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Project Overview

Project Purpose and Objectives
The City of Peterborough recognizes the critical role the urban forest plays in supporting community health and well-being. The City has an urban forest canopy of 29%, which it is committed to preserve and expand to 35% by 2041. This goal is supported by the Urban Forest Strategic Plan (2011 and its 2016 update). In late 2019, The City undertook a robust consultation process to understand what residents and stakeholders think about urban forest conservation.

Figure 1: Peterborough Urban Tree Canopy (2015)

The City of Peterborough understands that a tree conservation by-law is one of the tools that can be used by a municipality to manage forest conservation by regulating the removal and
replacement of trees on private property. The Ontario Municipal Act requires municipalities to identify the way we protect and enhance the tree canopy and natural vegetation. Feedback heard from the public and stakeholders will aid the City in developing a revised approach to urban tree canopy conservation in Peterborough.

**Public and Stakeholder Engagement Objectives**
The engagement process for this project was completed between November and December of 2019. Within the one-month time frame approximately 333 residents and stakeholders provided feedback to assist the City in the development of a revised Tree Conservation By-Law. The consultation process sought feedback on the following questions:

1. What lessons can be learned from the previous tree conservation by-law?
2. What should be considered when developing a revised approach to urban forest protection and tree replacement?

The engagement process sought feedback from three audiences:

1. Members of the general public;
2. Identified stakeholders; and,
3. Arborists (Tree Care Professionals).

Specific definitions of these three audiences are provided below:

**General Public**: Members of the general public are defined as those who live and/or work in the City of Peterborough and have an interest in the City’s urban tree canopy.

**Identified Stakeholders**: City staff developed a list of stakeholders to be interviewed. This list of stakeholders was determined based on a level of knowledge and experience related to trees, the urban canopy, and tree by-laws. Interviewees included Peterborough Public Health, Otonabee Conservation, Peterborough GreenUP, Ontario Aboriginal Housing Support Services and others.

** Arborists**: Arborists were defined as those who operate companies specializing in tree removal and pruning in the City of Peterborough. City staff provided a list of twenty-three arborists who met this criterion to reach out to for the purpose of soliciting their feedback.

**Report Contents**
This Engagement Summary Report documents the results of the consultation process related to Urban Forest Canopy Conservation. It highlights the engagement methods used to capture public input as well as an analysis of the feedback that was received. The key messages that stemmed from participant feedback will be reviewed and considered by City staff and will assist the City in its development of a revised approach to canopy conservation. The report concludes with an explanation of next steps.
Engagement Methods

The Urban Forest Canopy Conservation consultation process was designed to maximize participation through a multi-faceted approach. This section will demonstrate the communication and engagement methods that were used to capture public feedback on a revised approach to urban forest conservation in Peterborough. It will also show the numbers of people engaged through each engagement method.

Communication Methods
Several communication tactics were used to inform stakeholders and members of the public about the canopy conservation and opportunities for engagement. The following list demonstrates the communication methods that were used:

Print Media: Advertisements were placed in the Peterborough Examiner to advertise the five Drop-In Sessions.

Social Media: The City of Peterborough’s Facebook and Twitter accounts were used to promote the project between November 4 and December 4, 2019. The project’s online survey was promoted on the City’s website and on digital screens across City facilities.

Online: The City utilized its public engagement platform (https://www.connectptbo.ca/) to connect with residents and spread information related to the Urban Forest Conservation consultation. The page acted as a communications portal to inform the public about the consultation, provided notice for in-person consultation events, and hosted the online survey.

Engagement Methods & Reach
A multi-method engagement plan was developed to increase awareness about the consultation and solicit feedback from community members and stakeholders. Overall, the consultation reached nearly 1,071 people and engaged 333 members of the public and stakeholders in a one-month period through a mix of in-person and online engagement methods. All methods of engagement raised awareness about the project and garnered feedback that will guide the development of the City’s revised approach to urban forest canopy conservation.

The following table shows the methods used and their associated participation rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Method</th>
<th>Engagement Activities</th>
<th>Engagement Reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drop-In Sessions</strong></td>
<td>A series of five drop-in open houses were hosted across the City to invite members of the public to review information, speak with staff, ask questions and provide feedback related to the Tree Conservation By-Law. All sessions were held between the hours of 4:30pm and 6:30pm.</td>
<td>Engaged 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• November 14, 2019 - City Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• November 19, 2019 - Northminster United Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Survey</strong></td>
<td>An online survey was developed to engage participants who may not have had the opportunity to participate at one of the in-person engagement events. The feedback questions asked in the survey mirrored those asked at all public engagement events.</td>
<td>Engaged 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe:</strong></td>
<td>October 31, 2019 to December 4, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Interviews</strong></td>
<td>A series of 10 one-on-one interviews were conducted with knowledgeable stakeholders with an interest in or ability to provide key insight into the development of a revised Tree Conservation By-Law. Interviews lasted approximately 45 to 75 minutes and the questions mirrored those asked in the online public survey.</td>
<td>Engaged 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Interviewees:** | - Peterborough Public Health
- Fraser Smith, Registered Professional Forester
- Otonabee Conservation
- Peterborough GreenUP
- Drew Monkman
- Basterfield & Associates Inc.
- Ontario Aboriginal Housing Support Services
- Treescape Certified Arborists
- Nimigon Tree Service
- Logan Tree Experts
- Treeworks

Multiple attempts were made to interview a representative from Peterborough’s development community. All four individuals contacted for an interview either declined to participate or failed to respond to invitations. |           |
| **Arborist Surveys** | In addition to the abovementioned arborists interviewed by the project team, surveys were emailed to 23 companies who are known to operate in the City of Peterborough. | Engaged 3  |
| **Project Website** | The Connect Peterborough website (connectptbo.ca) was used to act as a communications portal to inform the public about the Tree Conservation By-Law. A total of 738 people viewed the project website between early November and Early December of 2019. 491 people viewed multiple pages of information on related to the Tree Conservation By-Law while 247 viewed the project landing page. | Reached 738 |
| **Launch Date:** | October 31, 2019 |           |
Total Engaged: 333
Total Reached: 1,071

*The number of those engaged indicates those who were both aware of the consultation process and provided feedback to influence the development of a Tree Conservation By-Law. The number of people reached notes those who were contacted to participate or visited the project website but did not provide any direct input.

What We Heard: Key Messages

The public and stakeholder consultations for Urban Forest Canopy Conservation resulted in feedback related to two main topics with related sub-themes as listed below:

1. Urban Forest Canopy Conservation
   - Public perception regarding the value of trees (e.g., the importance of trees, and the perceived benefit of trees);

2. An Approach to Conservation
   - General sentiments towards a tree by-law (e.g., general observations);
   - Experiences with Peterborough’s previous tree by-laws (e.g., what worked well, what could be improved);
   - By-law features and requirements (e.g., permitting, exemptions, exceptional circumstances, arborist certifications, and other conditions);
   - Tree replacement options;
   - Tools and resources to support the by-law (e.g., for the City, for property owners, for arborists);
   - Costs (e.g., administration, enforcement and education); and
   - Additional considerations.

This report draws out the key messages that emerged from an analysis of feedback from the public drop-in sessions, online survey, stakeholder interviews and arborist surveys. Comments received from members of the public versus those received from stakeholders and arborists have been indicated accordingly. The key messages detailed in this report were used to inform the City’s approach to canopy conversation. A full list of public survey responses can be found in Appendix A (Public Survey Feedback).

1. Urban Forest Canopy Conservation
   
   Public Perception Regarding the Value of Trees

Public Feedback:

Participants were asked to provide insight into their perceived value of trees and their associated benefits. Online participants were asked to indicate how important trees are to them. An overwhelming number of respondents indicating trees are indeed personally important to them, with 87% saying very important and another 10% saying important (Figure 2).
Respondents also noted the many benefits of trees, with the top five being natural beauty/aesthetics, supporting wildlife, improved air quality, providing shade and mitigating climate change (Figure 3).

**Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:**

Stakeholders feedback was aligned with the public feedback results. Stakeholder comments also expanded upon this feedback with some noting that trees should be valued as public infrastructure similar other municipal assets such as roads, sewer systems and bridges. This opinion was shared due to the multiple health and well-being benefits associated with trees and additional benefits trees provide (e.g., beautification, increased property values).

![Figure 2. Online Survey results indicating importance of trees](image)

**How important are trees to you?**

- Very important: 87%
- Important: 10%
- Somewhat important: 2%
- Not at all important: 0%

![Figure 3. Online survey results indicated benefits of trees](image)

**Benefits of Trees**

- Natural beauty/aesthetics: 85%
- Improved air quality: 85%
- Supporting wildlife: 84%
- Providing shade: 84%
- Mitigating climate change: 77%
- Improving mental and physical health: 71%
- Reducing heat build-up in the City: 69%
- Reducing home heating and/or cooling costs: 63%
- Increased property value: 62%
- None of the above: 10%
- Other: 10%
- None of the above: 0%
2. An Approach to Conservation

**General Sentiments Towards Trees and a Tree By-Law**

**Public Feedback:**

Members of the public were asked to indicate if they thought the City of Peterborough should have a tree by-law to regulate the removal of trees on private property. The majority (Figure 4) felt that the City should have a Tree Conservation By-Law. The following points demonstrate the sentiments shared by participants.

- The implementation of a tree by-law was perceived by some participants as a positive step that the City could take to emphasize the importance of trees and was considered critical to the preservation of the tree canopy in the face of increasing development.
- Participants noted that a large percentage of Peterborough’s urban forest is located on private property, which limits the City’s ability to manage the tree canopy. As a result, some participants stated that a tree by-law is needed as a strategy to ensure that trees are not removed without good reason and that the City’s canopy can be monitored.
- It was noted that homeowners and private property are caretakers of their properties for only a limited period of time whereas trees may be multi-generational. While located on private property, it may not be appropriate to view trees as being “privately owned.”
- Those opposed to a tree by-law indicated that municipal government should not have the ability to determine what can occur on private property, particularly if the decision does not negatively affect others.
- Some of those opposed to the implementation of a tree by-law were simply opposed to increased costs associated with tree removal or maintenance.
- Some participants felt that the City should not regulate the removal of trees, but rather incentivize residents to plant trees on their property or partner with organizations like Peterborough GreenUp to maintain or increase the urban canopy.
- A few participants noted that a tree by-law, if implemented, needs to be done correctly to ensure that the process is efficient for residents, arborists, and municipal staff. The tree by-law, if implemented, also needs to balance available resources, consider enforcement and address the need for public education. It was noted that a poorly written tree by-law may be more detrimental to the City than if there was no by-law at all.

**Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:**

- Multiple stakeholder interviewees stated that the City’s trees, regardless of location on public or private property, serve critical functions related to improving air quality, mitigating flood risks and erosion, providing habitat for wildlife and contributing to wellness and mental health benefits for the general public. Several of these noted functions also serve to combat climate change and associated risks (e.g., extreme heat and flooding). As such, the removal of healthy trees should be regulated by a tree by-law in recognition of their value as a public asset and role within the broader ecosystem.
- A common point, particularly for arborists, was that tree by-laws are generally a good method of regulating the removal of healthy trees. However, they noted that tree pruning (or injury) should not be considered as part of the by-law as it is too restrictive for
property owners and arborists. The regulation of tree pruning was also considered to be an unnecessary administrative burden for the City.

Experiences with Peterborough’s Previous Tree By-Laws

All participants were asked to share their experience with the previous Tree Conservation By-Law (2017-2019). The questions asked if participants had a direct experience with the by-law. The following points provide an overview of the key messages received from participant feedback.

Public Feedback:

It is important to note that only 23% of survey respondents indicated that they had personal experience with the previous tree by-law (Figure 5). Of this 23%, 60% indicated having had a positive experience, while 40% indicated a negative experience (Figure 6). Participants with experience with the previous tree by-law were asked to explain what they felt worked well with the by-law (Figure 7) and what did not work well (Figure 8). The following points demonstrate the sentiments shared by participants.

- Many of the survey respondents that indicated a positive experience with the previous tree by-law shared that their arborists provided excellent service in handling the necessary permitting process on their behalf.
- Of those who had previous experience with the City’s tree by-law, the majority felt that the process was clear and relatively easy to follow.
- A few participants stated that the City was reasonable in allowing them to remove a tree that was considered to be a hazard.
- Those who indicated a negative experience with the previous tree-by-law noted that it was either difficult to get in touch with the City regarding the permitting process or that the timelines associated with approvals were too long. Both of these issues made it difficult for residents to coordinate with their chosen arborist.
Some participants who indicated a negative experience disagreed with the decision made by City staff, particularly as it related to potentially hazardous trees. A few participants said that the process was too expensive.

A few participants indicated that they did not feel the City should have a say in what is done with a tree on private property. One person stated that residents should not be required to use an arborist to prune a tree on their property.

**Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:**

- Several stakeholders noted that the City’s previous efforts to implement a tree by-law sent a positive message to residents that trees are a valuable asset worth protecting.
- Stakeholder interviewees and arborists who completed the survey were in general agreement that the regulation of tree pruning was overly restrictive. While it was recognized that a tree can be “pruned to death,” preventing this possibility appeared to do more harm than good. It was stated that pruning permits made it difficult for arborists to pick up business from neighbouring properties from their work site.

![Figure 5: Online survey results indicating 23% of participants had previously applied for a permit.](image)

![Figure 6: Online survey results indicating that 60% had a positive experience with the permit process.](image)
By-Law Features and Requirements

-Permits-

Participants were asked a series of questions related to by-law features and requirements related to permits, requirements to publicly post permits, penalties for by-law non-compliance, and an appeals process. The following demonstrates public and stakeholder and arborist feedback.

Public Feedback:

- The majority of public participants (67%) agreed that the City should require permits for tree removal (Figure 9).
- There was some disagreement as to whether permits should be posted publicly before a tree is removed, with 46% agreeing that it should and 36% indicating that it should not (Figure 10).
- Members of the public expressed strong support (78%) for penalties associated with violating the permit process (Figure 11), but also indicated overwhelming support (84%)
for an appeal process available to residents who do not agree with the City’s initial
determination of a tree’s health (Figure 12).
- Some participants commented that pruning should not be covered by a permit process.

**Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:**

- Most stakeholders were in favour of a permit process but highlighted that it should be
  streamlined and efficient, as well as user-friendly for residents. Additionally, some
  stakeholders felt that the permit process should be limited to the removal of trees and
  should not cover pruning or routine tree maintenance.
- Stakeholder feedback indicated support for an appeals process.

---

**Figure 9: Online survey results indicating 67% support for a permit process.**

**Figure 10: Online survey results indicating mixed feelings about a requirement to publicly post a tree removal permit
prior to removal.**
**Permit Alternatives**
Participants were asked to suggest alternatives to a permit process.

**Public Feedback:**

- 73% of respondents indicated that they felt replacement trees should be required to discourage the removal of healthy trees (Figure 13). 46% of participants indicated that permit fees should be required and 36% of participants said that property owners should pay cash-in-lieu to the City to go towards replanting and conservation initiatives.
- Residents suggested two alternative methods to permits to discourage the removal of healthy trees. Education and incentives. Related to education, participants felt that the City should expand its efforts to educate residents about the broad community and environmental benefits of trees. Being equipped with this information may result in a property owner thinking twice before removing a healthy tree. Second, incentives, rather than penalties was suggested. Incentives could include property tax rebates for property owners based on the number of trees on their property. Conversely, a few participants said that the City should increase an individual’s property taxes based on tree removal or a lack of trees on their property.

**Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:**
• Stakeholders feedback was largely in line with the public’s input.
• one stakeholder suggested a rules and regulation model as an alternative to a permit-based process to accommodate the City’s capacity to manage a by-law. This model would provide flexible guidelines for residents to follow coupled with penalties for non-compliance, rather than a blanket permit process.

![Figure 13: Online survey results indicating strong support for tree replacement requirements and moderate support for permit fees](image)

**-Exemptions-
**
All engagement methods asked participants to consider circumstances in which trees should be exempt from a permit process. Participants were provided with a series of prompts indicating situations in which exemptions could be considered. These prompts included the following:

- Minimum tree size (e.g., a tree should be over a certain size before a permit is required);
- Tree species (e.g., certain species should be considered invasive);
- Poor tree health (e.g., dead, or in irreversible decline);
- Tree safety (e.g., high-risk trees);
- Fruit trees;
- Ash trees;
- None of the above.

**Public Feedback:**

• Public participants indicated varying levels of support for the provided list of potential exemptions (Figure 14). Poor tree health (85%), tree safety (77%), tree species (70%) and minimum tree size (67%) were all supported. Support for exemptions for ash trees (36%) and fruit trees (21%) were less clear.
• The main suggestion for an additional exemption was a call for the City to consideration for how nuisance trees might be addressed by the by-law (e.g., trees that are causing damage to property and infrastructure such as pipes).
• Public participants demonstrated strong support (72%) for requiring exemptions to be verified by a qualified professional (Figure 15).
Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:

- Stakeholders were generally supportive of all the provided prompts.
- Stakeholder feedback stressed the need for the minimum tree size to be increased above the current standard of a 7.5cm diameter at breast height. It was suggested that this measurement is seemingly arbitrary as some tree species (e.g., Manitoba Maple) can reach this diameter very quickly and that trees of this size contribute relatively little in terms of environmental contributions. One participant suggested an increase to 10cm.
- Stakeholders also shared that the City should be responsible for costs associated with trees that damage easements and providing financial support for lower-income households to maintain or remove trees if the tree is a risk to health and safety.

![Figure 14: Online survey results indicating support for four of the listed exemptions (poor tree health, tree safety, tree species and minimum tree size).](image)

![Figure 15: Online survey results indicating strong support for a required verification of exemptions by a qualified professional.](image)
Tree Replacement Options

All participants were asked to provide feedback related to tree replacement requirements and options for ensuring this replacement. Regarding tree replacement options, the City provided a series of prompts for participants to consider. These prompts were as follows:

- Require the property owner to plant replacement(s) of the same species or native tree(s) of similar stature or other appropriate species from an approved list;
- Provide incentives to the property owner to promote replanting native, large stature, long-lived trees;
- Require fees to cover the cost of replanting tree(s) in other locations; and
- Other (please specify).

Public Feedback:

- Residents indicated overwhelming support (85% strongly or somewhat agreeing) for the City to require private property owners to replace trees that are approved for removal (Figure 16).
- Generally, residents felt that the City should incent to promote the replanting of native, large-stature and long lived trees (Figure 17). However, were comparatively less supportive of the City requiring the replacement of trees on the property where a tree was removed (47%) and required fees to cover the City’s cost of planting replacement trees in another location (40%).
- When analyzing detailed participant responses, it was apparent that residents want the City to consider low cost solutions and partnerships to address replanting. It was suggested that the City should assist residents through the provision of trees, and could be funded through general property taxes or through partnerships with local suppliers, NGOs (e.g., Peterborough GreenUp and the Peterborough Horticultural Society).
- Related to the support for replacement incentives, participants noted that this could be achieved through modest tax breaks to property owners who replant trees or maintain trees on their properties. Another form of incentive would be to create City events such as a “Plant a Tree Day,” where a limited number of trees could be provided to homeowners at cost.
- Finally, a key theme of resident feedback was that there is interest in seeing the City establish a registry of property owners who would be interested in receiving trees allocated to replacement in “other locations.” This initiative would simultaneously address concerns related to an unequal distribution of the City’s tree canopy while providing the opportunity for residents to have trees on their property who may not have the financial means to plant one themselves.

Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:

- Stakeholders also expressed general support for tree replacement.
- Stakeholder feedback suggested that tree replacement should be flexible. It was suggested that offering a cash-in-lieu option for replacement trees, where funds could go into a pot to fund planting trees elsewhere or supporting general tree maintenance in the City, was a good option. It was also expressed that the current replacement requirements and rationale may not be realistic for Peterborough residents due to expense, property size limitations and other conditions. Some stakeholders suggested
that the City should consider incentives or supports for low-income areas to contribute to a evenly dispersed tree canopy across Peterborough’s urban core.

- Stakeholders also provided some specific feedback related to the size and species of replacement trees. While some stakeholders felt strongly about limiting replacement trees to native species, others suggested that the idea may not necessarily make sense. This is due to the fact that some areas of the City have disturbed soil and that Canada’s climate is warming.

