as the vehicle." The city of Boston, was used to develop a public policy for signs.

We usually think of city signs in terms of verbal signs, but 'signs' range from words to the actual thing, and include symbolic and pictorial representation as well. 27

The 'objective' as developed for the study is of particular
We believe that the fundamental reason... should be to increase the clarity, congruence, and visible meaning of the environment, as a powerful means of bringing the citizen into contact with reality, and of increasing his interchange with it. 28

Evolving out of the two team proposals were criteria that refer directly to the function of signs. "The view of a thing or activity itself is usually a more powerful and accurate communication than is a symbol of that thing or activity." The ideas of "expressiveness", that signs should convey the thing signified as completely as possible; "congruence" that signs should take the form of the thing symbolized; "rootedness", that signs should be rooted at the place where the symbolized activity exists, were forwarded as sign fundamentals. Further testing of these principles is necessary before complete acceptance, however the problems that are associated with signs and their control are directly related to these fundamentals, in that many signs do not follow these suggested criteria.

In summation the study groups suggests

The preferable sign is not only congruent and expressive, but it is one which allows the observed to enter into a process of communication interchange, rather than acting only as a passive recipient. 29

and further adds,
... a good sign is one which appears when it is sought, and which yields more and more detailed information on call. 30

It is interesting to note that both team proposals investigate the possibilities of positive controls and encouragement of signs as well as recognizing that signs are visual elements of the cityscape as well as a means of communication. This lends support to the view in the previous Chapter that signs are necessary and are only part of the elements in the environment.

Sign Design and Location

The various functions of signs, as partially listed in the previous section, involve many difficult considerations. It appears that the design or form of signs is dependant upon the use intended. The numerous classifications of signs are usually controlled by regulation in 'use' zones, which regulate their size and dimensions, thus locational factors are all important. For the sign-user, the placement as to visibility is a prime consideration. The user either wants "the highest sign in the world" or an extravaganza to capture "... the attention and admiration of even the most casual motorist in the vicinity."

In order to achieve and promote visibility as well as direct those who view it, the suggested location is to situate the sign at the heavy flow of traffic, being careful to avoid being hidden by a competitor and as far as possible
33 from the other sign. A guideline for sign location has been
developed and shown as Illustration IV. It is called the
"Location Visibility Chart" for planning appropriate client
saturation coverage, and shows visibility zones for certain
signs in downtown areas. Some of the different types of signs
are illustrated.

Comments, which follow are particularly oriented
to the attitude of being clearly seen.

The rooftop sign, or billboard, is oriented towards
long range identification. It is the costliest "eye-stopper".
The wall sign aids in identifying and locating the store and
therefore needs to be unobstructed. Window signs are for pedes-
trian travel, as are fascias, which are used for "across the
street vision". Some criticism against fascia-type signs
exists. "It is lost to traffic on the same side of the street
as the store, because it is directly overhead foot traffic.
It is interesting to note that the City of Toronto in 1950
passed a by-law banishing overhanging signs on a section of
Yonge Street, allowing only signs installed flush with store
fronts. It appears to have worked extremely well, according to
Samuel Cass, Metropolitan Toronto traffic engineer, who believes
that facade-type signs do not minimize the advertising value and
improves the general appearance of the street.

In selecting the site for outdoor advertising,

A site or a particular position on that site
is to be assessed in the light of three
ILLUSTRATION IV
SIGN LOCATION VISIBILITY CHART

factors over and above that of the audience. One is positive and two are negative: first and foremost, uninterrupted visibility; second, the extent of distraction; and third the height above eye level. 37

This is a significant statement, made by an advocate of the sign industry, for it contains some of the essence of the sign problem - that of appearance and distraction within the urban environment. Understandably, their intentions are directed towards survival in intense competition, but in the course of doing so might offend some sensitive observers, not because of the fundamental functions of signs, but because of other abuses that sometimes occur.

Many of the characteristics as discussed in the preceding section on function and criteria are directly applicable to sign design, when one thinks that "form follows function". Noyes' approach and some questions he considered are as follows

1. In signs using the company name is the corporation clearly consistently identified?

2. Are signs used intelligently in relation to buildings as elements of architecture?

3. Are other company signs being handled consistently as to text (message) and symbols (arrows etc.)? As to structure, colour and type faces?

4. Do all signs represent, and in a sense, identify the company through their design?

5. Does the sign program appear dignified and acceptable to the outside world, or is it adding to the general visual clutter and confusion?
6. Are there economics to be found?

Although the design of all signs may not take this approach, nor advertisers take this line of action, this approach eventually led to a design program, the results of which can be observed in almost every North American city. The symbolic I.B.M. sign identification is now unified throughout the corporation.

Summary

The history of signs has been traced from the beginning of civilization in the Old World and Asia to the present time without much change in user intention. The foundation of its proliferation has been based on advertising wares to maximize profits.

Democratic governments have helped the strengthening of the sign industry by allowing freedom to be seen as one of the individual's basic rights. The inventions of the automobile and the electric bulb have contributed in their own way to the problem by creating an impetus to sign use and innovations.

Recognizing that signs were necessary, both in the public interest and for private investment, governments had to initiate control over their use. This occurred as early as the sixteenth century in England.

The inherent problems associated with outdoor advertising and their means of communication gave substantial
evidence to the problem of the urban environment. Whether they are injurious to our amenities, vulgarize and degrade public taste, or distract the motorists is a matter of opinion to the individual, but many judicial opinions swayed sentiment against 'offending' signs, making the criticisms against signs of essential and applicable importance.

This meant the definition of a sign had to be attempted before classifying them into types.

Attempts made by various authorities to define signs, showed how complex the problem was.

The function of signs from the view points of the manufacturer, the advertiser and the designer were many and varied. The functional indications then gave application towards the criteria needed for sign design and location by the particular user.
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CHAPTER III

SIGN REGULATORY METHODS

Introduction

The sign industry is feeling a wave of anti-sign sentiment that is becoming a trend on a national basis. President Johnson of the United States gave impetus to this movement with the Highway Beautification Act, 1965. To date fourteen of the fifty States have signed agreements to ban billboards within 660 feet of interstate highways, with Vermont recently banning billboards from all roads except for signs on property owned by the advertiser, thus becoming the second State to legislate comprehensive control over billboards. The other is Hawaii; which has banned them since 1957, when the state was still a territory. In Canada, the Province of Alberta has similar legislation, with several municipalities in British Columbia banning billboards - Richmond, 1964, North Vancouver City, 1966, and the District of West Vancouver 1966.

The sign and outdoor advertising industries have today reached such proportions that its operations are effecting the interests of others.

The Conflict of Interest

Those whose interests must be discussed include: the sign advertising companies and those who use signs; the landowners on whose land the signs are erected; adjacent
landowners whose land evaluation is affected; the municipality, state or province who represent public interest, public safety and property ownership in the public highways.

The advertising companies are thriving well-organized corporations with millions of dollars invested in offices, equipment, billboards, and signs. In 1966, Canada had 50 outdoor advertising companies - 15,500 signs, in 360 communities and did $40 million business the year before. This was a rise of 17.2% over 1964 according to J.C. Penaligon, the Outdoor Advertising Association of Canada general-manager. From these figures, the interest of these companies is self-evident when considered in terms of monetary outlay.

The landowners on whose land the signs are erected generally benefit to some extent when considered in economic return. In the case of billboards, property owners must be located in strategic locations. Depending upon whether the land is on the urban fringe, on a well travelled highway, or in the heart of downtown, the landowner stands to gain some return. It may be as low as ten dollars, or as high as several hundred. The value of the location regulates the stipend.

He is often the first to complain about laws that control signs on his property. This opposition arises from dislike of any regulation, especially of his own property and from the public relations tactics of the advertising industry.
Adjacent landowners have an interest in the development of properties next to theirs. In spite of the edict that "every man's rights end where his neighbor's begin", the adjoining property may depreciate theirs by deteriorating into an area of numerous billboards, gas stations, hot dog stands, and junk yards.

The welfare of the municipality is considered next. The concept of the 'public interest' is applicable, benefitting the maximum number of people rather than a privileged few especially in the concept of land use and the purpose of its development. However, many municipalities confuse the issue of the public interest, when space is rented to advertisers on behalf of the city. The advertising bench in the City of Vancouver returns approximately $6,000 for 600 locations per year, while third party advertising on British Columbia Hydro vehicles, returns more than $100,000 per year. It may be that greater benefit to the well-being of the community can be achieved, at the loss of some economic gain.

It is obvious that billboards placed on curves and intersections, overhanging signs next to traffic lights and the general litter of sign profusion could be hazards to driving. (See Illustration V) A few seconds of inattention could result in an accident. The strategic locations of such signs are zealously sought out by the eager advertiser, and unless the use of these areas are controlled by the municipality for its own welfare, the interest of the majority may be
OUR COMPANY operates daily in the public sphere. The reception we get depends on our constant efforts to serve society.
endangered.

The interest of the province or state is concentrated in the system of roads that serve the taxpayer and public in general. Last year (1967) the Province of British Columbia had expenditures of over 95 million dollars for the upkeep of its highways system. In conjunction with roads, scenic areas have been set aside for visual enjoyment. For example, Garabaldi Provincial Park in British Columbia, and Algonquin Provincial Park in Ontario. The tourist industry which is largely based on the beauty and charm of province or state is a large industry to be considered. In Vermont "each year, twelve times as many visitors pass through the State as there are Yankee natives (416,000)". Under these circumstances, to regulate signs and billboards to protect the beauty of the landscape would not be the use of power to merely protect the aesthetic, but it would be protection of a substantial property right in the province or state.

