

Attachment D to LGL2024-010

Summary of Email Responses from Public Engagement

	Comments
1	No mature tree should be cut down on any Private Property, unless deemed unhealthy and if a mature tree is cut down it is replaced by a silver back maple tree, no pine or fur trees. Better air filtration.
2	What is the definition of Low Income?
3	<p>So sick of the city pulling extra taxes and fees out of their ass so lets just make up a new department and pay more people and increase the cost of government and taxes and create more bureaucracy, the only people to benefit from this will be the tree services that will no doubt charge for a "consultation" to see if a tree can come down. The city of Toronto at 1 point was 5 years behind in granting tree cutting permits.</p> <p>I agree that you should plant another tree somewhere if one has to go. The city is so hypocritical as they have no compunction about clearcutting lakefront land to build high density hideous condo developments like those in Fenelon Falls. Most property owners find it a painful hard choice to cut down a tree and go to lengths to go around a tree when building their house and usually plant replacement trees and natural stone and native plant landscaping . and its the city and their developers who are the assholes here, follow the money.</p> <p>This is a typical money grab and so tone deaf people are hurting life is now outrageously expensive so leave us alone and don't add to the burden instead maybe worry about the raw sewage going into lakes and rivers every time it rains.</p> <p>I agree a tree for a tree but check your FEES It is far more beneficial to plant a tree than give the city money and wait god knows how long and god knows how much for the city to decide.</p> <p>Taxes and spending are out of control in Kawartha Lakes so give us break and stop dreaming up ways to take our money.</p>
4	I do not see a need to implement a by law to control the cutting down of trees. I can see regulating the cutting of trees on subdivision property where they clear

	<p>cut the property because it is easier to build. There are often trees that are cut that do not impede the building but it is practice to clear cut the property. If you are concerned about the health of the lakes look at septic. There are probably existing by laws for that but no one enforces them. I do not see a need for this by law</p>
5	<p>Tree Service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Definition of a mature sapling? <p>Not a common term used in the industry. Typically we would state a size of tree in to be replaced in millimeters. That is how they are often sold in nurseries. Also, a list of species to be encouraged. This would prevent a homeowner replanting with invasives or non native. Planting non native species truly does not fit a residential canopy initiative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mature tree classified as a 5in tree? <p>Typically other cities will classify a mature tree as 30cm or larger. Factors for this being many aren't classified as mature at 12cm. In addition, does the City of Kawartha Lakes have the staffing to monitor and process this many trees? A back logged permit system will result in many ignoring it completely. As a tree service owner, time is money, we cannot afford to be waiting on permits backlogged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unhealthy tree to be determined by professional? <p>Defining terms of a professional? Required information to classify it as healthy? Defects/concerns to be noted on quote as reference? This would provide evidence in case of a complaint from neighbour witnessing removal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terminology <p>"Cutting down" would be better replaced with "removal of". This would reduce any confusion of if stump removal is allowed.</p> <p>Building an effective tree by law permit must consist of an achievable scope of work based on the staffing available. In addition to staffing, there must be realistic guidelines implemented provided by a professional in the industry.</p>
6	<p>The proposed tree by-law is vague. It includes the phrase located 30 meters (98.4 ft) from shoreline Does this mean</p> <p>Exactly 30 metres</p>

More than 30 metres

Less than 30 metres

What if a property is both more than 30 metres and less than 30 metres from a shoreline?

Why is distance from a shoreline even significant?

There seem to be 2 distinct purposes for this proposed by-law,
1 - to protect shoreline trees, trees in environmentally-protected areas,
and

2 - to ensure that subdivision development is done in a manner that
protects existing tree cover

Would it clarify things if there were 2 by-laws, one addressing each
purpose? I was certainly confused by the mixing of the 2 purposes. 2
by-laws would allow people interested in just one purpose to comment
explicitly on that topic.

In my case, I know nothing about the second intent, so will comment just on
the first.

In your comments below, you talk about "with respect to Lake Scugog, you will
see that forest cover within 30 metres of the shoreline is 57%, and the
target is 75%." In the Lake Scugog Lake Management Plan, these numbers
refer to "vegetated cover", not to forest or trees ("In the Lake Scugog watershed,
there is a 57% average of natural, vegetated cover within a
30-metre riparian buffer zone, well below the 75% recommended by Environment
Canada.") In the Plan, the corresponding numbers related to trees are 24.8%
and 30%.