![Figure 16: Online survey results indicating support for requirements to replant new trees when a healthy tree is removed.](image)

It is important to replant a new tree (or trees) if a healthy tree is removed in order to ensure the conservation of the urban tree canopy

![Figure 17: Online survey responses indicating the greatest support for replanting incentives and moderate support for requiring residents to replace trees on their property and the requirement of cash-in-lieu to recover costs on another location.](image)
Tools and Resources to Support the By-Law

Stakeholders and arborists were asked for their input regarding the tools and resource that may be needed to assist the City in implementing a potential Tree Conservation By-Law. The interviewees were asked to provide responses related to the tools and resources need for the City, property owners and arborists. The following demonstrates the feedback related to each group.

-The City-
- Increase staff and resources allocated to urban forestry;
- Establish an education program explaining the rationale for a tree by-law, the value of trees, and the environmental benefit of a robust tree canopy;
- Offer an online portal or digital application interface to streamline the application process that allows for photos to be attached for easy evaluation by staff. A portal should also assist a resident in understanding where their permit is within the established approval process;
- Partner with and leverage the value of established organizations such Peterborough GreenUp for initiatives to expand the tree canopy; and
- Create an advisory panel of experts to support the implementation of a by-law. The panel should include representation from trusted arborists.

-Property Owners-
- Provide accessible information about the by-law and the environmental benefit of trees. Information could include how to measure diameter at breast height;
- Provide financial support to low-income residents and vulnerable populations (e.g., seniors); and
- Create a recognition program for residents who plant trees, maintain a number of trees on their property or have heritage trees.

-Arborists-
- Establish workshops for arborists to educate them on a potential new tree-bylaw and receive feedback as to how it might be adapted in the future and;
- Find ways to create a smooth and quick application process when a professional and trusted arborist is involved in the removal of a tree.

Costs
All methods of engagement asked participants to consider how the costs of protecting trees should be determined. Costs would include the administration, enforcement and education related to a potential by-law. Participants were provided with a series of prompts to respond to. The prompts were as follows:
- Through the general property tax revenue, spread across the tax base as a community cost;
- Recovering costs through fees for applications and permits;
- Fees for applications and permits as well as general property tax revenue to share the cost between the applicants and the broader community;
- And other (please specify).
Public Feedback:

- The results of the public survey indicate that most residents are in agreement with the sentiments shared by the interviewed stakeholders. 60% of participants said that the costs of protecting trees should be split between fees for applications and permits and general property tax revenues (Figure 18).
- Supporting sentiments from earlier questions, relatively low support (15%) was demonstrated for covering costs through applications and permit fees alone. This evidence seems to support the sentiment that individual property owners should not bare the burden of costs associated with preserving the City’s tree canopy.

Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:

- Most interviewed stakeholders were in agreement that the costs of protecting the City’s trees should be split between fees for applications and permits and general property taxes. As stated earlier, trees were acknowledged as a public asset. As such, participants felt that this cost-sharing approach would result in the most equitable way to protect the urban tree canopy. It was noted that a modest increase in property taxes may not be perceived negatively if it is clear that it is related to maintaining and enhancing the urban tree canopy. One participant suggested that taxes related to stormwater fees could also be used to fund trees as it relates directly to green infrastructure solutions to stormwater management.

| How should the cost of protecting trees, including administration, enforcement and education of the potential by-law be covered? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percentage of Participants | 44% | 29% | 16% | 10% |
| Description | Fees for applications and permits as well as general property tax revenue to share the cost between the applicants and the broader community | Through the general property tax revenue, spread across the entire tax base as a community cost | Recovering costs through fees for applications and permits | Other (please specify) |

Figure 18: Online survey responses indicating majority support for split costs for a potential tree by-law between application and permit fees and general property taxes.

Additional Considerations

A few additional questions were posed to participants to gather additional feedback for the City to consider when weighing a potential revised tree by-law. The collection of additional considerations concentrated on three key questions.
• Is there anything else you would like to tell us that you think needs to be considered in the revised tree by-law?
• Do you think the City should consider a registration process for the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborists to facilitate an expedited permitting process?
• Opinions related to public trees.

Feedback related to both questions is detailed below.

**General Feedback**

**Public Feedback:**

• The revised tree by-law should consider issues related to biodiversity and the long-term health of the City’s tree canopy. Ensuring biodiversity may address concerns related to disease and other threats such as climate change and issues such as those experienced by Ash trees (Emerald Ash Borer). The City could also consider a program to replace invasive species and nuisance species such as Norway Maple, Manitoba Maple and European Buckthorn.
• The roll-out of a revised tree by-law should be paired with a clear communication and an education campaign to ensure community buy-in and compliance. This could be achieved through public education events or through flyers. The City could also communicate information about the importance of trees related to climate change and known threats to the City’s such as Emerald Ash Borer and disease and fungi.
• The tree by-law should be paired with monitoring methods and enforcement measures to ensure that the by-law is effective in achieving its goals. The City could consider hiring by-law officers or students to conduct inspections or investigate violations.
• A few participants questioned the requirement for a resident to hire a professional arborist. Some residents may be able to prune or remove trees on their own.

**Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:**

• One stakeholder noted that the City may not be applying the right approach to how it evaluates the function of a tree conservation by-law. By focusing on tree canopy, the City may be ignoring the value of species such as White Pine, that provide considerable environmental benefits, but have a limited canopy. Additionally, one large tree that may have a significant canopy, may not actually be more beneficial than a collection of several smaller trees that provide the same amount of canopy. Consideration should be given to the true environmental values associated with trees rather than measurements of success solely attributed to canopy coverage. This includes broad environmental benefits such as shade, flood mitigation, air quality, community well-being, and wildlife habitat functions.
• In addition to consultations, the City should consider a jurisdictional scan and best practice review. Peterborough does not need to “reinvent the wheel.”
• The City could consider acknowledging heritage trees and providing special designation to such trees to limit their removal. Some participants noted that establishing a designation process might be difficult to achieve.
Wanting a City Tree  
Public Feedback:

- Public Participants were asked if they liked the idea of City trees being planted in public right of ways. A vast majority, 91% of participants felt that the City should do so (Figure 19).
- Public participants, through the survey, were asked to share what might discourage them from wanting a City tree outside their property. Participants said they may be discouraged for the following reasons:
  - Potential property damage related to invasive root systems or storm-related damage;
  - Maintenance costs delegated to the property owner and the concern that the City may not fulfill its responsibility for maintenance;
  - Aesthetic concerns related to unwanted shade, general aesthetics and the potential inability to select the species; and,
  - The concern that the property owner may then be subject to a potentially restrictive by-law if pruning or removal becomes the property owner’s responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you like the idea of the City planting trees on City right-of-ways?

ISA Certification:
Stakeholder and Arborist Feedback:

- Only interviewed stakeholders and arborists were asked about their opinion about requiring arborists to be registered with the ISA as certified arborists. While some participants saw potential value in this certification related to ensuring some type of accountability safeguard, most stakeholders and arborists found this certification to be arbitrary. One participant noted that the ISA is not the government of Ontario, recognised trade certificate for arboriculture. Generally, stakeholders felt that most
arborists operate within good moral standing. However, a system for prequalifying arborists was indeed supported, however.

Next Steps

Participant feedback detailed in this report will be reviewed and evaluated by City staff and used to inform the development of a revised tree by-law. Staff will then work to develop the revised tree by-law and submit it, along with the findings from the consultation process, to City Council for approval in 2020.

The project team observed that some participant feedback was indicative of confusion or misinformation related to the mechanics of the previous by-law. This relates to various elements such as the permitting process and rationale related to key elements of the regulatory tool. Noting this, city staff recognizes the need to provide education and awareness related to the development and implementation of any new approach to tree canopy preservation in Peterborough.
Appendix A: Online Survey Feedback

Appendix A provides the results from the online survey as well as verbatim responses received from online survey and hand-written surveys submitted by members of the public. Responses have been listed under the corresponding questions.

1. How important are trees to you?

![How important are trees to you?](Image)

2. In your opinion, what are the top three benefits of trees? (select all that apply)?

![Benefits of Trees](Image)
3. Are you aware of any current tree conservation-laws in Peterborough?

![Bar chart showing 57% awareness and 42% unawareness of tree conservation by-laws.]

4. Do you think the City should regulate the removal of trees on private property for the conservation of the urban forest?

![Bar chart showing 63% in favor, 21% against, and 16% undecided.]