Sources of Planning Powers

Canada. In 1867 the British North American Act (B.N.A.) was passed by British Parliament which united into federation the four Canadian provinces and empowered the provincial governments to make laws in relation to 'municipal institutions in the province'. Under this sub-section of the Act, every province in Canada has established a third level of government, known as municipal or local government. These
municipal governments are empowered in turn to pass by-laws on all matters within its jurisdiction as set out in the provincial statutes establishing the municipality. The enabling act in British Columbia is the Municipal Act and would give each municipality the power to plan and control the use of lands by various zoning, subdivision, building and sign by-laws.

United States. The Constitution of the United States (1887) binds together the fifty states into a federal republic. The Federal Government from its seat in Washington, D.C. deals with only such matters as the states have delegated to it, and each state retains its 'states rights' and complete authority over all enumerated categories i.e. the cities. Ordinary Civil and Criminal law are state matters, for example.

In this system of government, cities and municipal institutions have only those powers that the state delegates to them, therefore the necessary planning powers normally given a community must come by a state planning enabling act. The principle regulatory powers employed to carry out planning proposals are 1) the taxing power 2) the power of eminent domain 3) the police power.

The police power is the basis for zoning, subdivision, and building regulations and other planning controls. These regulations must be justified by some considerations of safety, health, morals and general welfare in the public
interest. They must also satisfy 'due process of law' which forbids the states to deprive any person of life, liberty or property.

**Great Britain.** The British constitution is always said to be unwritten, that it has found no expression in the printed word, or formal document adopted at a specific date. The present constitution has been worked out over centuries by trial and error, with the greater part of it in the form of statutes enacted by Parliament. The utter supremacy of Parliament has always been considered a basic principle of the British Constitution.

Planning was a function of the Ministry of Health from 1919 until the creation of the Ministry of Town and Country Planning. This Ministry worked in conjunction with local authorities and was empowered to consider siting new buildings.

The Advertisements Regulation Act (1907), Town and Country Planning Act (1932) and (1947) and the Control of Advertisements Regulations (1948) are examples of Acts passed by Parliament to empower local authorities to make by-laws to control, remove and regulate advertisements, hoardings and the like in areas and localities of Great Britain. Thus planning powers are given by special Acts directly to local planning authorities, with each local planning officer interpreting the Act.
Derivation of Aesthetic Control

Interest in human or natural rights are as old as civilization itself. The rights of the individual were the causes of revolutions in America and in France. In both of these countries, there was embodied the idea that man shall not be deprived of liberty or property except in accordance with the law. The Bill of Rights in the United States and the Declaration of Rights of Man and of the Citizen in France sought to achieve these principles.

Since 1945, considerable discussion has taken place in Canada concerning similar constitutional measures. To date, however, these does not exist in Canada any form of guarantee (beyond those few in the B.N.A. Act) which a provincial legislature or Parliament, cannot repeal as freely as any other statute it has enacted. In this sense, no Canadian has the benefit of constitutional protection as it exists in other countries.

In the United States, the existence of these rights of the individual have provided the background for much legal debate on the subject of the 'aesthetic'.

It is interesting and significant for the purpose of this study to see how applicable the control of aesthetics and the regulation of signs are to each other.

The law as originally understood in all states was most clearly stated in City of Passaic v. Patterson Bill Post Co., 72 N. J. L 285, 62 Att. 267 (1905) thus:
Aesthetic considerations are a matter of luxury and indulgence rather than of necessity, and it is necessity alone which justifies the exercise of police power to take private property without compensation.

The courts upheld that public property might not be subjected to regulation under the police power of the state upon grounds of appearance only, as aesthetic sense is disassociated from any relation to the health, safety, or general welfare. The old idea was that the landowner could do what he liked with his property, especially with the appearance of it. The argument was that unsightliness was a matter of aesthetics; aesthetics was a matter of taste, and taste was not important enough to limit one man's use of property.

The rule of law that police power will not be extended to protect the aesthetic has changed, for today the whole complex of sign regulations, zoning ordinances, no-look-alike subdivisions and building regulations are determining a growing trend to place appearance as a function of land use, and thus under the police power.

The first step in the change to recognize the aesthetic occurred when it was coupled with health, safety and welfare. Aesthetic ordinances mostly oriented towards the aesthetic, were used increasingly and upheld by the courts as long as there was some connection with some orthodox aspect of the police power - health, safety, morals and public welfare. As more favourable decisions were returned, the courts began to state specifically that aesthetic conditions alone were enough
to base an exercise of police power.

A legal land mark was the Berman v. Parker case (1954) often referred to as the Massachusetts Billboard cases. The decision of Justice Douglas disposed of fifteen cases which had been in ligation for fifteen years. It was based on the broad conception of the police power of the state, a recognition of the right of travellers upon the highways to escape from the annoyances of commercial propaganda and the legality of the protection of public amenity. It supported restrictions as to billboard sizes, locations, setbacks, fees and banishment from locations of scenic and historic interest.

Today the public control of aesthetics is being slowly accepted as an extension of the legitimacy of the police power as it exists in Canada and the United States. The trend in judicial decisions will soon make aesthetic controls a universally accepted idea in property rights for "in spite of what many lawyers seem to think, the least of the obstacles (against beauty) is the law. The law is increasingly on the side of those who want to fight ugliness.

Specific Regulatory Controls

Directing, guiding or restraining power via regulation is a method of channelling human activities, setting boundaries to them and limiting the permissible range of individual discretion. Furthermore, to be effective, regulation depends on
1. An enabling act which allows the municipality to impose regulations on property owners.

2. The jurisdiction, or area over which the regulation is limited, e.g. city, country, or region.

3. The limitations on the permissible regulations of private property, e.g. Federal and State Constitutions in U.S. 20

The various enabling acts, as stated previously, which allow the planning process to be carried out in Canada, United States and Britain give to the municipal institutions the power to enact and pass by-laws or ordinances which will enhance good planning practice. In 1966, of 928 cities reporting to the International City Manager's Association, 97 percent exercise specific regulatory powers for the control of signs. 21

Zoning Ordinance. It is safe to say that today the majority of cities in North America employ the zoning ordinance as a specific regulatory power for the control of signs. In 1966, it was reported by 78 percent of 888 cities reporting as their source of sign control. 22 (See Table II)

The right to zone in Canada is a delegated power of the provincial legislature expressed in an Act of that body. In British Columbia this is the Municipal Act (R.S.B.C. 1965). One stated opinion is that zoning by-laws disclose a wide range of controls commonly imposed that have far greater effect on the design, character and appearance of our cities and towns than any other control over even individual buildings.
## Table II

**Source of Sign Control Authority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>No. of Cities With Sign Controls</th>
<th>Zoning Bylaw</th>
<th>Building Code</th>
<th>Sign Ordinance</th>
<th>State Law</th>
<th>Other Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 500,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 to 500,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 250,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 100,000</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 25,000</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

would likely have.

In the United States the zoning ordinance came out of the community's power to regulate land use for the health, safety, and general welfare of the public. However, the restrictions of the Constitution, made court interpretation necessary, hence in 1926, the Euclid case created a precedent when the Supreme Court judgment declared that the community should be free to determine its own character. This court interpretation of zoning led to prolonged litigation, as zoning implied interference with the property rights of the individual, and thus interferes with 'due process of law' as stated in the Constitution.

The use of zoning as an aesthetic control has been put to use in the concept of 'Historic' or 'Design' Control Zoning in which specific scenic, historic or architectural areas are conserved for tourists, historians and other civic-minded individuals. The cities of Portland, Oregon (See Appendix B), Seattle, Washington in the United States and the City of Montreal in Canada employ such regulations which include control of signs as part of any design.

**Police Power.** Before zoning regulations existed or gained recognition in name or practice, nuisance regulations were recognized as a proper exercise of the police power.

When an incompatible land use, noise or smell constitutes a genuine menace to the surrounding area, it may be
classified as a 'nuisance' and therefore be ordered to cease. Thus, nuisance regulations are considered the spring-board of zoning. The first court cases dealing with nuisances gained recognition as the first legal use of police power. The abatement of nuisances is provided for in the British Columbia Municipal Act, Section 870 and has its origin in the B.N.A. Act, Section 92 (15).

In the United States, the division of powers between the Federal and State government resulted in the granting to the states of the 'police power' which denotes all those regulations of property which are consistent with 'due process of law' and justified by some consideration of public health, safety, welfare and morals. This phrase is similar to that used previously in describing zoning, for the police power became the basis for zoning, building, subdivision, sign regulations and other planning controls.

**Building Code.** This regulation usually controls the construction, demolition, alteration and repair of buildings and contains certain provisions for overhanging signs and various forms of outdoor advertising. The code also regulates size, weight, height and projection of signs from buildings and can describe the materials to be used and the structural requirements for fastening signs to buildings. However the public interest in controlling outdoor advertising is not always confined to the hazards of public safety resulting from
improper construction. Aesthetic considerations, when thought necessary are included with safety, and can be placed in the zoning ordinance, however most efforts to control the location or size of signs in the interests of safety, for those walking or riding beneath, are accomplished by the building code. Statistics on those cities which use the building code for sign regulation are located in Table II.