Let's look at how to get from 24.8% to 30%. Clearly, restricting the cutting of
trees is not going to get there; even if all trees continue to grow, the coverage is
not going to increase by 20% (24.8 to 30). The only way to get there is to plant
more trees.

Encouraging property owners to plant more trees may require incentives, not

	<p>restrictive bylaws. For example, what if every waterfront owner were allowed a \$20 annual property tax reduction for every mature tree (to some maximum number, such as 20) within 30 metres of the waterfront? Would this, or some other incentive, achieve the target?</p> <p>As you can see, I believe that, now that we understand the goal, a restrictive tree-cutting bylaw may prove useless in getting to the goal, while some form of incentive might work miracles.</p>
7	<p>It is not obvious to me what it is that we are trying to achieve – beyond what is stated which feels incongruent – since the rationale and the by-law don't seem to align or be logical (ie) the tree canopy in the City doesn't require protection in the way it has been outlined or the by-law has been structure. After reading the proposed by-law it almost feels like there is a very important need requiring attention but the by-law is too broad and too encompassing to adequately address the issue that has brought this by-law to this point. I would recommend reviewing what it is that is trying to be achieved and to devise a more specific and precise by-law to address whatever that particular need may be. All this to say I think more specificity and alignment is required as this by-law seems out of place in a largely rural City.</p> <p>Should you wish to proceed in the current iteration I would recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limiting the by-law to more urban areas of the City. Clarify how enforcement will occur (eg) is the City going to inventory all of its trees and then perform an audit to or we relying to neighbours to escalate proposed violations to the City. How will a violation be determined after a tree has been removed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Further to this – with the firewood carve out which is incredibly important - how do you prevent any tree from being cut down and then stating it was for home heating? ii. If one chooses to replace a cut down tree with a sapling and it dies is the resident required to continually replant? Clarify who is an expert that can validate if a tree is a danger/unhealthy – is by a certified arborist only? If yes, where will these services come from as they are currently limited within the City? In an area like we live many people possess this expertise through experience or simply knowledge (ie) do we need an expert to tell a homeowner/City that an ash tree affected by the emerald ash borer is a hazard? While I can appreciate the need for financial relief, basing it solely on income leaves out families with higher incomes and, as a result of their cost

	<p>structure, rather than their income, and could make for difficult choices. If you proceed with financial relief a better 'needs test' would be required.</p> <p>Should the setback from a shoreline be aligned with the setback for building/conduction purposes?</p> <p>There should be some relief/process for tree removal as it relates to the square meter coverage required for new building on existing lots where the lots are smaller.</p> <p>It is not clear, if an environmentally protected area, could a tree be removed is structurally unsound and posing a hazard or for home heating.</p> <p>Should there be an outright exclusion for lots over a certain size (ie) greater than 10 acres.</p> <p>How would this impact trees that are on a lot line?</p>
8	Home heating users concerned with the \$1,700/ mature tree.
9	Why are golf courses except?
10	What is the defn of "forestry"?
11	<p>Owns a large property and is concerned as to whether or not it is regulated as EP designation, given a OS zoning.</p> <p>"I am confident that the majority of woodlots in the municipality are on land that qualifies for the farm rate tax reduction and are not under the MNFR's managed forest program. Certainly this is true of my farm and of others of my acquaintance. I note the Official Plan permits forestry, including on land zoned EP, and it does not specify it needs to be under a MNRF managed forest plan."</p> <p>References section 16 of the Official Plan: Rural – Goals s.16.1(a): "To promote growth and development of the City's agricultural and natural resources through a sound economic, social and environmental framework." s.16.3: "The primary use will be agriculture in the form of ranching and forestry." In the list of uses is "forestry management"</p>
12	I think if the city requires a professional opinion on the health of a tree they should at least cover part of the cost.
13	<p>Farm: First of all. I am happy to see agriculture exemptions. I would like to have riparian areas removed from this exemption. Riparian areas should be protected everywhere. Except for maintaining field edges or hazard trees removal.</p> <p>For fuel wood. Fuel wood should only be for personal use.</p>