5. If you answered question a above, please explain your response:

- Without a proper tree conservation and protection by-law in place we lose too much healthy canopy with no replacements required. If this continues, we will eventually lose too much and won't be able to bounce back.
- Trees should be protected.
- Most trees are located on private property, without protection a significant portion of urban canopy would be lost.
- Because of the benefits checked in question 2.
• Trees have so many important benefits to the Urban setting and the City as a whole. Trees are part of the infrastructure of the City and are important part of a function municipality.
• We have to promote the element of trees in our City and control their existence to benefit all.
• Trees should be regulated in a way that allows the municipality to monitor and assess the Urban Forest. Trees should be removed in a responsible manner that does not provide negative impact to the Urban Forest. If trees are removed, they should be replaced.
• The City should regulate the removal of trees on private to preserve our natural canopy and ensure trees are not being taking down without a valid reason (dying, unhealthy etc.)
• It would offer the property owner another perspective on trees on their property and would educate them on benefits of maintaining trees rather than removing them.
• The City of Peterborough could do some regulations in order to ensure that all trees aren’t removed on a property. However, some control should be left in the hands of the property owner.
• The trees are a community resource, and although they may reside on private property their benefits impact the entire City
• The urban forest acts as a whole and provides benefits to the entire community, so regulating trees on private property is essential.
• More regulations just cost more to enforce, and is it really that big a problem? Maybe offer a replanting incentive instead for people who take down trees.
• Trees are incredibly important for addressing climate change, pollution, urban heat island effects, etc. so we need to be planning on how to protect and improve the urban forest both on public and private property.
• Trees are a community asset that benefits an entire neighbourhood and not just the property owner. If the tree is not directly impinging/damaging a building, then the community needs should be taken as a priority above the property owner.
• Trees on private property provide essential benefits to the overall community. Therefore, community needs should play some role in the removal of trees
• I believe the removal of trees by private landowners and corporations should be tracked to ensure the City knows how many trees need to be replaced to maintain a minimum amount of canopy cover in the city.
• At the very least, before a private owner removes a tree for whatever reason, the city should be informed. There should also be a bylaw that requires tree replacement.
• A small property owner should be able to remove and prune trees on their property without a permit
• For every tree development destroys, three should be planted, but for a homeowner with a healthy tree the city and orca should feel lead. As if the city comes to our land, we are ready this spring, just saying
• I think it is heavy handed to regulate the removal of trees on private property. The only trees on private property that should be regulated are those that are species at risk (SAR) or which can be classified as significant because of age.
• If the city contributes to the costs involved with maintaining the health of the trees by pruning and removing trees when necessary.
• Yes, and regulation should consider risk to private and public infrastructure, whether species is native, impacts to real estate value of the neighborhood.
• The City should regulate with a tree by-law like the one in the City of Toronto as an example. Trees provide mitigation against climate change and should be preserved.
• Private property, the city should stay out of it.
• I have had two neighbors remove mature healthy trees due to a preference for a sunny yard. This is highly detrimental to the urban environment and canopy.
• I think applications to remove trees would help preserve the tree canopy however it would require additional staff and could become costly.
• I agree there should be some limits, but that homeowners bear expenses related to tree maintenance and safety that can be difficult to meet.
• Though the importance of the overall urban canopy is important to all that reside in the city, as a homeowner, I should never feel like I cannot make a decision regarding trees and their impact on my property.
• The average homeowner may not understand the impact of tree removal.
• Did we have a problem before? Most people like their trees and will never cut them down unless the tree is dying/dead or about to cause property damage. I am undecided because I don’t think we had a problem, and even if we did, then bylaws should target the specific problem, not blindly target people who were already caring for their trees.
• Many citizens do not appreciate or understand the value of trees. While some may be removed due to health/safety hazards, there are probably many instances when trees are removed because they are “inconveniently located” or are not aesthetically pleasing.
• There should be a process and proof that the tree is posing a danger or is dead to remove the tree. Also, there should be more money spent on school education programs, so our next leaders have the knowledge.
• the city regulates all kinds of things that happen on private property for the common good. we don't let homeowners burn trash in their backyards, or defecate into open pits, or keep packs of wild hogs, just because they want to. why should they be allowed to chop down a 100-year-old tree just because they want to? removing trees degrades the entire community. it is not up to a property owner to make those decisions.
• There are a lot of people who don't think about all of the benefits of a mature tree when they go to cut it down. Many dismiss trees as "messy", when in fact they are incredible necessary for a wide variety of reasons. The effects of a tree aren't limited to the borders of an urban yard and if a tree is cut down, it affects neighbouring properties (loss of shade, shelter, beauty etc.), as well as a plethora of species relying on it for their sustenance and shelter. It is a wider ranging impact than on the homeowner who wants to cut it down, and thus there should be some regulation to the process.
• Trees are one of the most important defences to the climate crisis and considering the recent ruling to declare a climate emergency, the city should absolutely prevent frivolous tree removal.
• Owning private property does not expunge a person from the community they are a part of. When you "own" an animal it does not mean that you can do whatever you want with or to it without repercussions. Trees are alive, and unlike pets, they provide us with
oxygen to breathe. Making decisions in the short term (human life is short) to change the aesthetics of a property by removing healthy trees is short sighted, selfish, and should be subject to review by the appropriate authorities.

- Don’t cut down trees.
- Regulation of the urban canopy should be linked to evidence-based outcomes, if it’s to support natural environment, single trees on a manicured lawn should not be the focus but more pockets of habitat and stands.
- It is extremely important for the city to regulate the removal of private trees because it is impossible for all residents to understand the cumulative impact of unregulated tree removal. Residents require guidance and education about why and when it is appropriate to manage trees, determine if complete removal is required, and how to replant.
- It is important to protect our forests, so specific regulations could help prevent us from losing trees and biodiversity.
- They do it in many other cities, and I think it works really well to maintain overall tree coverage for all urban residents.
- Trees are important for all the above reasons and property owners should be required to be responsible for the well being of all.
- Trees are part of the collective good and their purpose/benefit extends beyond the property line.
- The importance and significance of trees to the overall health of human and non-human beings is bigger than the individual. We need to start acting not only with our individual selves in mind, and what is desirable to us as individuals, but instead with an awareness and consideration of the wellbeing of the greater community.
- Trees take decades to produce a full canopy and one landowner an afternoon to cut down. Trees provide community benefits off property and therefore cutting down a tree has impact beyond your property lines.
- Trees are disappearing at an extremely large rate for many reasons. We need to conserve our urban forestry in Peterborough before our town turns into one large Lansdowne Street.
- See Question 2 for some of the reasons why the city should regulate the removal of trees on private property.
- A large portion of Peterborough is private property, so it makes sense to regulate trees on private property. Native trees should be required to be maintained and replanted as destroyed and non-native trees should be banned but, replaced. Some species such as butternut trees should receive greater protection. In addition, to this an incentive should be created to ensure trees are planted at different years so a windstorm won’t destroy the cities canopy. In addition, to this a tax incentive for property owners that take measures to reduce flooding including having a native tree should be implemented.
- Without regulation, too many trees could be lost that would be very deleterious to urban wildlife, aesthetics, and the overall health of the ecosystem.
- Simply killing healthy trees for aesthetic reasons should stopped. Each case should be decided on its own merits instead of a blanket prohibition.
- The city regulates all kinds of things for the consideration of the public good. Since trees do all the good things listed in question 2, it stands to reason that no single person
should have the right to destroy healthy trees for selfish reasons. Also, the city declared a "Climate Emergency" so it's a bit comical that this is even an issue.

- Many municipalities have tree bylaws, to improve the function of urban forests
- Some restrictions on trees of significant value. Not the intrusive previously recommended...precipitously enacted? all trees of 6"+ diameter and the necessity of involvement of an arborist.
- Private Property owners often only think of themselves and not the larger picture. They get older and don't want to rake the leaves, so they decide to cut down their tree. That is not a good reason to cut down a tree.
- Trees may be on private property, but the benefits of a forest cannot be managed on a lot-by-lot basis. A landscape perspective is needed and frankly, individual property owners cannot be trusted to act in the best interests of the landscape. Within a month of the previous tree protection by-law being suspended, 3 mature healthy trees on my neighboring properties had been cut down for reasons of personal aesthetic preferences and making room for house extensions. Without regulation there is no way to curtail or offset the effects these decisions will have on the overall function of urban forest cover.
- With considerations for the reasons for proposed removal. Educate property owners with reasons for agreement or disagreement for same so the city does not come across as disrespectful of homeowner.
- For all of the benefits listed in question 2 (especially climate change mitigation!) we need as many trees as possible to stay standing and be planted!
- There should be an inventory of significant heritage trees on all properties and depending on the size of property the potential loss of a carbon sink should be evaluated and understood and considered.
- In the last 5 years, I've seen property owners clear their property of trees or grove without replacing with something.
- Air quality in urban areas is a huge concern. Property owners should not be allowed to clear cut healthy and helpful trees for visual appeal. I would go so far as to say that properties with viable soil and sufficient acreage should be expected to have a certain number of trees planted if they are not farming or gardening.
- I feel the City of Peterborough have enough to keep them busy maintaining the existing tree canopy and to plant and nurture these trees on City property. The City should also spend a little time to improve their selection of tree species and also the planting locations in our new subdivisions and parks. Under no circumstance should a fee be charged for a permit to prune a tree on residential property. This, I feel, should already be covered by the high property taxes that each resident is charged each year.
- Trees provide benefits far beyond the personal, but most trees are situated on private property. Although property owner interests need to be taken into account, owners come and go - trees are part of the community forever.
- Process took a long time to having actual dangerous trees removed
- Close to THIRTY heritage (85+ year old) trees were removed at the City's expense on private property on the corner of Wosely/Aberdeen many years ago because PUC wanted to "trim" the trees and the property owner didn't like needles on his driveway and roof. Similarly, now the heritage property at 788 Aylmer St is being turned into a subdivision, despite it being a designated property with a direct architecture to nature.
link. It is absolutely 100% the responsibility of the City of Peterborough to protect these
trees as there eventually arrives an owner who wants to cut them all down, and as we all
know, this affects everyone. In a time when the government is implementing nation-wide
planting initiatives and climate change is the #1 news story of the past five years, the
City of Peterborough needs to step up and be a leader in this area, where they have
demonstrated poor, or considered (e.g., the parkway through Jackson Creek) destructive
and irresponsible decisions around our natural canopy. There should just be a rule that
any healthy tree that does not pose a safety issue CANNOT be cut down! That's an
easy start. Then there should be new planting initiatives. Any boulevard without a tree
(or many trees) should be planted now. It is such a shame that the City has not
prioritized such a critical element of our existence. Really, someone needs to take
responsibility and make immediate change/improvements.

• As we pay taxes on the land we should be able to do as we want
• I think that the city could take a more proactive approach without needing to police
property owners. Encouraging owners to improve their properties with trees, rather than
adding penalties and onerous requirements. Perhaps subsidizing the cost of
replacement trees, continuing to fund awareness campaigns and organizations like
GreenUp that help property owners.
• I paid $150 for what? I have many trees on my property and I needed to remove some
for a pool. It took me a call to my Councillor to get the permit officer out, after waiting
four weeks, so the project wouldn't be delayed. I own my property and if I want to cut
down or prune a tree or trees for what ever reason I should be free to do it. And the price
for the permit, give me a break.
• I believe as a property owner, if the city would help private property owners with the
trimming and removal of any potently damaging trees - they would be more inclined to
planting and cultivating both new and existing trees on their property- I know I would
• Tree canopy is important for our climate
• Homeowners are caretakers of properties for a limited period of time whereas trees may
be multi generational. I strongly feel there needs to be well thought out bylaws to protect
trees from casual removal.
• I believe the property owner should have the power to decide how to manage trees on
their property.
• The city did not listen to property owners wishes, the last time around.
• Any trees that are removed should be replaced by at least one more tree.
• Avoid cutting unnecessarily
• Diameter limit permitting administered by private licenced arborists who are audited by
city experts.
• I generally don't feel that the amount of tree removal on private property is making a
difference to the urban canopy issue. Getting a permit is just delaying the process of
dealing with a tree or branch that has become a hazard. It's not like people are clear
cutting their properties but they feel like it. It's expensive to remove a tree so I believe
the property owner has already made a good call about which trees and why they need it
removed. Getting a permit just pushes the process longer and costs the property owner
time and money.
The city needs to know what trees are being removed and make sure it is being done properly.