Sign Ordinance. It appears that the sign ordinance both in Canada and the United States is relatively new to the field of sign regulation. In the 1966 Municipal Year Book, only 47 percent of those reporting regulatory sign controls employed a sign ordinance, with the use of the ordinance decreasing inversely with city size. Most of the cities used a zoning ordinance and/or a building code.

In Canada, the provincial enabling acts grant the municipalities the power to pass by-laws on all matters within their jurisdiction, including a sign by-law. In British Columbia, this is contained in Section 514 (3) of the Municipal Act. Originally concerned with safety, they have turned increasingly to aesthetic considerations in the last ten years.

The Municipality of Richmond, a pioneer in British Columbia in the passing of such a regulation (1957) has banned all billboards, prohibited roof-top signs and third-party signs. Other areas in British Columbia to have passed some form of sign by-law are: Victoria (1963), North Vancouver City (1960), and West Vancouver (1966), to name a few.
The American Society of Planning Officials conducted a study of fourteen major American cities in 1964 on sign control in the Central Business District. They stated that the ordinance provisions of the sample cities were "far too complex for adoption in smaller urban areas," and that "no overall trends are apparent concerning regulatory methods and techniques." It appears that this mode of regulatory sign form is in a state of flux and therefore accounts for the large disproportionate number of cities that do not employ this ordinance.

Types of Sign Controls

It has been frequently said that any regulation of signs is only as good as its enforcement. The following information as reported by the Municipal Year Book, 1966 reveals the existence and consistency of such controls. (See Table III)

Permit. A large majority of cities, 89 percent, require an individual to apply for and receive a permit from the city before the sign is erected. The high percentage of cities in all population groups requiring a permit is consistent. Usually a small fee is charged.

Sign Classification. For effective designation of sign types, more than 56 percent of reporting cities classify signs into types such as pylon, roof, marque etc. It appears the larger the city the more apt it is to classify signs, and conversely the smaller the city, the less frequency to do so.
### TABLE III

**TYPES OF SIGN CONTROLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>No. of Cities Reporting</th>
<th>Specific Regulatory Controls</th>
<th>Require Signs</th>
<th>Require Permit</th>
<th>Annual Inspections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 500,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 to 500,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 250,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 100,000</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 25,000</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>928</strong></td>
<td><strong>888</strong></td>
<td><strong>522</strong></td>
<td><strong>826</strong></td>
<td><strong>274</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sign Inspection. Less than half of the reporting cities (30 percent) conduct annual sign inspections. Of these, the largest majority inspects structural soundness, electrical wiring, location as to property line and conditions of the sign 'face'.

Sign Exemptions. Most common groups of sign exemptions, as reported by the study, are house numbers; official public notices; flag poles displaying only patriotic and civic emblems; name plates for doctors, lawyers, etc; and sale or lease signs. Poles displaying name flags, advertising matter and cemetery signs are most frequently not exempted from sign regulations.

Sign Prohibitions. At least two-thirds of the cities over 10,000 population prohibit all signs in residential zones. These include all sign categories of swinging, projecting over public property, rotating beams, neon, flashing, unidentified or nonadvertising, and animated. Slight differences in sign prohibition exist in central business districts and industrial areas, but generally prohibitions in one are usually applied to the other.

Non-Conforming Signs. When a community passes a sign ordinance there are existing signs that do not meet the new requirements, therefore most ordinances contain provisions for removal of these signs if abandoned, destroyed, or substantially damaged. If the turnover rate of signs is high, as in the Municipality of Richmond, where signs average
approximately five years, there will not be many prosecutions. Since the passing of the Richmond by-law in 1957, there are only two non-conforming signs still in existence at the time of this writing.

The provisions are likely to be 'amortization concepts' which give the owner a period of time to recoup or amortize his investment. According to the American Society of Planning Officials, more and more of those communities with sign regulations are using the amortization concept, which have three to five years as the average period. For example, the City of Victoria has a five year period, while The District of West Vancouver has three years. Some municipalities treat violating signs as 'non-conforming' the same principle as used in zoning.

Implementation and Enforcement Problems

The sign industry has and will continue to lobby against a stringent sign regulation. Conversely, if a community does not enforce its existing sign regulations, many firms will disregard the by-laws governing sign designation. Towards this end, the council of the municipality should be prepared to hire a full time enforcer.

Of particular interest towards this problem is the Planning Advisory Service (P.A.S.) questionnaire study completed in April 1966, in which all P.A.S. subscribers were asked what
ordinances were used for sign regulation, and the success or failures of administrating these provisions. The number of city and country-city agencies to reply were 366 of which 251 city agencies indicated that signs were regulated under one or more ordinances, and 19 either had no authority or elected not to do so when the authority was available. However, only 40% reported some action was taken to enforce their enactments when elimination provisions were introduced. The questionnaires were sent only to P.A.S. subscribers.

"Communities, fearful of a legal confrontation and buffeted by pressure groups, have developed a wide range of devices to satisfy various constituents and protect themselves from a legal battle." This statement points out the liberal attitude that communities adopt against non-conforming signs. When asked in the questionnaire about the lack of provision enforcement, or partial enforcement, the following reasons were given:

1. Lack of staff time.
2. Lack of support from local officials.

Typical comments were:

Lack of sufficient personnel to follow up and enforce regulations.

Shortage of manpower... lack of firm city policy.

Political scene bows to pressure of the billboard industry.

Policy is now to ignore these prior violations but prohibit future violations.
In summary, the report states that it appears harder to enforce the ordinance, than to pass one, and concludes with the statement:

A community that adopts elimination provisions should realize that it has the responsibility to enforce them, regardless of the time it takes or the popularity of the program. 34

Summary

The advertising and sign businesses spend millions of dollars each year in North America on equipment, signs and employees. It is natural that they lobby to promote their business to the utmost. Towards this end, they exert tremendous pressure on the other groups associated with sign placement. These are the landowners, the municipalities and the state or province, each with a conflict of interest.

The enabling acts of Canada, United States and Great Britain are basically established for the same purpose: that of empowering the local authorities, municipal institutions and municipalities with power to pass planning laws such as the zoning, subdivision and sign by-laws or ordinances. Thus each city or urban area can legislate specific regulatory controls for the control of signs.

The zoning, building, sign ordinances through the use of the 'police power' in the United States and Canada are the regulatory measures most often used. It is also through the 'police power' that aesthetic control, as we know it today,
rose to prominence. The famous Billboard Cases of Massachusetts (1954) allowed aesthetic control under the 'police power' to be used for aesthetic purposes only, irregardless of the previous connections with health, safety and public welfare.

Permits, sign classification and sign inspections are types of sign controls employed in American cities, which force municipalities to employ large staffs for routine duties. The enforcement problems of sign legislation are brought to light in view of the shortage of manpower, lack of staff time, and lack of support from local officials.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF CONTROLS IN SELECTED MUNICIPALITIES

Introduction

Present sign regulation appears to have three areas of emphasis. Outdoor advertising signs, including billboards are frequently subject to strict control, particularly in relation to freeways and scenic highways. The size and character of business signs, their location, and their general effect upon the aesthetic quality of the environment are matters which are arousing much concern. Lastly, the emphasis upon standards requiring the safe installation of signs appears to be wide-spread.

The problems that confront any sign ordinance depend on the present situation within the community. The need for sign regulation should be met with as little damage to the community, while considering areal needs for conserving values and promoting the welfare of the people. This often proves difficult as there are different degrees of control which are influenced by the strength of the opposition.

In formulating legislation, the problems that are legal and administrative in nature may be grouped into three areas of conflict.

1. Custom. The customary accepted situation or what has precedent, but has shown the need for its control or prohibi-
tion will prove difficult to legislate against. For example, the billboard, which in the past has been a common occurrence, but has been banned recently in several British Columbia communities in the Lower Mainland Region. The "tied" sign, which advertises a product as well as the identity of the owner, and the "special sale" banners, mobiles and "goods on display", are examples of permitted signs. Other instances of customary occurrences have been the moving, flashing and animated displays which have been traditionally used to attract attention.

2. Interpretation of Words and Phrases. The choice of words and phrases used in the ordinance must be selected carefully, so that interpretation is consistent. The rule of "one word for one meaning" applies especially in this instance. In spelling out the definition of signs, it is of utmost importance that the regulations are clearly aimed at a specific category of sign type. This becomes painfully clear when sections of the ordinance permit or prohibit certain types of signs.

3. Draftsmanship. The interpretation of words and phrases is dependent upon the wording of the device. Thus the ordinance, if drafted according to rules, should be "tight" and generally able to be upheld in courts of law. One of the problems in controlling the appearance of signs is the drafting of the device. "Drafting and administrating regulations ... still appears to be unsolved, except in historical or other special
areas." (See Appendix B)

Recent sign control regulations of selected British Columbia municipalities were chosen for analysis. They prove to be varied in technique, but "Comparison is always useful even though the assumptions used in drafting the selected regulations may not be applicable to other jurisdictions." The examples are:

- The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, 1960, No.2933.
- The City of Victoria, 1963, No.5335.
- The Corporation of Richmond, 1964, No.2071.

Types of Sign Classifications

The existence of various sign shapes and functions eventually leads to the problem of definition. It is difficult to agree on a mutual definition of a sign. (See Appendix A) A clear definition of the categories of signs is a necessity, so that appropriately differing regulations (or exceptions) may be made for each without excessive repetition. Terms used to distinguish physical characteristics will need definition. Among these are "projecting sign", "wall sign", "flashing sign", and others. A further distinction should be made between signs on private property and those which extend over public property, as the latter group may be reasonably subjected to greater restrictions.
BILLBOARD AND ROOF SIGN

Note how the sign destroys the skyline of the cityscape. The "A" frame adds nothing when viewed from behind the sign.