	Wants forestry to be based on good forestry practice.
14	Seriously another tax most of us are trying to get by and cost of living is up 38-50% your disgusting greedy bastards. You serious think 1700\$ a tree is okay I would love to know the name of the person who suggested it. Make sure they never get into any position of power again. Seriously do something with this dump of a city. You take take take for what some brick sidewalks in that dump. Crack heads everywhere homeless everywhere and you dinging a person who is trying to get by fuck you!
15	You people are nuts
16	<p>Arborist:</p> <p>I am an ISA Certified Arborist and can't agree more with this bylaw, however I would suggest increasing the permit size from 12cm DbH to 30cm DbH. City's like Richmond Hill have a 15cm DbH policy and I have seen too many times voluntary seedlings becoming a problem after that 15cm mark but before 30cm. A lot of people don't know they have a problem until they have a tree in the way, at 12cmDbH it is barely a stick.</p> <p>Failing to create a more reasonable permit size will create A LOT of unnecessary paperwork and make the bylaw extremely difficult to enforce.</p> <p>Just my 2 cents from many years of forestry and arboriculture experience, and working with many different municipalities over those years.</p>
17	I do not support this proposal. In my opinion, it is a tax grab and focuses only on specific people within the community. As a waterfront owner I feel unfairly targeted. Either make the bylaw applicable to all in the city fairly, or perhaps change it to encourage planting of trees rather than focusing on taxing removal. A "strategic priority of a Healthy Environment" is great, but not at the cost of the few. As a primarily rural community, this makes no sense given the abundance of trees freely established already. In the few cities this would make more sense versus focusing on rural areas. Further, most trees are invasive/non-native and, if we are going to try and focus on a health environment, these should be removed to encourage native species to flourish.
18	<p>I don't think this is going to be very popular with property owners or tree companies. I can see it being viewed as a cash grab. There is also the question of who at the City has the staff to manage this file. They will be overwhelmed. This will be a huge file.</p> <p>Another important exemption that needs to be added is that if tree roots are getting too close to septic tile beds. Maybe you have that covered in the</p>

	<p>exemption that reads "trees that pose a hazard to structures", where a septic tile bed is defined as a structure.</p>
19	<p>To whom it my concern.I think that in this day 90% of people would only cut down a tree if necessary. With the cost and inflation and how hard it is to live today this seems to be another money grab.Really...it seems the city is looking for more ways to get money from people.</p>
20	<p>Forest Conservation Officer: The Ontario Woodlot Association's Kawartha Chapter has been interested in seeing a good bylaw for our municipality for over 20 years. It is something that was brought forward by the Kawartha Chapter several times over the past two decades to various council members and committees. It is nice to see some action on this front, however, the draft as it is written makes very little mention of forests or forestry and has left woodlot owners with many questions and concerns.</p> <p>The draft bylaw bears no resemblance to neighbouring jurisdictions with comprehensive and successful bylaws such as Northumberland County, Haliburton County, and Durham Region. Perhaps there are reasons CKL has decided to take a new direction, and I do see some very interesting components of this new draft that could be very helpful in addressing problems with land developers. There are specialized online resources available for municipalities to share and learn about tree bylaws. These resources were developed by a partnership with the Ministry of Natural Resources and a large number of upper tier municipalities with tree and forestry bylaws about 10 years ago. I will send a link for your reference and I hope you can encourage the folks who are involved with the drafting of this bylaw to educate themselves on the subject in detail.</p> <p>https://www.ontariowoodlot.com/Legislation-in-Ontario</p> <p>Another resource is the Ontario Professional Foresters Association (OPFA) - they have provincial legislation that regulates the profession of forestry in Ontario. So only qualified OPFA members or those who have narrow exemptions can practice the regulated activities. Arborists get an exemption for urban tree work but are not qualified to prescribe or authorize active forestry management in a woodlot setting. There should be some consideration of this legislation and the forestry professionals in the bylaw I think.</p> <p>When considering a bylaw, a distinction is made between a tree bylaw for</p>

cities, and a forest conservation type bylaw for upper-tiers. Usually the distinction is made based on the size of the treed or forested area - areas of contiguous trees 1 ha and larger being treated much differently than individual trees or trees forming a woodlot less than 1 hectare in size.