I believe in many of the benefits of a vibrant urban forest, however, believe it is up to the discretion of the property owner to remove trees. I would hope that disease or danger or potential damage emanating from a tree to property would be the only reasons for a property owner to remove a tree. Scarce funds should be deployed for better benefit than regulating tree removal.

Trees should be regulated but the biggest issue is developers who cut down hundreds of trees while the city looks the other way.

Landowners may have many different reasons for their choices. Regulation seldom addresses the full complexity of reality. Incentives are a more positive approach.

I have two priorities I would like to see addressed regarding our urban forest in Peterborough: 1) QUALITY of the urban forest and 2) the AREA of the urban forest. Many of the suggested responses in Q2 relate more to quality than area. If city staff are confident that no (or loose) bylaws can maintain both quality and area of our urban forest, then I believe there is no need to create new bylaws on the issue. If, however, there is evidence to suggest the quality and area of our urban forest is threatened by not having a bylaw, then I believe it is in our best interest to create a bylaw that reflects these values.

It’s called private property for a reason.

There is far too many stupid laws on the books already

To prevent excessive removal of trees

many people don't have a good understanding of the benefits of trees.

People pay property taxes. It is their private residence. You are not going to pay if a tree root on a city boulevard that grows through a pipe on the residents property (personal experience) thus, I should not have to have your approval to tend to my yard on top of having to pay $150.

I believe in the permitting process and would have followed through with the stipulations of said permit if it stayed in effect.

As much as I want to conserve the tree canopy, I don’t want government to meddle with my private property decisions. Unless my decision is harmful to my neighbours or their property, I don’t want to be regulated by government.

I applied for a permit to remove a tree. I planted the tree by mistake. I planted the wrong species. I had an arborist come to my property and assess my situation. The tree would ultimately impact my home and my landscaping. The tree needed to come down. I applied for a permit. After 60+ days I was notified that my application was declined. I had to get my city councillor involved. In the end, I would have to endure an impact to my house before I could have reconsideration to have this tree taken down. That is completely unacceptable. This is my property. I pay extremely high taxes that this city has no problem raising and this is extremely intrusive. I had to dig up my back yard at a cost of several thousands of dollars because the city/builder had some serious discussions in my backyard. After fixing the grading of this property, I planted two additional trees - a serviceberry tree and a Vanderwulf pine tree. However, this was not good enough. Residents take pride of ownership in their homes. We pay home insurance. That tree needed to come down. I had constant worry about that tree
impacting my home at some point. If it did, I would have serious financial burdens. Taking the tree down was me trying to be proactive. The city has no reason to be regulating the removal of trees on private property.

- I think the City's time and energy is better spent conserving the trees on City property. If homeowners are aware of the benefits of trees and the risks of removing trees, I think they assume those risks and benefits.
- Yes, but the number of trees on an individual's property should also be taken into account if the old bylaw is going to come into place. My property is full of trees mainly shaded and I would have no place to plant another tree but was told I had to when I first applied.
- The approach taken with the previous by-law created delays in scheduling arbor care that might be needed to prevent property damage and preserve property value, because owners needed to wait for approval of a permit before work could commence. There could be a different approach taken, where property owners have permission to remove a set percentage of trees or tree canopy on their property (pruning or removal) but must file a notice with the city. The city can then audit the property and take action where owners exceed the permitted percentage with a replanting order to be executed by the owner or the city with reimbursement paid by fee or adjustment to property taxes. The main concern is to remove impediments to planned arbor care.
- To help preserve the tree canopy
- It is private property; I should not have to consult with the gov't to remove trees on land I own. Unless of course you want to maintain them
- I think that some regulation of tree removal may be a good idea. In my case, I was required to obtain a permit for the destruction of a tree that would have died anyway after my addition was constructed as a result of excavation. The timeline for replanting the tree was my issue, as landscaping was not slated to happen in the timeline that I was given.
- If the city does allow this then some sort of planting program should be set up
- City needs to have a by-law to give guidance to property owners and their neighbours.
- Developers and private landowners clear cut development lands and ask for forgiveness later which destroys healthy trees and has many associated impacts.
- There may need to be a consultative process where options are looked at, but homeowners have the final say.
- Enough with bylaws attempting to control what taxpayers can and cannot do with their own property!
- Trees are necessary for our health and well being as a group and as a group we should have a say in there well being and they should be maintained an not destroyed needlessly.
- I think it is important to maintain the canopy and not have people erroneously cutting down trees. I do think it needs to be reasonable though so people aren't trapped in what they can do because they can't cut down a tree or have to replace it with so many new trees
- Trees are a public good, providing benefits beyond the property owner, therefore there should be regulations to prevent their wanton destruction.
• People obviously don't like being told what to do with their property, but some amount of regulation is necessary. What has been successful in other cities?
• Mature trees are a blessing and removal should be assessed. It’s tricky to balance though - people have the right to do what they own with their property (for example removing a backyard tree for a deck or pool installation), but mature trees are vital and it’s difficult to find a balance.
• I do not believe in permit costs or required tree replacement.
• If the tree has historic significance, then the homeowner should be provided with this information prior to tree removal. Also, homeowners may not be aware of the local animal habitats that said tree would be removing for animals on their properties. Therefore, I feel that the city should regulate trees, so that education can be provided to homeowner prior to them making a decision.
• I think the city needs to regulate the removal of trees not only on private property but on city property i.e. the decimation of trees by city crew along the back of the east city ball diamonds. There needs to be valid reasons and permits issued after examination and evaluation of reason for desired removal.
• I believe we need centrally manage our trees to ensure the health and viability since they don’t just benefit the homeowner. We need to have a process that benefits both the home/landowner as well as the city so we can ensure the long-term viability of our trees. We would need to define what constitutes a hazard tree and if it’s a safety issue how we can safely remove that tree and plant a new one and the approvals required. We also need to geo-reference every tree that meets a certain criterion so we can have and inventory of these special trees and track meta data on each tree such as DBH, height, active insect or diseases, stick nests etc. This doesn't mean every tree but only those that meet certain criteria, age, unique species, height, diameter, historical significance.
• There is always a balance between private property rights and communal needs, but I think the benefits of trees wins out on this one. I think it's reasonable to prevent someone from cutting down a big old healthy tree that is providing good 'services' to the neighbourhood, as long as there is no legitimate concern such as tree roots growing into the house foundation.
• Trees often outgrow a small property and it is good practice for the owner to responsibly remove and replace older trees.
• I basically think people have the right to do what they want on their own property unless they are breaking the law by harming others directly.
• Your previous bylaw completely disregarded the difference between an urban core home with 1-3 trees and houses in your amalgamated regions, e.g. Selwyn. My property has over 200 trees: you need to back off and let me manage them within reason.
• If it isn't mandated, people are less likely to do it for financial reasons.
• Trees are crucial to the health of the city and should be preserved at all costs. People who want to remove trees in their yards should be required to go through a process involving an assessment by tree experts.
• Yes, with conditions.
• As a property owner with a number of mature trees, I understand that the trees on my property are part of a larger ecosystem and that decisions I make with respect to the tress on my property impact my neighbourhood and community. The City must play a
role in creating and enforcing common sense bylaws to ensure our city canopy is maintained and increased. I do believe there should be allowances in the bylaw made for trees that pose a safety risk, a risk to property or trees which have been damaged due to pests.

- Denuding of our forest canopy for private use vs public benefit is something we must avoid.
- Large trees should be protected for the benefit they provide to more than just the property owner.
- Peterborough is behind other parts of the world in valuing its urban forest. Act now before it is gone.
- According to the mapped tree canopy, most of the trees are with in the city are on Private property that could be subject to development proposals and removed if not protected.
- Having a tree on private property that the city may consider safe might be a problem for the landowner as this tress roots or shade from the tree may be causing other problems.
- I think some level of regulation is required to ensure that the tree canopy and a healthy urban forest is maintained. I have a number of trees on my property and plan to maintain as many as I possibly can, however, given the planting strategies employed by previous owners they are too tightly spaced in some cases and some may need to be removed to ensure the health and productivity of the others. I do not intend to clear-cut my property, but some recognition of good arboriculture/urban forestry practices is required and the previous by-law did not do that.
- Yes, there are trees that are irreplaceable on private property.
- It is PRIVATE property. Get it!!!
- Property owners need some limits on what they can and cannot do with the trees and shrubs on their properties. Even I, who LOVES trees, and who has 3 invasive species on my property that are out of control, want to know that "someone" is overseeing my right to remove them and replace them with something less invasive.
- One of the roles of government is to encourage individuals to act in the interests of the common public good. Around 75% of Peterborough's urban forest is privately owned, so that while the city should show the way with good practices, the city should also create regulations that are not too difficult to navigate but that encourage the desired behaviour.
- My concern regarding trees in Peterborough is the dead & dying trees that the city & residents own that are not trimmed or removed, therefore, create a dangerous and ugly issue across town.
- We cannot continue to destroy our natural environment because it doesn't fit in with our own personal aesthetic. Cutting down an established tree because it's blocking the sun or has a large leaf drop or because it is in the way of putting in a pool or gate is inappropriate. We can't continue to pave over our environment then wonder why there is more flooding than years before.
- Trees aren't removed without a reason so let the homeowners decide when to prune or remove them.
- My property, my choice how I manage it
- The evidence even from the last few months of how many trees are being removed, especially 59% healthy ones with minimal plans for replacement will degrade the urban
environment. Without some regulations, or at least mandatory planting of trees on public right of ways, the city's urban cover will continue to degrade and affect the environment. On the other hand, as someone with three very mature trees (and numerous smaller trees not quite at the size requiring replacement if they die) on a small .05 ha property, the previous law would have been onerous and not really designed to replace the tree cover (e.g. yes, replace four for each of our big ones, ...but where, over what time frame, what size, where can I get them without a large outlay of cash if they need to be reasonably mature).