FASCIA SIGNS

The sign coverage of one building must be considered.

CANOPY SIGN

Little control over sign content is displayed here. A complete menu is nearly illustrated.
ILLUSTRATION VII

SIGN TYPES

WALL AND FASCIA SIGNS

The "Classy" wall sign flashes, moves and is animated.

COMBINED PROJECTING AND ROOF SIGNS

Note the exposed structural members in the "A" frame supports. One sign hides the other.

BILLBOARDS

Advertising uses every opportunity to display and advocate products. The owner of this building receives his due.
Of the sign by-laws studied, all had a wide range of definitions for the same sign type or classification as well as including or excluding many categories. (See Table IV) For example a sign in Victoria includes "billboards", whereas in Richmond they are not included as signs. Furthermore, the City of North Vancouver does not recognise any advertising structures which are 4 square feet or less, nor over 6 square feet as signs, for they are defined as "billboards". A "canopy sign" in Richmond and Victoria does not include a "suspended sign", whereas in West Vancouver it is included. Similarly, a "projecting sign" in West Vancouver may project 24 inches from the building and only 12 inches in Victoria and Richmond. The investigation discloses that all definitions for mutual signs types are different in wording, scope and function. A "fascia sign", although agreed to mean a parallel sign to the face of the building, in Richmond, North Vancouver City, Victoria and West Vancouver, does not conform further in definition. West Vancouver does not specify the distance it may project from the building face. The other three specify 12 inches. North Vancouver City further controls a maximum area of sign. This example appears to be the closest in uniformity of those definitions that are existing in all selected municipalities.

The problem of sign definition is further exemplified by the definitions as used by the District of North Vancouver. The classification of signs is based on the use,
TABLE IV
TYPES OF SIGN CLASSIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>North Vancouver District</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>West Vancouver District</th>
<th>North Vancouver City</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fascia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special purpose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy or Marque</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashing or Moving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identificational</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Composite signs serving several places of business, real estate signs, contractor signs.
purpose or function of the sign, such as governmental, informational, identificational etc. This system is entirely different than those used in adjoining municipalities which are based on physical characteristics and thus contributes to the problem of comparing similar sign types.

From these few examples, the sign classification problem can be attributed to the lack of consistency between ordinances.

**Areas Controlled by Sign Regulations**

An analysis of selected municipal data revealed more consistency between the various ordinances in this field. The Municipalities of North Vancouver District and Richmond have the most stringent by-laws, as revealed in Table V. The other municipalities do not apply control over as many areas.

The area controlled most frequently, is sign location. Most of these location controls regulate setback from the property line, projections over the public street and distances from public highways. Other location controls involve permissible areas of the city for various sign types. Most of the municipalities designate their zoning districts (according to their zoning by-law) as their sign control zones. The municipalities of Richmond, West Vancouver and several others permit the erection of signs in certain zoning districts; Richmond by the actual designation of zones of permission, and West Vancouver
### TABLE V

AREAS CONTROLLED BY SIGN REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>North Vancouver District</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>West Vancouver City</th>
<th>North Vancouver City</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (Width &amp; Height)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (Gross Area)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of Light</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Signs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Surface Area</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Structural members may not be exposed.
b. Aesthetics.
by allowing "in all areas of The Municipality other than residential areas".

The City of Victoria, has created six sign zones, each zone classified in accordance with the sign use permitted and assigned to it. These are different from the zoning districts and are thus only applicable to the sign by-law. This method points out the difficulties of deciding the area and placement for sign control. It appears that existing zoning by-law districts would be easier to work to in designating permissible zones for sign location.

Next to location, size and construction of signs are areas most often controlled by regulations. All the examples regulate the width and height of signs, the gross area of signs and sign construction. The total display surface area is highly regulated also.

A great variety of sign sizes are allowed in the municipalities examined. Depending upon the classification of sign, they may be restricted in size from 100 square feet (North Vancouver City); 250 square feet (West Vancouver, freestanding signs); to 500 square feet (Richmond, freestanding signs). Others may restrict sign size, depending on sign type, to a ratio related to each lineal foot of site street frontage (Victoria and West Vancouver). A maximum height, maximum width and minimum height may or may not be mandatory. There is again no consistency among the ordinances.

All the by-laws have a section devoted to construction,
ILLUSTRATION VIII

SIGN ASPECTS

STREET FURNITURE

How many fixtures should be placed on one supporting pole? The public authority has control in this sector.

TORONTO, ONTARIO

This street scene is refreshing to the eye. Signs and street furniture have been controlled for a better environment.

ACCESSORY SIGNS

Private enterprise has the right to be seen, without regard to the ensuing "clutter."
although each have a different degree of emphasis. Richmond, West Vancouver and North Vancouver District have stringent requirements: Victoria, a lesser degree of requirements. In one, North Vancouver City, the requirements are left to the discretion of its Building Inspector. There again appears to be no overall agreement as to the standards.

Two of the by-laws have sections covering sign contents. Both permit signs which devote no more than one-third of its area to the advertisement of products sold on the premises. (Richmond, West Vancouver). The City of North Vancouver does not cover this aspect and the City of Victoria only regulates the total advertising area in each of its six sign zones. The District of North Vancouver specifies that informational signs "shall have white letters, numbers or other symbols on a dark background;" and "shall have letters or numbers no less than 3 inches in height." Identification signs, as well, have a restriction on letter height. Other than the aforementioned, no further control over content is pursued.

The most infrequent areas of regulation are colour, and intensity of light. North Vancouver District regulate the contrasting colour of informational signs, as shown previously. Most of the municipalities require the colour be shown on the plan specification application and other than this, colour is not controlled. The intensity of light, emitted by signs is not usually regulated. Flashing, animated signs, and rotating
beam signs are prohibited by several municipalities. However, this is not based on the intensity of light, but on light movement.

Other areas controlled in sign regulations are concerned with aesthetics and appearance. The Municipalities of Richmond and West Vancouver have moved a step farther than the others in banning "roof-top signs". In addition to this Richmond has stipulated that "all framework and other rigid devices required in the construction of the sign shall be contained within the sign's body in such a manner as not to be visible to the public", and "in no case shall the 'A' frame system ... be used." Revolving signs and any signs that move are banned under the provisions of the West Vancouver By-law. North Vancouver District bans flashing lights and rotating beacons.

Under these regulations these municipalities have moved farther from the safety aspects and closer to the realm of the aesthetic.

Sign Exemptions

The most common exemptions in all regulations are house numbers, official public notices, including municipal signs, flag poles displaying patriotic and civic emblems and real estates signs (with a maximum area). From Table VI an indication from the selected municipalities shows the diverse content of each.
TABLE VI
SIGN EXEMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signs</th>
<th>North Vancouver District</th>
<th>Richmond District</th>
<th>West Vancouver District</th>
<th>North Vancouver City</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Public Notices</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate (For Sale or lease)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xa</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Signs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Signs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Name Plates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags (patriotic)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xb</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Not exceeding six square feet.

b. With some restrictions in size.
Prohibited and Permitted Signs

The problems and strengths of sign ordinances are based on the contents of these sections. "It is not feasible to argue for the removal of all signs, on the other hand a choice for some must be made, allowing others which are necessary, to remain." The prohibition of billboards, revolving signs, roof-top signs has occurred in Richmond and West Vancouver. In addition flashing, animated, moving and beacon signs are banned in West Vancouver and North Vancouver District. Victoria is less stringent, allowing billboards in several areas, as well as many sign classes in others. (See Table VII)

Practically all sign ordinances prohibit advertising signs in residential areas. This is true for the examples studied. The name and/or address of the premises, directional signs, government signs etc. are usually permitted with maximum sizes set forth. (e.g. Victoria, 12 square feet) or other limitations such as its height and projection from various reference points. Table IV, showing the types of sign classifications, and thus the types of signs permitted and prohibited typify the situation - no mutual agreement as to the regulated signs.

Areas Covered in Sign Inspections

The areas covered in sign inspections are as shown
### TABLE VII

#### SIGN PROHIBITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>North Vancouver District</th>
<th>Richmond District</th>
<th>West Vancouver District</th>
<th>North Vancouver District</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>x*d</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating Beams</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Sign</td>
<td>xd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flasing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Signs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xe</td>
<td>xe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboards</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xf</td>
<td>xg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Signs attached to a building which do not advertise occupants, products sold or produced within the building.
b. Must not extend more than 2 feet above roof line.
c. Prohibited in certain sign zones.
d. Not more than one moving part.
e. Refers to a sign with more than one-third of its area devoted to products sold on the premises.
f. Posters, handbills, hoardings.
g. Canvas signs, pennants, bunting, balloons and advertising flags.
in Table VIII. These areas are fairly consistent, but each municipality requires a different degree of inspection and requirement. As mentioned previously in the "construction" of signs, several municipalities are stricter in their requirements than others. These are Richmond, West Vancouver and North Vancouver District. Structural soundness and location as to the property line are the major considerations shown.