The approximate average annual income for the CKL forest management operations over the past 20 years is \$100 000, while the average annual consulting fees over the same period are approximately \$15 000 per year.

Durham is a better model for better protection of woodlands. MOECP does not monitor MFTIP.

Prefer cut off at 1 ha over 5 acres.

Better define managed woodlot.

Require a RPF for woodlot management.

Need RPF to be the witness for the prosecution.

Durham spends \$40-60k for arborist & has 30 applications for commercial forestry per year.

York has 5 RPFs and Simcoe has 3.

We don't have any out here. CKL has 10,000 acres of woodlot.

Hire at \$90k+/a.

Circulate to Haliburton, Northumberland and Ptbo.

Shoreline and logging should be separate by-laws.

Many woodlands (including some EP areas) benefit from forest management activities to enhance and protect ecosystems and to prepare for anticipated changes in climate, new pests and diseases etc. This is something that Professional Foresters do and is regulated by the Professional Foresters Act 2000. There seems to be no recognition of the profession of forestry at all in this bylaw. Please refer to opfa.ca (Ontario Professional Foresters Association) for more information. Another good source of information for municipalities in Ontario is <https://www.ontariowoodlot.com/Bylaw-FAQs> Please make an effort to consult with the people who have made their careers and businesses in the field of forestry and forest conservation before considering adopting this bylaw. The Ontario Woodlot Association is a good start for consultation, as well as local professionals."

	<p>Please feel free to contact me anytime as you continue through the process. If you decide to use Durham or Northumberland as a model, there is some wording in each of those bylaws that I would tweak for clarity - there might have been a few too many cooks in the kitchen with the Durham bylaw, but it is a good one. Lastly I would discourage you from including the topics of migratory birds and endangered species within the bylaw. That legislation stands on it's own, and especially with migratory birds there is a lot of nuance as to how it might apply. Bird breeding timing windows can be added in as a permit condition on a case by case basis when appropriate. I have some experience dealing with the feds on this and can further explain this rationale if needed. There are so many hurdles to getting this new bylaw accepted and those are two items that don't need to be in the mix.</p>
21	<p>Rejuvenating of trees is important. Young shrubby trees are the nesting habitat of so many species of birds. The most impact to our climate, birds etc happens on large properties like golf courses. When a developer uses farm land or vacant land this is were the most destruction happens to trees. They need a permit at the same rate as home owners. Or no permit to remove. On some of these properties are Woodlots that are nesting sites for a large number of species including owls.</p>
22	<p>Wants to ensure he can buy fuel for home heating. Does not support environmental need for by-law.</p>
23	<p>Does not support. Money grab.</p>
24	<p>1.2 acre threshold is too small</p>
25	<p>Illegal: Municipal Act 394 1 (b) and 394 1 (e) and Forestry Act 92 (5) Do not support fees for taxpayers</p>
26	<p>Supports retention of road windrows by farmers</p>
27	<p>Does not support in principle due to landowner's rights to manage their own property, constituting a minor fraction of forest tracts within Canada. Not a core service; focus on core services.</p>
28	<p>Developer. We have a good enough program for developers re 1 tree per lot. Don't need this by-law. Not a core service; focus on core services.</p>
29	<p>Is this proposed bylaw just for water front properties? I have a cottage on Four Mile Lake.</p> <p>I own a farm in the village of Burnt River. Would it apply to the trees on that property as well as a lot that I own in the village?</p>