- The City is already involved in too many regulations on taxpayers. Taxpayers are already overburdened by the overwhelming bureaucracy at the City. The City should focus on reducing their own footprint and stop increasing taxes beyond inflation every year.

- I think that over time fewer people can be depended upon to keep trees for civic-minded reasons, which is why I think government needs to regulate removal of trees.

- Old mature trees are interfering with old sewage city owned sewage pipes. If the tree needs to be removed to prevent further damage to the sewer and foundation of our home we should be able to remove without city interference.

- City should focus on promoting the continued planting of new trees, on city property and offer a form of rebate for private property planting (much like was done in conjunction with PUC for water or electrical conservation).

- Private property in the city has an older, large treed forest canopy, with numerous safety and infrastructure issues. Do not restrict citizens in their ability to be safe or protect their property.

- Many trees in the city are non-native species, such as Siberian elm, European buckthorn, Manitoba maple or Norway maple, which should be completely excluded from any kind of tree removal by-law if the city implements one. Perhaps the city should focus more time on eradicating invasive species that impact the current tree cover and forested areas, such as Japanese knotweed and dog strangling vine.

- Trees impact all of us just not an individual property owner.

- Bureaucracy can frequently get in the way of honest work. I'm concerned about the content of the regulation and the extent to which the City would interfere with my management, enjoyment and protection of my property. For instance, replacing a mature tree with four saplings - the City is the one who allows for tiny lots to be developed - where on earth would someone put four replacement trees on a small lot? Mature trees, if they have to come down, also leave extensive root systems that take time to degrade, how much effort to dig all of that out am I expected to do to play four more trees? Frankly, I don't trust the City to make good decisions for me and my property.

- I think there should be regulation for removal of HEALTHY trees, but homeowners should be able to remove dead or damaged trees without regulation. This is especially true if dead or damaged trees present a hazard. Delays resulting from the permitting process could result in property damage or physical injury.

- A homeowner should have a say on what happens on the property they pay taxes for. Certain types of trees affect lawn culture and some homeowners consider that a negative. A homeowner should enjoy their property.

- It would depend on the regulation.
• I believe the city should be a part of the process of managing our urban forest but regulate is too strong a word.
• Depends on the conditions, costs and delays placed on the property owner by the city and by-law. Property owners typically have a reason to remove a tree e.g. safety concern, causing damage to home, invasive or non-native species.
• It's important to make sure it isn't too easy to remove trees, as well as to monitor the canopy coverage.
• if developers razed all trees for a subdivision, they should be regulated. If a homeowner wants to take a tree down on their property, they should be able to do so without interference from city.
• If you refuse to allow an individual to remove a tree and then that tree falls and damages their home, or the roots impact their supply lines it could result in the city being liable for the damage. If you want to increase the overall urban forest, then you should offer to remove older trees and replace them with young trees as opposed to forcing home owners to remove them at their own expense and then incur further expense for a replacement tree. At the very least the city could offer saplings (not seedlings) to owners who remove older trees to be planted in place of the removed tree.
• I believe our tree conservation bylaw is now in abeyance. It required that property owners get the City’s permission to cut or remove trees, and to plant at least three trees to replace every one removed. I strongly request that this bylaw be restored and strengthened, to stop the needless cutting & destruction of healthy trees by those who fail to understand their tremendous value.
• Regulate, not prevent. Someone from the city should visit the property and discuss with the owner why they want the tree removed. For example, safety issues are important for old trees.
• I think that this process should be monitored by way of a free or low-cost permit and that an inspection is required by city staff. This permit should not bilaterally prohibit removal of trees. The city must be more proactive in the development of land for subdivisions ad developers have a tendency to use a scorched earth approach and strip the land of all trees.
• Yes, but they need to be reasonable and flexible. -just making people replace trees that are removed is simplistic. My neighbours have a bunch of dead and half dead trees, the remains of an old Chinese elm hedge. They are planted too close and crowding young maples that need some room to grow. The rest of the yard is dominated by a huge black walnut. I'm sure an arborist would recommend removing the old elms (for safety but also) to allow for growth of the healthy trees.
• People need to be encouraged to participate in creating/maintaining an urban treescape. The bylaws mandate only and do not encourage willing participation
• Unfortunately, most property owners want to pave over their properties, erect outbuildings, put in pools, etc., and trees get in the way of this.
• Without it, we might not have any trees left!
• We live in a free country, part of these freedoms are being able to decide what you do with your private property. Governments do not need to regulate private owners, there is already too much regulation.
I do believe the city should regulate this because I believe residents should be responsible for replacing trees they remove from their private property. However, it's the degree to which the city regulates that is my concern. The previous bylaw was too onerous. So, something going forward that is less onerous would be better for me. I do not object to replacing trees on my property when or if we need to remove a tree, especially if it is diseased or dead.

Private property is private property. We pay our taxes so we can have the private property we want.

Due to climate change, we need an overall strategy for the city. We cannot continue to rely on people's good will and intentions to preserve the green coverage that currently exists.

We need to act on this NOW, and if property owners can't act as responsible stewards of their trees, we need to step in as a society and stop them. Urban canopies don't come back. Period.

Some healthy strong trees are being carved down without thought to our planet, city, and urban canopy. We need to protect and conserve and only thoughtful removal, such as disease, or age should be considered. Also, with the removal of such a tree, there must be a re-planting. Many areas of the city have had strong removal for various reasons where an entire street is deforested, or a city block where building may occur, trees are entirely removed. Many things to consider! before cutting.

There needs to be room for collaboration and choice between private landholders and the city, including trees planted in boulevard strips. There needs to be more common sense in these decisions. Example: a neighbor being denied permission to remove a single diseased tree only if TEN trees are planted in its place - on an already tree-filled lot.

For many years I have thought it was completely unacceptable to cut down a healthy tree, for many of the reasons cited in Question 2 of this survey. I also think that the city must actively and aggressively penalize people who remove trees without good reason or permits. The requirement/acquisition of permits has to be well advertised and explained, but it is worth the effort.

I can see both sides of the regulation of removal of trees. Private landowners may require removal to do renovations to their homes, however, the tree canopy should be protected for the benefit of all.

In this Climate Emergency, we all need to understand the issue and participate in mitigated its effects. In this context, private property is not really relevant.

More attention should be paid to developers removing trees.

The city's urban forest plan is generally more comprehensive than the plan of an individual homeowner. If the city doesn't wish to do this, they need and education plan for all homeowners giving them reasons to plant trees wisely and not to remove them.

Regulation does not have to involve legal stipulation. Ultimately, property rights will win out, but there can be regulations that encourage the adoption and maintenance of an urban forest. More carrot than stick, there should be a regulatory environment that makes it easier to plant and keep trees.

It should not be allowed to destroy a healthy tree.

Trees benefit the community.
• regulatory pressure will protect the urban forest.
• Regulations have to be reasonable. For instance, in a prior by-law an owner was obliged to use a licensed professional to just "prune" trees of a certain size on the owner's property. Owners should have the "right" to look after maintaining their own property themselves, without being obliged to pay a third-party contractor.
• Removal of healthy trees on private property needs to be accompanied by planting new trees to replace them.
• The city should have no say about tree removal on private property period. The city should plant more trees on boulevards, city parks and other lands owned by the city; then put in a plan to water them. I have seen so many City planted trees did to lack of watering.
• Trees are valuable for all of the reasons listed in question #2 and more. Just as wetlands are a value and we regulate or restrict development in or near them, we should do the same for trees. However, there needs to be some flexibility for property owners to prune/trim/remove trees that have grown too large for their location. Particularly where infrastructure (e.g. homes, utility lines, etc.) is at risk
• "As we are all taxpayers within the city, residents should have a say in whether they can remove a tree from their property. Some trees are nuisances, some damage homes because they are too big, some are home to squirrels which can be a nuisance. Penalizing/restricting residences from handling their own trees is very restrictive. Its' understood that the city has been planting trees in other green spaces to benefit the city as stated in question 2 (reasons why we need trees). I find this method very proactive and should continue. Choosing what types of trees to be planted is also something that should be looked at. Some trees are not appropriate for certain locations depending on their types and size. planting near power lines, driveways where branches can damage cars would be inappropriate.
• Private property is private - the government has no right to dictate what a private property owner must do on their own property. Instead the city should spend their time & energy focussing on better managing the trees on city property.
• I don't agree with a process that costs the landowner money, or a process that takes considerable time for decisions to be made. I also don't like the city planting non-indigenous species in the forest landscape. The focus should be on indigenous species associated with this climate zone.
• I would answer YES to the above except sometimes by adding regulation we are just adding red tape. We might better put our "energy" into to finding ways to add tress to our environment.
• trees are such an important aspect of the urban landscape for all of the reasons listed above that we can leave their protection to chance or the whim of individual property owners. In a sense no tree "belongs" to any of us; we are temporary owners in the grand scheme of things and often benefit from the wise actions of others who planted trees long before our tenure. By protecting trees, we are extending that same service to others who will come after our time.
• Don't know.
• There needs to be a process trees should not be removed without consideration. However, maybe some conversation about how many trees should be mandated on a
particular property should be considered. It was stress creating for us when we were told we needed to replace the dead trees we were having removed because we have a lot of trees and had no clue where to plant the new ones or how since we are elderly