General Provisions of Sign Regulations

The Building Department and the Building Inspector of each of the communities are the source of administration and enforcement. One exception was Victoria, in which the City Engineer was the responsible party. The enforcement of sign by-laws must not be left "to the Building Inspector's satisfaction", as this is technically and legally a redelegation of power and thus incorrect. One ordinance in the study uses such wording - North Vancouver City, Section 11, which states "No sign shall be erected, placed or maintained by any person unless it is safely and securely fastened to the structure to which it is attached in a manner satisfactory to the Building Inspector". All the other by-laws state the conditions that must be met, and if not empower the Building Inspector to take action. Some provision should be made for the removal or alteration of all existing signs which are not in conformity at the time of enactment of the regulation. The difficulty is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Structural Soundness</th>
<th>Condition of Sign Face</th>
<th>Electric Wiring</th>
<th>Location As To Property Line</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver District</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver District</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Legislation covers an aesthetic intent.
clearly shown by the range of differences shown in Table IX; West Vancouver, 3 years; North Vancouver District, 5 years; Victoria, 7 years. Richmond on the other hand, does not have a retroactive clause as "by-laws have no retroactive clause, so cannot force people to take signs down, but fortunately, the high sign turnover takes care of this occurrence."

An application for a sign permit and a permit fee was standard practice, and was contingent upon meeting the requirements of the ordinance. Some communities, Richmond and West Vancouver notably, require plans and specifications of the proposed sign as part of the sign permit application. This can protect the community from an undesirable sign, in that it is a precautionary device to ensure that the sign is "not unsightly, grotesque, or inappropriate as to site, design or location".

As the ordinance becomes more sophisticated and more complex "a non-commitant burden is placed on the public agency to administer the regulations". For this reason, the by-law should be as simple as possible.

Three of the examples required applicants for a sign permit to file a bond or insurance certificate to indemnify the city from any damages which may result during the construction or placement of the sign. These were North Vancouver District, Richmond and West Vancouver District. Richmond did not specify an amount, only a bond satisfactory to the Municipal Solicitor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Retroactive Clause (Years)</th>
<th>Permit Fee ($)</th>
<th>Plan Specification</th>
<th>Max. Area (sq.ft.)</th>
<th>Penalty ($$) Days</th>
<th>Insurance ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500a</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>250a</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No-c</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Depending on Sign Classification.
b. An unspecified amount is necessary.
c. Diagram only.
One of the reasons put forth by legal authorities against the use of the zoning by-law for sign control, is the fact that pursuant to the British Columbia Municipal Act, Section 703, all zoning by-laws require a public hearing which could be quite detrimental to the effectiveness of sign control proposed. No municipal council can adopt the proposed zoning without a hearing and publication in a gazette. Traditionally, the hearing is part of the process which is an opportunity for people to voice their objections against the proposals if they feel it infringes upon their private rights. Although no decisions are made at the hearings, considerable sentiments and feelings can take place.

The sign by-law can be a device brought into existence without resorting to a hearing as such. The British Columbia Municipal Act, Section 514 (3) enables its creation and subsequent adoption after three readings in council. Although the sign by-law may be a better method of achieving sign control, in the sense that it avoids some active public disproval, the zoning by-law method may be just as good or better. The quality hinges upon content. Many sign by-laws work in conjunction with the zoning by-laws, by using the existing zones created by the zoning ordinance. The municipalities of Richmond, West Vancouver District, North Vancouver District, and North Vancouver City regulate signs through this method. Only Victoria, of the
examples, regulate through special sign zones. For added con-
trast, the City of Vancouver, and the Municipality of Surrey
apply sign control through the zoning ordinance.

**General Appraisal**

Several significant factors stand out from this examination of sign by-laws. All of the devices generally follow the same sectional format - definition, prohibition, permitted, and so on. The draftsmanship to achieve these ends is mostly different, as is the degree of regulation of "customary" signs. This is reflected in the choice of permitted and prohibited signs and the allowable size of signs. There is as yet no agreed standard in any of the sections of the studied by-laws. This applies to aesthetic as well as structural and safety regulations.

Several by-laws attempt to regulate in a less comprehensive manner than others. Others propose more stringent codes. For example, most of the ordinances were originally concerned with safety, however in the last decade or so, many of them have been aesthetically oriented. It is acknowledged that Victoria was one of the first to consider aesthetic value (1963), which closely followed the pioneering efforts in Richmond (1957) of banning billboards, roof-top signs and unsightly structural members. The most recent by-law is the Lower Mainland Region is definitely aimed at improving the appearance of the community. The District of West Vancouver
in its legislative intent states that "signs which provide a service to people as a whole ... are considered desirable", and "special consideration will be given to proposals for: co-ordinated streetscapes ... designed with the attention of creating an effective and pleasing appearance". This can only be interpreted as another step towards a better environment using sign regulation for the advancement of aesthetic purposes.

Although all the selected by-laws are of diverse character, each in its own situation have been adopted to further the aims of their respective communities. "The detail of the provisions and the lack of uniformity bear witness to the complexity of devising satisfactory sign regulations."

Summary

The analysis of controls in selected communities leads to the conclusion that municipalities have adopted various types of regulation that best fit their particular situations. This reveals itself in the diverse nature of the studied examples. The many types of sign classifications that are permitted shows a random pattern as well as differences in defining the same categories. There is a marked degree of inconsistency shown in the examples. This follows as well in the areas of control, although several areas such as size, construction and location are common to several examples. Sign exemptions and prohibitions show diversity also. Prohibitions are not consistently upheld by any of the ordinances. Sign inspections cover
the same general direction, but each ordinance requires a different degree of structural soundness, wiring etc. A wide range of general provisions are exemplified in retroactive clauses, permit fees, and penalties.

Although all of the selected by-laws differ in characteristics, each shows that the adoption of non-standardized regulations is helping resolve the conflicts of sign regulations.
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CHAPTER V

SIGN REGULATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT

Introduction

There have been many instances in North America where revitalization of urban areas, on a block or areal basis, have been undertaken. These programs, often called 'beautification schemes', have included as one of its ingredients, control or regulation of signs.

Most of these programs have been attempted in urban areas, more specifically in commercial, or 'core' areas. They have tried to halt the slide of deterioration, clutter, blight etc. by means of 'spot' action, a form of rehabilitation or conservation. Victoria, as an example, not only undertook new sign legislation, but restored and preserved Centennial and Bastion Squares, two areas of historical interest, for Centennial Year. The remainder of the program consisted of a paint-up plan in which the City proposed a co-ordinated colour scheme for private buildings, eventually carried out by the owners themselves. The plan succeeded so well that cities in Canada and the United States have asked Victoria for guidance in conducting similar programs.

Other projects involving beautification of urban areas have been in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Champaign, Illinois; and Thomasville, Georgia. The most recent proposal in Canada has
been Vancouver, B.C. (1968) where a beautification plan, co-ordinated by consultants, city officials and merchants, replaced sidewalks with brick-coloured concrete; redesigned light and trolley poles; installed modernistic street furniture; included new street signs: planted trees, shrubs and improved parking and store fronts. The pilot scheme cost $115,000 of which the merchants will pay $73,000 through local improvement taxes, and the balance by the City.

Several examples in Canada are now illustrated to show the efforts of communities to achieve and adopt effective sign control while indicating some of the problems encountered in the legal formulation and administration of their ordinances. The process of adoption is aptly illustrated in the following documentation.

Victoria, British Columbia.

The Setting. The capital of British Columbia, Victoria grew from a Hudson's Bay Company fort and trading post in 1843 to British Columbia's second largest city. Located at the southern tip of Vancouver Island, the City is approximately 9 square miles in area, has a population of 56,464 (1966) and is located within the Capital Region Planning Board, created by the British Columbia Municipal Act in 1951. This regional planning area comprises 220 square miles with a population of 165,000 people. The City has a substantial tourist industry and a heritage of historic buildings. Because of its mild climate,
beautiful gardens and quiet atmosphere it is considered an ideal retirement location.

**The Situation.** Prior to 1959 Victoria was regulated by a sign by-law which has been in existence for many years, but referred almost entirely to structural and safety requirements ignoring the aesthetic impact of signs on the face of the community. These structural and safety regulations eventually became obsolete, for they were devised when sign proliferation, construction, and materials were much different from those existing today. It was this situation that encouraged the invasion of unrestricted signs and contributed to "...seedy store fronts and neon signs that managed to cancel each other out..." Thus urban blight and the first vestiges of environmental clutter were identified in the central areas of Victoria.

A two-fold purpose to advance proposals for new sign control legislation existed at that time.

1. To update the technical regulations of an obsolete by-law.

2. To increase and improve the aesthetic controls over those elements that contribute towards an unsightly urban environment, with particular attention to signs.

The study for such a by-law to regulate signs began in 1959, with a preliminary draft of the proposed sign by-law prepared by the Victoria Architectural and Special Projects Department at City Hall, taking into account the ultimate appearance
expected of City streets while relating signs to buildings and
4 the 'townscape'.

As soon as the document was ready for review by
Council Committee, it became public information, and the sign
industry sent representatives as "observer's." This passive
approach to new legislation by the sign industry was reinforced
immediately by lobbying individual members on Council who were
aware of the contents of the new legislation. This first
encounter was reported by the press, and from this moment the
proposed sign legislation became an issue with closely defined
sides; on one side the sign industry, back by their legal
counsel and pressure from Vancouver and Head Offices of national
advertisers in Eastern Canada; and on the other the local groups
such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Community Planning Associ­
ation of Canada, the Elector's Association, and many other
smaller groups and private citizens.