	<p>I have other properties that are 10 and 24 acres in Burnt River. Are there any restrictions there? My farm backs on the Burnt River. Would there be tree restricts there also?</p> <p>I own a forestry lot of 104 acres on the river, would there be restrictions as to the distance from the water that I could cut a tree? As you see I am concerned.</p>
30	<p>Other than agricultural hedgerows and subdivision, no by-law required.</p> <p>Replanting fruit trees should be encouraged.</p>
31	<p>Reduce scope so don't effect Brenemans sawmill [Note to file: Are they in the MFTIP?]. No private nature trails on large property. What if plant on neighbouring property? What if plant 1,000 seedlings instead of a sapling? Why replant when the forest can act as a replanter? Does not like brushing equipment. Areas that will not support a root ball will need to pay.</p> <p>Here are some suggestions regarding the proposed tree preservation by-law:</p> <p>If the City of Kawartha Lakes wishes to involve itself in environmental preservation, the first step really should be a thorough examination of local ecosystems to identify priorities for preservation. To fail to do this is likely to doom the City (though well meaning) to cause more harm than good.</p> <p>The City should be encouraging people to plant native species, rather than nursery stock generally.</p> <p>This by-law seems to overlook the fact that natural regeneration of forests, where practical, is clearly a better environmental option than bringing in nursery stock.</p> <p>It is a mistake to assume that planting large nursery stock is necessarily the best course of action, this needs to be revised to take into account the fact that seedlings are better for the environment, more economical and in many locations will do better than "mature saplings."</p> <p>If the City is going to encourage people to plant trees, it really should provide information on choosing the right tree for the site, rather than pushing people to buy large nursery stock, that in some cases is just going to die. Local Horticultural Societies, the Kawartha Field Naturalists, and Kawartha Conservation would likely volunteer to help the City put this information together.</p> <p>It seems that this by-law was drafted with waterfront areas and subdivisions or urban areas in mind, but is going to apply to many other types of ecosystems. It is a mistake to apply an environmental by-law to ecosystems without taking the time</p>

	<p>to consider them first. As drafted, this by-law would make a lot more sense if it was only applied to waterfront areas and subdivisions/residential development.</p> <p>It is a mistake to focus on the environmental impact of cutting trees, while overlooking other impacts of development. This by-law should be revised to take into account the environmental impact of development more broadly.</p> <p>This by-law is rigid and drafted in a legalistic manner. There is an environmental cost to the enforcement and to forcing people to do things that may not be the best idea in their particular location. Have you considered an approach that is based upon enabling people to do the right thing, rather than attempting to enforce that they will not do the wrong thing? For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do a public consultation where people are encouraged to suggest places or aspects of the local environment that are worth preserving. Create a registry of local environmental sites that are worth preserving (similar to how heritage properties are already catalogued). Include sites that should be preserved for environmental and cultural reasons. In consultation with local environmental groups, establish priorities for what habitat needs to be preserved, and determine the costs of doing this. Work with local environmental groups to educate the public about the local environment, and specifically, to communicate the priorities from (c) Instead of enforcing tree cutting fees, create a public education program along the lines of “cut a tree, plant a tree” There are people who would want to donate land to be preserved. Help these people find a way to make this happen, especially, when it can help accomplish the priorities from (c) Encourage people to donate money for reforestation and conservation projects Instead of imposing tree cutting fees (which turn trees into a liability), make a portion of development fees fund reforestation and conservation projects, addressing the priorities from (c) Use a portion of the environmental fees to create a grant program (similar to the Community Partnership and Development Program) to help local charitable groups with voluntary environmental projects and environmentally-related public education projects. Local volunteers can do a lot of good work at minimal cost, but often they could do much more if they had resources to work with. Instead of creating a one-size-fits-all rule to govern development (that might not be sensible in all locations), consider offering the service of environmental consultation on a voluntary basis. For those who would be interested in doing the right thing for the environment, provide an advisor who would look at their property with them, identify how to develop it in a way that minimizes environmental impact, and to identify if there are features on the property that are worth preserving.
32	Fleming:

	<p>Enforcement is an issue with the current by-law. Discussed intentional to ensure that staffing is sufficient, then can close loopholes re hazard requires permit in future iteration.</p> <p>Okay with 5a cutoff.</p> <p>Fleming is a free resource.</p>
33	<p>Farm:</p> <p>Does not like the idea of any restrictions for farmers that reduce the efficiency of the land (hedgerows and water setbacks).</p>
34	<p>Farmer. Woodlot owner:</p> <p>Clear cuts every 10-20 years as part of good forestry management.</p> <p>Clause 3.03 (k) of the proposed Tree Preservation By-law which does not permit cutting of trees on land designated for Environmental Protection, including but not limited to lands within a woodlot , a provincially significant wetland or the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation area is not consistent with the City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan -2012 section 17.3.1 which does permit a) agriculture (excluding buildings and structures), b) Buildings or structures for erosion or flood control, c) Conservation (excluding buildings or structures), d) forestry (excluding buildings or structures,) e) Nursery and Market Gardening (excluding buildings or structures), f) Recreation or park purposes, excluding buildings or structures g) Wildlife management areas, excluding buildings or structures. To be consistent with the Official Plan I submit that clause 2.01 c) and clause 3.03 (k) should be removed from the proposed Tree Preservation by-law.</p> <p>Need the requirements of the Tree Management Plan to be "or as determined by the EO", as mapping all trees on a very large lot may not be practical.</p>
35	<p>We think that the by-law needs to be stronger. The City of Peterborough tree by-law is a good example of a more comprehensive one and we assume that you have seen it along with others.</p> <p>This draft by-law does not have provisions to preserve and enhance the urban tree canopy, that is trees on properties smaller than 1/2 hectare and those not on shorelines. The by-law should apply to all properties.</p> <p>Furthermore, there should not be exemptions for farms and particularly not for golf courses. Furthermore, trees should not be cut down for use as wood fuel, especially in these times when climate change should require us to minimize healthy tree destruction. There is enough wood, to serve as fuel for those that need it, from trees that are cut down due to storms, disease, being invasive</p>

	<p>species and those that are hazards to structures.</p> <p>Also, the tree replacement cost should be higher than prescribed in this proposed by-law to serve as a deterrent to it just being seen as a cost of doing business, especially for developers.</p> <p>The by-law should also require tree owners to submit an application to the City in advance of any work being completed and require developers to submit tree saving plans when they request permission to build new homes. Such plans will help save mature trees and small forests for all the value they will provide to the new community.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this and we hope that you consider some amendments to incorporate the above concerns.</p>
36	<p>Ontario Woodlot Association: https://www.ontariowoodlot.com/resources/Tree_Conservation_By-law_Template_Jan-2013.pdf</p>
37	<p>Had concerns with impact to farming. Advised no impact. Had questions that were answered.</p>
38	<p>Developer: I do not agree that such a by-law is required. It is tantamount to "a taking without compensation" and a serious interference with private property rights. A more reasonable approach to the subject is required.</p> <p>If the City feels it absolutely has to have such a bylaw then it should at maximum call for penalties on removal of trees with a trunk diameter of at least 12 inches (30cm) as called for in the City of Toronto Private tree bylaw which has been in effect for many years and seems to be working quite effectively.</p> <p>A further exemption should be included as follows:" cutting is done in accordance with a valid subdivision agreement or site plan agreement that is registered on title, in accordance with the Planning Act of Ontario" Especially in the case of file #16T96501 which has been in effect for many years and the approval of which was grandfathered under Settlement Agreement" with the City in 2015 written agreement.</p> <p>I reserve the right to make further and other representation to the above bylaw after further study and input from my consultants.</p>

	<p>Please take my comments above into consideration and keep me informed.</p> <p>[16T-96501 lapses Dec 31, 2031; in Oct 11 2023, via PLAN2023-053, red line amendments to plan referred back to Staff re phase 3 of the Woodland Hills Community Inc.]</p> <p>[\$300k payment estimated, being \$1,840.49 for each of the 163 lots planned]</p>
39	<p>Tree Care:</p> <p>1) I found how the use of the word "mature" confusing and odd in this bylaw. Mature saplings are not real. Whips, saplings, small, medium and large trees are real. I suggest that the word "mature" should be removed. It is unprofessional and it is confusing for many people. Instead, describe the tree by the word "tree" and the diameter of the stem at breast height (DBH), as defined by the International Society of Arboriculture. For example, trees smaller than 13.5 cm DBH do not need a permit.</p> <p>2) This by law utilizes two different kinds of measurements in the definitions. Please use metric as the primary and imperial in brackets for clarification.</p> <p>3) The areas that the bylaw governs is a little confusing.</p> <p>a) Does the bylaw only cover all private and public land that is within 30 m. of a water way and environmentally protected area?</p> <p>b) Does it cover all land over 0.5 hectare?</p> <p>c) If it covers land outside of the 30m. mark, what about the land that is less than 0.5 hectare? I did not read anything about that.</p> <p>Clarification would be great, thanks.</p> <p>4) I see that the plan is to hire two more staff to look after this new bylaw. Is this enough staff? As a former Arborist for the City of Kawartha Lakes (2014 to 2020) and steward of Living Legacy Tree Care (2013-2024), I have a unique understanding of the area, the trees, cottagers, public spaces on and off the water. It is my opinion that only bringing on two people you will not have</p>