- Ownership is irrelevant to the concerns above.
- I don’t think you should assume that residents want to cut down their trees without good reason (e.g. ash trees dying from EAB) & that we don’t care about the City’s tree canopy. Incentives to plant trees would be much more effective!
- Trees need to be protected from those who are not aware of their importance to the whole of society.
- Efforts are best put forward protecting land from further development and having forest planting instead, where it is ecologically positive for animal life. Urban sprawl, even here in Peterborough, is the greater threat than current homeowners not being able to manage their properties. Build up not out for future development.
- I believe there should be a reasonable balance of the rights of property owners and the best interests of the local and larger community of the world. I believe many individuals are not aware of the value of trees as detailed in all the above checked categories. An application, a fee and a minimum diameter of tree as well as a response time from the approving body are important. This gives individuals an opportunity to be educated and time for a pause to consider the ramifications of cutting down a tree. This applies in particular to the cutting down of healthy trees. On example of the cutting down of about 30 trees on Wolsely at Aylmer a number years ago is an example of extremely poor approval methods.
- Yes, you need to manage the trees to ensure not every homeowner is removing trees for no good reason but it must be done in a convenient, no hassle method that works for the public otherwise we will cut them without your approval.
- Clearly, I cannot trust my City to introduce a fair tree bylaw. I had to remove a walnut tree that was damaging the cars parked below and my neighbor’s roof. My experience with the process in 2018 was very stressful. Using words like "injuring" or "destroying" a tree may be technically accurate, but to a novice to the process it sounds like I am a criminal. In my case the fee was doubled because the one trunk of the tree that came out of the ground then branched into two canopies. I was billed for two trees, that undoubtedly came from one seed.
- For the better good of the community and those that will come after us.
- Entire trees, yes. Pruning, no. By the way, I live in East City and there has been major tree-ravaging around the school on Armour Hill, and along the Trent Canal. I don’t who did it and what their reasons were, but they removed 100+ very large trees and it shouldn’t have been allowed to happen. For shame!
- The City should regulate the removal of trees to ensure that the urban canopy is maintained and increased. However, there should not be a fee nor extensive waiting period in order to apply, and the application should be simple, straightforward, and easy to find on the website. Additionally, support for homeowners, including incentives, should be provided to help with replanting and to increase the urban forest.
- Given the importance of trees as a means of mitigating and adapting to climate change, and given the projected net canopy loss in the coming decades, it’s paramount that we protect this important asset, and I don’t think that will happen without regulation.
- Bored and lazy homeowners chop trees when they have nothing better to do. Along with cutting yellow grass in July.
- The climate crisis requires that trees be protected from unnecessary destruction.
- Co-operation between city and property owner would be essential to keep trees growing and thriving in the city. Although I wonder about cost issues.
- Every tree is important and too many people don't value or understand their importance. My neighbour cut all her trees down this summer because they were messy.
- Much of the property that exists in Peterborough is private. But private property houses a lot of public resource that isn't easily replaced. A tree that is older than the city itself isn't replaced by planting another tree, or even several trees. A property owner should not have sole control over the removal of the city's forest canopy. Nor should the city itself be able to unilaterally remove trees for public works projects.
- There should be limits on tree removal, but there are also good reasons to do so, beyond a tree dying (e.g., removing a tree in order to grow a vegetable garden).
- City should better manage tree cover and urban forestry on their own properties and in public spaces. Done correctly, we wouldn't have to worry about what happens on private property.
- I believe that property owners should be able to remove trees as they see fit. Sometimes trees are a threat to damage buildings and need to be removed.
- I believe the city should embark on a significant planting of trees on boulevards city parks, school yards working with the B of Ed etc. A regulation on homeowners especially seniors is a tax they cannot afford. A better idea is to incentivise the homeowners to plant trees on their land and rebates claims for receipts. Use some of the money from the sale of the PUC to plant 3000 trees on 2020 and 2021. Homeowners need the right to protect their home from overhanging branches.
- Homeowners should not just be able to cut trees down without good reason. Good consultation is important though between the homeowner and the City.
- Trees are for the common good (see number 2 above). I believe there should be a good reason for cutting them down, even on private property. Acceptable reasons could include tree health, which can be a safety hazard, and perhaps clearly defined threat to private property (roots affecting pipes, for example).
- Private landowners cannot be relied upon to conserve trees. Sometimes healthy trees are removed because they "block the view", or "I hate raking leaves" or "I'm worried the tree will fall on my house". Private decisions are sometimes made without the best information. And for sometimes selfish reasons, without consideration of the benefit of trees "for the common good".
- This is a hard question to answer, as I want to protect live trees but it has to be affordable to the homeowner to replace the tree(s). The City also has to be very careful in drafting a new bylaw making sure it is not overly impinging of the rights of the property owner. Permit fees, if required should be based on the actual cost of producing the permit, not the cost of running the program, IE staff wages, replacement trees etc. This cost of running the program should be a line item in the general budget. You have to set the program up is such a way that people will use it.
• There are too many uneducated imbeciles out there who do not understand the value and importance of trees. Walk anywhere in this city and you see massive pruning f-ups people have made to trees on private properties.

• What the city REALLY NEEDS is a proper invasive plant species removal and management program put into place because the Rhamnus cathartica (Buckthorn) is destroying ecosystems citywide.

• I’m concerned about the potential of by-laws to be heavy-handed. Fairness should prevail. Homeowners ought to be able to make reasonable decisions on their own concerning trees on their property. Some trees, like Norway Maples, are a nuisance and if left untreated can quickly get out of control.

• We cannot afford to lose a single tree, because climate emergency.

• Most of the trees in the City are on private property.

• Private property rights should not be a justification for destroying the shared value and benefits that all citizens derive from the urban forest canopy. Private landownership is not only a "right", it is also a responsibility to do what is right.

• Without regulation some magnificent old trees could be removed for inappropriate/inadequate reasons. Consequence: aesthetic and environmental loss.

• I appreciate the forest canopy of the city and I love trees but at the same time I am not a fan of municipal governments saying that people can and can not do on their own property.

• Homeowners will have the best interest for their needs. They planted then, the looked after then. It should be their choice.

• No residents should have the right to decide what trees to remove on their property.

• I need more information before stating a full opinion however there needs to be some city guidelines.

• If I planted the tree then I should be able to remove it as well.

• Private property.

• At the very least, the city should take a leadership role in this area for the sake of an urban tree inventory. Trees take decades (and longer) to become established and deliberate removal must be balanced with known/expected mortality in order to avoid a famine of trees in the future. Tree habitat is becoming scarce because of urban interventions such as asphalt/concrete, waterway diversion and culverting, and soil degradation. Our interventions have to be countered several times over in order to maintain a robust canopy.

• It takes decades to grow a mature tree and minutes to cut it down!

• As a community, we regulate other aspects of private property and trees should not be an exception given the ecosystem services they provide for all. I experienced the removal of healthy and safe trees on adjoining private property for no reason beyond aesthetics, to the fatal detriment of the trees on my property. I have also seen licensed tree experts remove healthy native tree species while leaving invasive buckthorn on private property.

• Property owner’s decision
• Although regulations can be frustrating for a homeowner, ensuring thoughtful consideration before tree removal should be in place if the tree is healthy.
• I believe we should have similar bylaws to other municipalities in place to protect our trees. For example, the bylaws enacted in the city of Toronto protect all private trees and require the consultation of neighbours and the city for permission to remove them.
• Homeowners shouldn't have to jump through hoops to take down trees that have grown to large or are possibly a risk.
• Replacing three trees for every tree removed is not feasible or practical. The expense is too great, smaller lot sizes may not allow for sufficient growth and ongoing maintenance will present difficulties especially for seniors. Ongoing and available conservation education would be more beneficial.
• People should be allowed to prune or cut off small branches on trees and bushes without the City interfering. If a tree is looking like it is dying and will possibly fall in a bad ice or snowstorm, they should be allowed to remove it.
• I am uncertain whether permitting is an effective tool for tree conservation.
• I think that there should be clear guidelines that must be met if a tree is to be removed from public property (i.e., risk/hazard since old, two close to house & disrupting drainage), and that it must be replaced at least 1-2 more trees per tree removed.
• I think we need to replace trees that are removed from anywhere in the City. Property owners need to be responsible citizens. A program that costs individual property owners little or no cost but requires some accountability would be reasonable. A much more rigorous program should apply to developers.
• We need trees and we need a plan to maintain/increase our tree canopy
• to protect the values associated with trees from inappropriate practices e.g., clear cutting to make development easier or cheaper
• particularly developers who cut down mature trees
• Years ago, the people behind me down cut down an old beautiful silver maple because of the leaves in their pool. The other people behind me cut down a beautiful large cherry tree because it dropped leaves in their pool.
• the issue is cutting of large number of trees, but removal of hazard trees should not be restricted or require permits
• this removal "thinning out" would help promote healthy trees to grow
• Trees are critical in helping with climate change and we are in a crisis right now. They are our soldiers and we need them all.
• Allow only if a tree has a disease and is diagnosed by a qualified arborist.
• I plant trees for aesthetics
• Within reason - the previous bylaw was too oppressive
• Current property owners are only temporary stewards of trees on their property. The City should have a say in preserving and maintaining the canopy.
6. Prior to March 25, 2019 had you previously applied for a permit for tree injury or removal in the City of Peterborough?

7. How was your experience with the permit process?
8. Please tell us what you thought worked well during the process. (select all that apply).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Worked Well</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understood the permit application process</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time to process applications was acceptable</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was happy to replant trees (if applicable) as required</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advice I received during the City staff visit was helpful</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The permit fee (if applicable) was fair</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Other” Responses:
- I believe working for a local arborist and relationships with city staff sped up the process.
- Because I contracted a company to cut down a dead tree, it was painless for me: they did all the work.
- The reasonableness of staff in reviewing the locational circumstances and subsequently allowing me to deal with a tree that was a potential hazard.
- The City was reasonable considering the parameters of the tree to be removed.
- The City did not listen to my representative.
- I asked the city to remove two overgrown ash trees on my front boulevard & was denied. One of the trees is completely blocking the streetlight & the other tree has had large Limbs break off falling on the sidewalk below. Both are public safety issues. I then asked the city to trim up the dead branches from their trees and I am still waiting two years for this to be done. Also, try going for a walk on the sidewalks and you are constantly pushing low hanging branches out of your way.
- I had a dead tree and I hired a contractor to remove. They took care of the permit process for me.
- I had tree pruning done by an arborist in the early months of the by-law and they followed a process to ensure I was within the bylaw allowance, and my trees were pruned to avoid damage in winter both to themselves and my roof, car and the wires overhead. I was aware of the by-law throughout.
- It was a terrible process. I contacted my City Councillor to support me through this process. The time to process applications was way too long. Calls were not returned to me. I left my name and number on multiple extensions.
• My problem was not with my experience with the city, but my problem was with a dubious tree removal company. A winter windstorm damaged a tree in my back yard and left it leaning over my above ground pool. The company I hired to cut it down quoted a price which included the arrangement and payment of the permit. They then claimed that the reason they did not come back for months was because they were still waiting on the permit. So, I called the City myself to see what the hold up was only to learn no permit had been applied for. I think they were scamming me with your permit process.
• Nothing went smoothly.
• Nothing worked well. If you want to pass a bylaw that states if you remove a tree you need to plant a tree, I would be ok with that. But the need to pay for a permit and a site visit is unreasonable.
• The arborist looked after the paperwork.
• The city helped my tree grow properly by fixing its gnarled roots.
• Unfortunately, we are unable to identify what went well as it was a slowly responded to process.
• There was ultimately no permit fee.