The sign industry was adament in endeavouring to
'kill' any legislation which imposed a greater degree of sign
control, however, it was apparent that opinion was strongly in
favour of the type of by-law being proposed. Direct pressure
from the sign industry on the Council Committee tended to offset
this, and consequently the true picture was clouded by doubts,
fears and apprehensions. The press and radio reported the many
meetings between both 'sides', trying to be partial, but many
'public interest' articles appeared, supporting the by-law and
thus contributed greatly towards public acceptance for the new ordinance.

**The Formulation Process.** The need for sign control was not initially recognized by Council Committee until the extensive process of education had occurred. The primary research on sign control in advance of the preparation of the draft legislation took the form of assessing existing and proposed sign control in many other cities in Canada and the United States. In addition to this, a study of the effects from lack of control and means and methods of avoiding similar situations in the future were considered in detail.

The problems were numerous. The Council Committee met on a weekly basis to consider every clause, every reason and every implication of the proposals. This continued, for more than a year. Representation in the Special Committee consisted of aldermen, numerous sign industry representatives and the City Planning Officer.

The first draft proposals were almost immediately discarded, as it was obvious that within the Committee, sentiment against any effective change from the old obsolete by-law was prevalent. The process of countless changes and amendments began, with each point gained toward a better sign by-law, a hard-won point. "If it had not been for the obvious general public approval for what was being tried, no progress at all would have been achieved."
In essence, what was finally proposed for legislation, (1963) would eliminate certain types of signs which tended to disfigure structures and buildings and control those not necessary to the immediate occupants of buildings. In this latter category came billboards, rooftop signs, third party advertising. For the remainder, the size and extensions of signs beyond property lines or beyond the profiles of buildings were to be curtailed in a proportion of the size of the premises to which signs could be attached. The location and size of the signs in different parts of the City were to be regulated in accordance with the type of exposure; that is, whether the signs were located in the main business centre, on traffic arteries, on local shopping centres, or in industrial areas. The proposed legislation became a derivative of what would be best for Victoria on a long-term basis, assuming the future of the City would be different than any other North American city, by having its own particular characteristics and amenities which should be retained and not destroyed.

The Evaluation. It appears that any new legislation involving signs must undergo tremendous pressure from vested interest that will, to some degree, change and influence the outcome of the final form. Those people directly implicated in such a situation, would have concrete ideas on the value, significance and final form of the enactment.

The following is the Planning Officer's evaluation
of the Victoria Sign By-law and how applicable the preceding statement is to the problem.

... while it is 100% better than what existed before, it is probably only 20% as good as it could be. Even so the improvements—in the face of the City, especially in the downtown areas, are apparent, and have been favourably commented upon by those who were able to compare on a "before and after" basis. It is, of course, my opinion the sign by-law now in force could and should be improved. The advantages of the new legislation are that it controls signs as a ratio of building frontages and that it limits to some degree the type of sign most likely to disfigure buildings and to disfigure streets: in particular in favouring fascia signs over projecting signs. On the other hand, the present sign by-law permits almost unlimited freedom for billboard exposure, still allows very big roof signs, although smaller than before, and does not effectively control signs in or adjacent to shopping centres in residential districts. 10

He gives the following advice to other urban areas who are contemplating sign by-laws.

... any city considering a sign control by-law requires a dedication to the cause of elimination of disfigurement to their city, a practical approach to the purpose and need of signs, which should not be disputed, and a great deal of perseverance. 11

The by-law is a distinct improvement over the previous regulation, as judged by many recent evaluations. The City has received many inquiries from cities in North America that wish to carry out similar procedures. 12

The foregoing illustration, while oriented towards the process of adoption, introduces the aesthetic purpose of
sign control. The investigation for the improvement of the urban environment lends itself readily to the next example.

Having defined the elements of the environment, and the "outdoor room" earlier in the exercise, and learning that signs are just one of its components, the Sparks Street Mall, Ottawa is presented as an example of an improved environment through the control and use of signs.

The Sparks Street Mall.

The Setting. Ottawa is the capital of Canada and the seat of federal government. It has a population of 289,000 (1966) and an area of approximately 8 square miles. The City has its own planning commission, but there exists by Government authority a regional agency, the National Capital Commission (N.C.C.) to aid the City and the surrounding municipal governments in planning matters. The N.C.C. area comprises 1800 square miles including the Ottawa-Hull metropolitan areas in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, with a population of over one-half million people. Since 1956 the rate of population growth in this Region has been the third highest in Canada, after Calgary and Edmonton.

In the late 1950's increasing competition from spreading shopping centres began worrying merchants in the downtown areas of Ottawa. The automobile explosion had the effect of making suburban centres possible and increasing traffic congestion and parking problems in downtown. This problem has been docu-
mented in earlier chapters. The solution to bring the people back to the city's downtown was thought to be a mall, which would be oriented to the pedestrian. The mall craze was in vogue at this period throughout America. Between 1957 and 1959 at least fifty experiments had been tried in cities such as Toledo, Ohio; Kalamazoo, Michigan; Miami Beach, Florida; Pamona, California and Knoxville, Tennessee.

The Initial Scheme. In 1945, the federal government, concerned over the development of the Capital region, appointed a French planner, Jacques Greber, to direct the preparation of a master plan for the N.C.C. While in Ottawa he suggested the concept of a pedestrian mall for the three main blocks of shopping on Sparks Street. This idea received support in 1959.

After an inspection of a similar scheme in Toledo, Ohio, and considering the success of Kalamazoo, Michigan, which was the first American shopping mall (March 19, 1959), over 70% of the Sparks Street merchants agreed to form the Sparks Street Development Association (S.S.D.A.)

In the Association were merchants, architects, City and N.C.C. representatives who were to formulate Canada's first mall. A budget of $30,000 was agreed upon, to be shared equally between the merchants and the City. A minor disagreement over the cost of covering abandoned street car tracks was solved, with the City finally agreeing to meet this cost in order to initiate the scheme which would protect approximately $1 million in tax revenue from the three experimental blocks.
THE EXISTING STREET

Sparks Street as it had existed for many years. This is a typical scene in the city.

THE FUTURE MALL

The ultimate proposal if the mall becomes a permanent fixture in downtown Ottawa.
The design of the Mall was handled by a design committee with representatives from the City, N.C.C. and local architects. The aim was to create an urban environment in which trees, flowers, grass, water, outdoor cafes, sculpture and other design features created a relaxed pleasant atmosphere dedicated to resting, strolling, shopping, seeing and being seen. Another aim was to gain experience for the operation of a more permanent mall for Centennial Year 1967.

The first step was to close the streets to cars by City By-law. This by-law, a $1 million Downtown Parking and Pedestrian Mall By-law, was voted on by all property owners in the City, as it was felt that everyone in the City, not just those in the immediate area, would benefit from the plan. This was passed June 23, 1960. It provided funds for additional parking in the downtown area.

The street was closed from May 14, 1960 to September 3, 1960 to all vehicular traffic except police, fire and delivery vehicles, assuming those services would be continued through the promenade, as there was no connection to lanes at the rear of stores.

Since it was a temporary mall, none of the street furnishings such as curbs, fire hydrants, street lamps, pavement or street signs could be altered. The outdoor room had to remain the same. Within three days the merchants had completed painting, landscaping, decorating and building pavillons and restaurants.
The first block west of Confederation Square (at the east end of the scheme) contained a sidewalk cafe for 35 patrons, a gayly coloured entrance pavillion, and a City-operated tourist kiosk. The next block had a fashion show pavillion, another European-type restaurant and an outdoor pool. The last block contained a children's play area and a merchandising pavillion.

The following problems were encountered:

1. The police and fire service could not reach all parts of the area because of limited access.

2. Deliveries had to be restricted to before 8 A.M. and between 6 and 8 P.M.

3. Elimination of on-street parking put pressure on nearby parking facilities.

These problems proved to be only minor in nature and soon were overcome.

To the dismay of those who were against the Mall, the scheme achieved much public approval and acceptance. It was decided that a survey would be conducted after the first year's operation to assess the effect of the mall on the area. The research committee consisted of a City traffic engineer, a statistician, a member of the parking authority, representatives of the governments, and several businessmen.

The survey consisted of 1) An analysis of store sales figures in comparison with the year before. 2) The effects of the mall on traffic patterns and use of parking spaces.
3) Pedestrian and traffic counts. 4) On-the-spot interviews with shoppers.

The results were encouraging. All groups reported a substantial increase in business during the experiment in comparison with the previous sales of 1959. Of 2000 people polled, 92% liked the mall and 89% wanted it to be permanent. Of those who objected, parking, or the lack of it, was the reason given. The summary of the report stated that "Ottawa's mall is a smashing business and aesthetic success." Further testimony to its success was the announcement by Rideau Street merchants, east of Confederation Square, that a long term redevelopment plan for that street would be proposed along the same ideas of Sparks Street.

The 1961 version of the mall was an instant hit. In 1962 the mall was studied by the S.S.D.A. to gauge if the mall's previous success was due to the attraction of a novelty. The basic soundness of the concept was proven by research. From this, a permanent mall was considered.

The Permanent Mall. A Citizen's Committee was formed in 1963 by the S.S.D.A. to assess the permanent mall and propose a cost estimate and design.