	<p>enough staff to administrate, and properly police this new bylaw.</p> <p>One last suggestion is that when looking for people to consult on a bylaw such as this bring in local professionals too. There is a great resource right in Lindsay at Fleming College. They have an Arboriculture, Urban Forestry, and Forestry programs that have gladly partnered with the City of Kawartha Lakes in the past. I know because I have worked on the college side and the city side of this great partnership.</p> <p>After reading again the proposed tree bylaw I have a concern about the minimum size of replacement trees suggested in the bylaw. Transplanting a 70 mm/ 8-foot tree has a lower success rate in surviving and thriving in the new location than a smaller (40-50mm) tree would. I would also like to point out that most citizens do not have the means to move these trees to a planting area, let alone plant them properly. The average weight is between 600 and 800 pounds of a 70 mm/ 8-foot tree. Also, when planting trees, you have to consider where you are to plant them. Some lots do not have the space to plant such large trees in an area where they would thrive.</p> <p>What if the homeowner wants to plant a fruit tree such as an apple or pear? Those trees do not come in larger sizes.</p> <p>Another thing to consider, do local tree nurseries even stock 70 mm trees? Most trees I have bought and planted for my own clients, and when I worked at the City of Kawartha Lakes as an arborist, were between 40 mm and 60 mm. So why have private owners do something the city staff does not do themselves?</p> <p>As a certified arborist, I suggest that in order to increase the rate of transplant survival the sizes be lowered to a minimum of 40 mm, or 4-foot conifer, and also add in the option to plant apple or pear trees. Doing this you will increase the number of different species of trees planted, which promotes biodiversity. It might encourage people to plant more trees because smaller trees cost less. It also makes it easier for people to comply when they can do the work themselves.</p> <p>The purpose of the bylaw is "to protect and enhance the healthy tree canopy in private ownership in proximity to shorelines." Let's make it easy for the homeowners to do it.</p>
40	Voluntarily incentivize people instead
41	Developer:

	Want an exclusion for senior's housing. Proposed cap of \$250k.
42	<p>Tree Farmer:</p> <p>Exemptions should be considered for properties with a forest management plan. Landowners who have an approved plan, are taxed at a lower rate. Depending on the plan, some of them specify that the purpose of the trees are for lumber production and are scheduled to be cut down.</p> <p>This is a provincial program and as such, the bylaw should be bounced off the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.</p> <p>The bylaw should provide incentives to plant more trees. For example; Over the past two decades, Maple Leaves Forever has supported the planting of 133,443 Native Canadian Maple trees! That's equivalent to 1,228 km (763 miles) of maple-lined Ontario roadside, more than the driving distance from Thunder Bay to Parry Sound!</p> <p>The proposed bylaw will benefit if the proponents discuss the bylaw with; Ontario Woodlot Association who have 2800 members.</p> <p>OWA Values</p> <p>As an organization built by enthusiastic and engaged people, committed to using best land management practices, we want our land and relationships to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable and productive Ecologically healthy and diverse Spiritually and physically renewing <p>Try to avoid creating a bureaucracy for the purpose of administering the bylaw.</p> <p>These bylaws have been tossed out in other municipalities if voters see more aggravation in their lives rather than benefits.</p>
43	<p>Only one article is mandated, namely a policy, as in 270(1) 7.</p> <p>I have constructed such a policy for your consideration.</p> <p>It is the policy of the City of Kawartha Lakes to engage the citizens in the protection, and enhancement, of the tree canopy. The city will, from time to time, provide educational materials that will emphasize the importance of the tree canopy. These may include print materials related to tree identification, damage caused by pests, and physical hazards. A web page will provide links to some of the excellent YouTube videos that have already been made by experts. In the</p>

	<p>summer season a limited number of hands-on demonstrations will be arranged regarding the planting, fertilizing, and pruning, of trees.</p> <p>A well-informed public will make wise choices regarding the selection, planting, and long-term care of trees. The future of the tree canopy will be in their safe hands.</p> <p>It is wise that larger trees should be planted by qualified arborists. To that end, 10% of the cost of planting trees may be charged against property taxes, up to a maximum of \$500 per year.</p> <p>This bylaw will encourage people to get rid of old, slow growing, ecologically diverse trees, because there is no penalty. A canopy of Aspens is not environmentally desirable.</p> <p>Tamarack, with a trunk diameter of 3.7 inches. It is about 18ft tall! It will, in a few years, be an important part of the canopy. It can, under this bylaw, be chopped down with impunity. Perhaps that 'tree' and others like it, should be protected.</p> <p>These problems do not arise when my suggested policy, or something similar, is adopted by Council.</p> <p>Note: The educational program will also encourage people to plant a wide range of native trees. We, as a society, need to look at the long-term diversity of the entire canopy, rather than encourage fast growing shade trees that are popular with urban communities.</p> <p>The City Arborist should visit the property <u>BEFORE</u> anything else is done. The arborist should look at the location, soil types, amount of shade, prevailing winds, and species that would do well. Then the owner can proceed with confidence to plant the four saplings. I believe that citizens should be encouraged to plant fruit trees, and nut trees. These trees provide nutrition for humans, and for the wildlife.</p> <p>Appeal process to City Council.</p> <p>Perhaps, at this special time, you could start a kinder, and gentler, form of stewardship.</p>
44	<p>Kawartha Haliburton Federation of Agriculture: Will be meeting in early January and the proposed tree cutting by law with be discussed. Formal comments are expected to go to adac and Council.</p>

	<p>Watershed report cards from Kawartha Conservation (KC) provide some perspective of ongoing environmental pressures.</p> <p>When looking at report cards over the years, a trend can be seen for decreasing tree cover in urban areas primarily and residential development on shorelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oddly, this by-law does not apply to properties less than 1.25ac (portion may be covered along shoreline) which would take in a majority of urban areas and rural lots. However, all properties larger than 1.25ac may be included. This doesn't align with the areas showing reduced tree cover in the KC data. - The proposed by-law carries more significant fines for larger properties (\$1700) than smaller properties (\$425) for removal of individual trees. However, as properties gets smaller, each individual tree becomes a larger percentage of the total area. These fees do not reflect the significance of tree density on a property. <p>Much of the land used for agriculture is not zoned as agriculture.</p> <p>EP and regulated areas mapping is inaccurate in many places and will cause issues in the application of the bylaw.</p>
45	<p>Developer:</p> <p>The proposed Private Tree By-law risks inadvertently restricting property owners' ability to act swiftly in managing their land. It creates potential barriers that could prevent property owners from undertaking important stewardship and forest management measures as a result of delays in obtaining permits and the complexity of compliance with the proposed Private Tree By-law regime. The proposed Private Tree By-law will serve as a general disincentive to property owners from engaging in proactive forest management measures through the creation of undue administrative hurdles.</p>

46	Wants to buy a large forested property for SFH. Asked him if moving threshold 0.5 h to 5 acres and cap for SFH to \$5k would satisfy him.
47	<p>Registered Professional Forester: Refinement of the duties under the term 'urban forest services'. This element of the position should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not have the focus of resolving a particular tree issue (a chicot, a diseased tree ,a tree needing pruning...) work with municipality planners, developers, etc in creating and implementing quality 'greenscape' plans for all the towns in CKL develop over arching approaches in maintaining and enhancing the CKL greenscape inventory and manage greenescapes across CKL work with the latest approaches in urban forest planning
48	<p>Small lot on water. Wants to know if Rural Zoning By-law will prevent agriculture on EP lands. Otherwise, he will be flooded out (downstream of a stand of trees).</p> <p>Wants to know the rules and timing for the Tree By-law.</p>
49	Proposes woodlot conservation per By-law 70-21 County of Brant
50	Advised that I will be looking for development and City-lands to go forward at Sept 24, 2024 and balance July 1 2025.
51	The CKL could incentivize tree coverage through property taxes i.e. lower property taxes on lands that have a specific percentage of tree coverage. This could be something similar to what the County does for conservation land, including provincially significant wetland.