The suggested design consisted of a new decorative street surface from building line to building line; continuous canopies to protect shoppers from sun, rain, and snow with gas-fired infra red heaters in the canopy soffits to warm pedes-
trains in the winter; overhanging signs banned from the mall, with illuminated signs hung below the canopies, allowing the canopies to be used as a continuous sign fascia under strict design control. The elimination of sign clutter was a critical consideration for achieving the atmosphere of seeing and being seen. Each block was to have a design feature; a sculptured court with an outdoor cafe in one; information kiosks in another; an outdoor pool in the third. To enforce the regulations, the S.S.D.A. appointed custodians to maintain the mall, and oversee sign and building changes.

The cost of the project was $165,000 for the cost of repairs and reconstruction of the street; $445,000 for the Mall itself (which the Citizen's Committee suggested to be split between the City and property owners equally). Under this formula the capital costs were $360,000 to the City and $250,000 to the owners. All buildings on City property would pay rent to the City, adding much to the City treasury.

The Citizens Committee report was presented to the City in October, 1963. The City then included a permanent Sparks Street mall on its projected five year plan of capital projects, to be completed in time for Centennial Year 1967.

Another Canadian City to undertake sign legislation within an overall program of environmental improvement has been Niagara Falls, Ontario (1965).
Niagara Falls, Ontario.

This by-law was instigated by a group of local landlords, businessmen and private citizens. The condition of the downtown business district was "run-down and shabby" with most buildings in need of repair, paint and new signs. A local group of architects collaborated with the citizens for a beautification scheme called the "Queen Street Restoration Program", suggesting ways and means as well as design and colour co-ordination. A petition for a new sign by-law revealed eighty percent of those polled desiring new regulations.

The City Council was approached to co-operate with the Citizen's Committee, with the Planning Director acting as a liason for the two groups. Integration of the scheme with parking, building beautification and future mall was considered by the planners.

The sign industry on the other hand resented the new legislation and began to exert pressure on Council and other connected parties. The main points of contention were 1) Sign Size, 2) Appearance, 3) Permitted Signs. After much discussion, the opponents co-operated with the Design Committee, accepted the idea and worked with the Committee. They then contacted the merchants to work out plans for the purchase of new fascia signs.

Since the passing of new legislation (1965), the main street of Niagara Falls has met with much approval from
residents and tourists and received many plaudits on its upgraded appearance.

Not all sign regulation has been initiated solely towards improving the community's appearance, as the Municipality of West Vancouver has done, whose legislative intent is clearly stated as "intended to encourage a pleasing streetscape" with special considerations given to "paint-up projects" and placement and styling of signs "with the intention of creating an effective and pleasing appearance." Contrary to the foregoing idea, Montreal's new sign legislation (1963) was adopted for a different purpose.

Previous to the adoption of its new by-law, Montreal's regulation of signs consisted of numerous by-laws (69 or more), because the zoning of the City depended on by-laws made originally on each of its municipal wards. Thus signs were controlled by by-laws which applied generally to the whole City and some which applied only to sections. In general, sign control was adequate in residential areas, but commercial and industrial areas had much to be desired. The preparation of the new by-law was to fill the need for an overall uniform regulation for the whole City, and to impose adequate requirements in those areas of deficiency. Since its passage there have been few amendments, because the by-law is doing "a good job".

Similarly, the Municipality of Burnaby, at present
without a sign by-law, is formulating such a device as a preventative precautionary measure against sign proliferation. The building by-law is now the controlling device, and has proven less than desirable.

Summary

The preceding chapters have been largely devoted to a review of the literature in ascertaining the various implications of signs and their effect on the environment. By means of the case study method, the investigation analyses several Canadian cities in the action of formulating and adopting new sign legislation thus controlling signs to achieve a better urban environment.

Victoria, a city with a sign proliferation problem, could trace its difficulties to an old, obsolete by-law, which enabled signs to gain notoriety. To combat strong lobbying by the sign industry, the local municipality initiated discussions and meetings until a sign ordinance satisfactory to all groups concerned was finalized. This illustrated the process of adopting sign control.

The effect of sign control on the urban environment is aptly demonstrated in the study of Ottawa's Mall. The objective was to create a 'pleasant relaxed atmosphere'. To do this, the local authorities, applied their delegated powers to control the fixtures in the public-right-of-way to achieve the desired effect. Sign regulation, one of the
elements necessary in the total improvement scheme, was manipulated to substantially increase the favourable reaction to the plan. The apparent success of the experiment adds weight to the methods employed in achieving the results.
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CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of the Study

The introductory chapters of the study were largely devoted to establishing the fundamental problems associated with sign regulation. These can be stated as the physical (appearance, aesthetic, proliferation etc.), the political (private and public interest), the administrative and the legal or formulation problems. An outline of the existing urban environment is then attempted for some description within the sphere of operation is needed. The urban environment is studied for its elements, its integral parts and the role of signs.

In the following chapters, sign information is investigated to bring the media into focus. Basic history, definition, function and problems were outlined for a fuller understanding to the existence of signs. The presentation of current regulatory methods and statistics show significant trends in their use. The examination of this information revealed many differences in sign definition and classification for the purposes of control.

The analysis of existing regulatory methods revealed three significant observations. The first was the relatively small number of cities that used sign ordinances; the second was the trend for the law to uphold the aesthetic more frequently, thus meaning more favourable sign control decisions; and the
third was the relatively low number of municipalities that enforced new provisions because of lack of staff or political pressures. The statistics reveal a transitional period in North America, with more sign ordinances being enacted each year, but still being less than one-half the total number employed. The enforcement problem points out the laxity of municipalities, their unwillingness to enter a 'fight' and the power of private enterprise.

The analysis of control areas introduces the main emphasis of the study in that formulation of any device to control signs and thus control the environment, introduces numerous problems. Five control areas in British Columbia are analysed. Their legislation is specifically examined in the areas of sign classification, areas of control, exemptions, prohibitions, inspections and general provisions. Observations reveal that a comparison of ordinances results in a diversity of content. Aesthetic intent in two ordinances shows the aesthetic purpose of each enactment to influence the community's environment. However each legislation appears to have been enacted according to individual needs and problems, thus leading to the diverse nature of controls.

The City of Victoria was used as a case study to state clearly the problems encountered in formulating and adopting sign control. The aesthetic intent of the by-law led to public and private differences that shaped the form of the resulting enactment. The case study of Ottawa's Sparks
Street Mall shows as well that sign control can be used towards an effective environment. Observations reveal that signs as one of the necessary parts of the outdoor room can influence the overall program of environmental improvement.

Recommendations

In light of the findings it may be presumed that a course of action for formulating sign legislation is possible, to be used in urban areas for the provision of an effective environment. The achievement of control should be based on the collaborating powers of both private and public sectors to achieve meaningful results. Although the "interests" of both sectors lead to diverse regulations, the ultimate goal should be controlling the direction of the developing environment by means of sign regulation. A task force to put action into the revitalization or protection of any urban area must be formed consisting of city and private business representatives, so that proposals can be all inclusive. Sign control should be one of the fundamental parts of an overall total improvement program, mindful that such controls must be endorsed by public opinion, especially by those affected. The roles of the private and public sectors are expressed below to place the previously observed conflicts in their proper context.

Local Municipality

Throughout the study, the underlying element has
been the 'public interest'. The problem of signs whether it be proliferation, appearance, location or administrative, must be ultimately considered in light of the 'interest' of the people. It is observed that in some cases, the initial reaction for sign control has been local business or private individuals, and in other cases, the local municipality.

Central responsibility must reside with local government, because the beautifying of any section of the urban area involves public policy and the undertaking of public works. As a delegated power, the municipality is responsible for all of the elements that exist on the public right-of-way. The design and placement of public furnishings as well as private advertising are the important factors to be considered.

The first step must be the education of the citizens as to the advantages of legislation, how it will work, and when it will be considered. Leadership by the municipality in applying and directing programs in an administrative and advisory capacity would be a contributing factor in achieving meaningful private co-operation. It must be impressed on the public that they are not compelled to accept their surroundings. As Victoria and Ottawa showed, a successful environmental program depended upon enthusiasm by both civic government and downtown merchants as well as an adequate staff and extensive public relations.
Private Enterprise

Active participation instead of public apathy is needed both by private enterprise and individual citizens to formulate and put the program into effect. Businessmen in many cities have realized that success depends on a healthy city, and unless they invest time, effort and money, progress can go elsewhere. Collaboration between public and private sectors can be sparked by dynamic leadership from private enterprise as well. Action can be through a group, a Board of Trade, a professional group or similar community organizations.

Once the program is under way, private enterprise can contribute by participating in the formulation of sign content, thus the specific needs of the community can be met by those that will be affected.

Lastly it should be borne in mind that imposition of controls needs to be endowed by public opinion to realize the benefits of the program.

Appraisal of the Assumptions and the Hypothesis

It was necessary to establish a number of assumptions before undertaking the study. The first assumption that "it is desirable for man to seek and demand an environment which will contribute towards his well-being" found support
from the literature—Ian Nairn stated that "mans aim always, is to improve and intensify the quality of life"; James Rouse, who describes the flight of urbanities from the city as a flight to find a new style of life; other who imply that man is continually seeking a better environment.

The second assumption concerns the validity of the 'public interest'. Throughout the exercise, the public interest has been one of the significant factors to arise from the actions of public officials. As representatives of the people, it is their duty to act in accordance with the public's interest. This is substantiated by observations in the studies of Victoria and Ottawa. Further documentation as to the validity and usefulness of the public interest is shown in the Vermont and Massachusetts legislation, where apparent clashes between the public interest and private investment were resolved in decisions for the public good.

The factors that effect the last assumption, "that sign regulation is desirable and possible, with some optimum" are readily apparent by the studies in the preceding chapters. Investigation into recent sign regulation attempts by several communities point out the need and desire for either new or revised sign regulations. The prescence of numerous levels of control may not show an optimum level of achievement but it emphasizes that sign control is possible and is being applied. "It is only 20% as good as it should be" reflects the situation
in one statement. The observed difficulties extend from the complexities of the desired level of regulation, the encountered problems in achieving these levels and the control or enforcement of the regulations, once they have been established.

The suggested explanation of the problems, as put forth by the hypothesis is that

The aesthetic purpose of sign regulation leads to a conflict of public and private interests that is being resolved by the adoption of diverse municipal sign regulations.

To be verified, the following observations in the study were noted:

The analysis of selected municipalities demonstrates the aesthetic purpose of sign regulation. As seen by several municipalities, it is the intent of legislation that improvement of appearance, a pleasing cityscape and prevention of the confusion arising from sign conflicts, are some of the purposes of sign regulation.

Ordinances oriented to the above purposes have led to public and private differences. This was observed in Victoria, Ottawa, and several other communities. The resolution of these differences is noted in the diversity of the resultant sign by-laws. The lack of uniformity points out the complexity of devising sign regulations. As such, they are useful for they provide a variety of regulating techniques for
others to use on a comparative basis.

Without adequate sign control, evidence was found that deterioration of urban areas often occurred. A heterogeneous ordinance in itself is not bad, if formulation of the device can be accomplished multi-laterally between public and private elements. The overall improvement of the environment must include regulation of signs.

It is felt that the hypothesis is reasonable, and should be supported. However, adequate aesthetics, nor even an effective environment cannot be guaranteed by regulation. There must be strong enforcement as well. Subject to the limitations of the investigation itself the hypothesis is considered valid and sign regulation should be encouraged in urban areas.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The investigation revealed that further study and research is needed in the fields of sign regulation and the complex urban environment.

Sign regulations have proven to be highly diverse, thus lending the notion that municipalities are unsure what areas should be covered and what level of control should be pursued. More studies should be continued along these lines, as well as sign appearance, sign content research and 'optimum' control research to aid in selecting a desired level.

The studies of Lynch, Kepes and others have been
pioneering attempts for the study of man in his environment, and have provided the impetus for further research. Towards this end, it is suggested that work be continued in the fields of urban environment with all of its interrelated elements, enabling signs and their regulations to be measured in light of their contribution to the overall effect. The methods for measuring such aspects should be pursued; the values that individuals place on convenience, comfort, aesthetics, light, open spaces and other factors that contribute to our living enjoyment.

Lastly, a continued effort towards studying the sign as a media of communication should proceed and hopefully add information towards sign regulation and use.
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APPENDIX A

DEFINITION OF SIGNS:
The New York zoning resolution (1961, as amended) defines a sign as:

any writing (including letter, word, or numeral); pictorial representation (including illustration or decoration); emblem (including device, symbol, or trademark); flag (including banner or pennant); or any other figure of similar character, which

(a) is a structure or any part thereof, or is attached to, painted on, or in any other manner represented on a building or other structure, and

(b) is used to announce, direct attention to, or advertise, and

(c) is visible from outside a building. A sign shall include writing, representation, or other figure of similar character within a building only when illuminated and located in a window.

The zoning resolution further distinguishes between "advertising signs" (in other ordinances sometimes referred to as non-accessory signs) as signs which direct attention to a business, profession, commodity, service, or entertainment conducted, sold, or offered elsewhere than upon the same zoning lot, and "business signs" (sometimes referred to as accessory signs) which direct attention to a profession, business, commodity, service, or entertainment conducted, sold, or offered upon the same zoning lot.

The zoning ordinance of Cincinnati (1963) employs a threefold definition. First, signs are defined according to the type of message conveyed:

a. Real Estate: A sign advertising the sale, rental or lease of the premises on which it is maintained, including a subdivision sign.

b. Instructional: A sign conveying instructions with respect to the premises on which it is maintained, such as a sign designating the entrance to or exit from a parking area, a trespassing sign, a danger sign, and similar signs.

c. Professional: A sign indicating the name and occupation of a professional person or group of associated professional persons.

d. Identification: A sign other than a bulletin board sign indicating the name of a permitted use, the name or address of a building, or the name of the management thereof.

e. Nameplate: A sign indicating the name and address of an occupant.
f. **Bulletin Board**: A sign of permanent character, but with moveable letters, words or numerals, indicating the names of persons associated with, or events conducted upon, or products or services offered upon, the premises upon which such sign is maintained.

g. **Announcement**: A sign of temporary character indicating the names of persons associated with, or events conducted upon, the premises upon which the sign is maintained. In Districts where business or industry is permitted, an announcement sign shall also include a sign of temporary or permanent character indicating products or services offered upon the premises where the sign is maintained.

h. **Business**: A sign directing attention to a business, commodity, service, or entertainment conducted, sold or offered upon the same premises as those upon which the sign is maintained.

i. **Advertising**: A sign directing attention to a business, commodity, service or entertainment conducted, sold or offered elsewhere than upon the premises where the sign is maintained, including a billboard sign. An advertising sign shall also include a sign directing attention to a product or service offered upon the premises, but which product or service is or could be offered elsewhere than on the same premises.

Secondly, signs are defined according to the location on the premises or the method of attachment:

a. **Wall**: A sign erected against the wall of any building with the exposed face thereof in a plane parallel to the plane of said wall, and which sign is mounted at a distance, measured perpendicular to said wall, no greater than eighteen (18) inches. A wall sign shall include a sign suspended from the ceiling of a marquee, canopy or vestibule where such sign does not project into the street right-of-way.

b. **Projecting Street**: A sign erected approximately perpendicular to the street right-of-way line, including a sign similarly erected at the corner of a building, and projecting into the right-of-way of any street, sidewalk, alley or other public thoroughfare. A projecting street sign shall also include a sign suspended from the ceiling or a marquee, canopy or vestibule where such sign is located in the street right-of-way.

c. **Projecting Yard**: A sign erected approximately perpendicular to the wall of a building, including a sign erected at the corner of a building and projecting into an open space or yard but not projecting into the right-of-way of any street, sidewalk, alley or other public thoroughfare.
d. **Roof**: A sign erected upon the roof of any building.

e. **Ground**: A detached sign erected upon or supported by the ground.

f. **Marquee**: A sign other than a projecting sign mounted on the marquee of any building.

g. **Canopy or Awning**: A sign other than a projecting sign designated on a canopy or awning and identifying the name or address of a building or an establishment contained therein.

Thirdly, signs are defined according to the degree of illumination:

a. **Illuminated**: A sign designed to give forth any artificial light or reflect such light from an artificial source.

b. **Indirect-Illuminated**: An illuminated, non-flashing sign whose illumination is derived entirely from an external artificial source and which is so arranged that no direct rays of light are projected from such artificial source into residences or streets.

c. **Flashing**: An illuminated sign, whether stationary, revolving or rotating, which exhibits changing light or color effects, provided that revolving or rotating signs which exhibit no changing light or color effects other than those produced by revolution or rotation shall be deemed flashing signs only if they exhibit noticeable changes in such light intensity or color effects.
APPENDIX • B

EXAMPLE OF DESIGN ZONING.

PORTLAND, OREGON
Purpose:

Design Control Zones have been adopted for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the appearance of the City of Portland, especially in areas of existing or potential scenic value, of historical note, of architectural merit, or of interest to tourists, and for the purpose of assisting property owners to maintain the appearance or architectural tone of their areas.

Regulations:

In a Design Zone all the regulations of the regular zone shall apply; and, in addition, no building permit or other permit shall be issued for construction or alteration of any building or structure or the use of any land until proposed plans and elevations are reviewed and approved in writing as to location and design by the Design Committee of the City Planning Commission.
As provided in Section 6-3105 of the Zoning Code, and in order to protect the public interest and to assist applicants for permits in design zones and in order to maintain suitable relationships between new and existing structures within each zone, the Design Committee shall be guided by the following general standards:

Design Zone No. 1 - South Park Blocks

The structures in this zone shall be designed to maintain and enhance the park-like appearance of this area.

In this zone identification signs shall be included as part of the design.

Unless otherwise approved, utilities shall be concealed underground.

Relationship of a proposed structure to existing structures and the protection of existing trees and monuments shall be of primary consideration.

Design Zone No. 2 - Memorial Coliseum

This zone shall be developed to provide a setting for spectator sports, conventions, ceremonies, exhibitions, and other public events related to the major structures.

In this zone identification signs shall be included as part of the design. Size, design and location of advertising signs, poster panels and billboards shall be submitted.

Unless otherwise approved, utilities shall be concealed underground.

Design Zone No. 3 - Terwilliger Boulevard

This zone shall be developed as a scenic parkway. Primary consideration shall be given to safeguarding unobstructed views.

Design Zone No. 4 - Skidmore Fountain

In this zone, encouragement shall be given to the economic restoration of the area as a unique historical, cultural and commercial sector of the City, attractive to citizens and tourists.

In reviewing designs for proposed structures, or for the renovation of existing structures, primary consideration shall be given to the appropriate maintenance of the character of the area and to encourage a harmonious esthetic relationship between the existing structures and all new construction.
Skidmore Fountain Village Design Zone