9. Please tell us what you thought did not work well. (select all that apply).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did not Work Well</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to wait too long for a permit</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I needed an arborist to help with the application</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The permit fee (if applicable) was unfair</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not want to replant (if applicable)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not agree with the City’s decision on the health of my tree</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My arborist charged me to make the application as and I did not understand it</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process was complicated, and I did not understand it</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Other” Responses:
• I had a Black Walnut in my yard. It caused grass to stop growing underneath, the walnuts clogged up my gutters. Squirrels were everywhere! Fall clean up was overwhelming. If it had been a Maple tree, I probably would have left it.
• I was not aware of the application until after the removal, even though the tree was damaged, dead and needing to come down for safety. Staff were very nice and were not upset that I did not get the permit. However, they did require me to plant a new tree.
• We had to contact the city multiple times just to get a phone call returned regarding how to start the process. Response time and communication was lacking. Once the process
had begun the person we dealt with, via email, presented as somewhat rude, however in the end was helpful.

- The property was over planted in the beginning and now that they had matured, removal was needed for healthy growth. Also, the trees were diseased, and the City agreed to remove and wanted to wait till others were completely dead. Therefore, we had to mobilize the contractor twice.

- The timelines for response were not clear and this affected scheduling of an arborist. I had to contact the City to finally get a response on my application - this was not convenient as I live and work in another community. At no time was I contacted by the City to visit the property regarding my permit. The application was for seasonal pruning and removal of hazardous growth for the safety of neighbours and my property as well as theirs.

- You can tell both of my Councillors, if they pass a new by-law that requires a permit they will not be getting my vote in the next election.

- My very large tree had a crack in the split trunk from the crook to the ground and even with bracing to minimize movement of upper branches and with the current freeze/thaw cycles now taking place, my arborist could not guarantee that the tree would not cause damage to my house, neighbours homes, wires or fences on all sides of my property. The weight of the large branches would cause considerable damage and could have possibly killed a pet or child. As a homeowner with a damaged tree and upon consultation with an arborist I do not feel I should have to risk damage to my property and neighbouring properties while waiting for a City inspection and permit. I had to pay $4,000 for the removal of the tree and $700 for a new tree so I would not have been willing to pay for more trees.

- I wanted to also trim off over hanging branches from neighbouring property tree, she would not answer to give us permission. She watched the arborist trim my trees and he should have had the right to trim back branches hanging over my fence/property line without the neighbour's permission.

- Do not think it should be necessary to get a permit to remove a limb from a Manitoba Maple tree, which is an invasive exotic and grows like a weed.

- The second arborist I hired told me my tree was too small to need a permit. The permit provided opportunity for citizens to be scammed by opportunistic companies.

- As stated above - the permit fee was waived due to Ash tree problem which was good - but help from the City with the cost of removal would go a long way in getting the old dead/dangerous trees down and would invite owners to replant if they were sure of help in future in case of similar problems develop.

- I did not like that I was required to use an arborist for cutting down and trimming trees. We should be able to do it ourselves.

- I was perfectly capable of making a good decision about my property without being required to do it. And for funding that could have been used more proactively to by used for maintaining policy requirements.

- It is my property to decide what I will or will not do.

- Process should be self funded by applicants. Minimal City staff.
• The fee is very high. It might be better if the fee was less (i.e. $25.00 to $50.00 perhaps?). If someone is doing their own tree removal, the high cost might discourage them from doing it legally.
• The wording of the permit was offensive! We wanted to take down a tree that was on its last legs and the permit was called something along the lines of 'Permit to Destroy a Tree'. Also, the permit to prune or limb a tree was equally offensive in description 'Permit to Injure a Tree'. I felt like the wording of the permits was intended to somehow shame the applicant for even applying for the permit. The permit names should have been 'Permit to remove a tree' and 'Permit to prune or limb a tree'.
• There was nothing that did not work well. City was out to visit within a reasonable time to determine that the tree was on my property - just beyond the boulevard.
• When I applied for the permit, I was told that there was a backlog and it might take a while but that I would be contacted. I never heard anything more and did not proceed with getting an arborist to trim our trees.
• The timeframe provided was highly unreasonable given the cost, and the letter sent was the most insulting thing I have ever received from a municipality in my life. Neighbors agreed. We all understand that Ash trees needed to be controlled, especially those that were dead, but the way it was handled was insulting. In addition, the way the by-law was pushed through without consultation was not appropriate.
• I was declined for a permit. The reason was not acceptable to me as a homeowner.
• It seems unfair we have to foot the bill to get an arborist to make the call when we had house damage from a rotting limb. Now the City is planning to make us pay for the City to removal a tree cause of the tree being damage by a sewage pipe issue from the City services. This is not fair.

10. Property owners should have to get a permit to remove trees on private properties.
11. If a permit is required, it should be posted publicly before the tree is removed.

![Survey Results for Item 11]

12. If the revised by-law requires a permit to remove healthy trees, there should be penalties for the removal of healthy trees without an authorized permit. This will encourage compliance with the by-law.

![Survey Results for Item 12]

13. There should be an appeal process if an owner disagrees with the City’s assessment on the health of a tree.

![Survey Results for Item 13]
14. In what way(s) do you think the removal of healthy trees could be discouraged? Check all that apply.

**“Other” Responses:**

- Peer pressure developed through awareness campaigns and school connections with students.
- A publicly accessible map that tracks where trees are being removed.
- A City by-law officer and Ministry of Natural Resources bias call a City Councillor, then offer to replant trees and having it reflect of tax bill as for every tree cut three must be plants in City. Like the lost of trees in Jackson Park encampment this winter will be huge. Yes, there is a camp deep inside Jackson Park now and we hear them sawing at times.
- Removal Fee or fine for non-compliance with by-law.
- I believe in replacement but at a ratio of 1:1 or within reason given the size or layout of a lot.
- I think we were doing well before. Sometimes trees are in the way (of a building, of the view of a street intersection, of a food garden, etc.), sometimes they are sickly, sometimes people want to plant food trees instead of whatever other tree they have in the back yard. People have many different perfectly good reasons to remove a tree. Most will choose to leave them be (as evidenced by our existing canopy). I think it is a waste of time and resources to try to require permits for any of this. Permits should be required when a contractor wants to come in and clear a forest to build a bunch of houses. People just living normal lives are not cutting down trees.
- Require replacement trees to be planted, keeping permit applications free (or low) will encourage people to submit them and prevent unauthorized cutting.
- Education.
- It would be hilarious to force property owners to write an essay entitled "Why I think my short-term needs are more important than a beautiful tree that will probably outlive me" and post it to their front door for all to read.
- Education.
- Education and incentives.
• If the tree removed was an invasive so with a native species this should be considered or offset by other measures that contribute to environmental goals.
• Education.
• Property taxes could be increased based on amount of healthy native trees removed.
• Punishable by fines.
• Force the applicant to explain in words why their tree, despite all the scientifically proven benefits it provides to their community, needs to die.
• get a tax break for each tree you have planted on your property, so residents understand that keeping a tree is beneficial.
• Educate, educate! We cannot be seen as dictators without reasonable explanations in order to get buy-in from the public. We also need a way to monitor- more staff?
• Require the replacement tree to be of the same size.
• Also, a property tax reduction based on percent of live tree canopy per square meter of property could be applied. Use existing aerial/satellite images (i.e. Google satellite view) to determine this percentage. This could tie into “tree tax” method of paying for administration of this initiative as described in my response to question 17.
• The last three questions regarding healthy trees should have regard for the size of caliper of the tree. A small healthy tree of less than 3cm diameter should not treated the same as a mature tree of substantial caliper and crown diameter.
• A subsidy for properties that have a certain number of healthy trees (reward those who comply!)
• Once the act is in place, anyone who removes a healthy tree should be charged a hefty fine. Neighbours should be encouraged to take photos and whistle blow on anyone who mismanaged this critical resource.
• Public awareness campaigns, educating property owners, subsidizing cost of new planting and arborists who could help to maintain tree health.
• Some property owners will make poor decisions about their trees. Most will make good decisions, and encouraging the good ones is much more beneficial than policing everyone.
• If not replanting after the removal of a healthy tree, they can pay for a new tree that can be planted in public space or could be donated to lower income households for planting on their property.
• Plant a tree if you have room to.
• Refusal of permit.
• Positive incentives should be used. For example, encourage tree retention through property tax reductions where there is a significant non-hard surface or non-uniform (grass) coverage.
• I strongly disagree with use of permit fees to discourage healthy tree removal unless they are allocated to a special account used for urban forest enhancement (additional trees not already scheduled to be planted or other stewardship efforts). In my opinion, this program should maintain focus on the primary target (urban forest health/area improvement) and not on generating additional revenue sources for the municipality.
• Have the City pay for the tree.
• Taxpayers are already paying $5000 in our neighbourhood next year. When we need to call to complain because green space in the park is not being properly maintained it is not a good morale booster that all of the above suggestion will incur cost in some way. While replanting is important, this looks like a cash grab.
• Again, if this is on private property, planting on City property at the front of the house. Trees become a big financial burden with maintaining them, insurance concerns, etc. Perhaps the city could offer to plant trees at the front of homes.
• My tree was healthy. But it was going to impact my home. I replanted trees but that last by-law wanted a similar type tree. That was ridiculous. Why would I plant a similar tree (that I admit was a huge mistake on my part) on my lot again? I planted trees that a trained landscaper selected for my property. Next, I will reach out to the City to plant a tree at the front of my house as long as it is in relatively decent shape.
• Replacement trees should be planted if it is one of only a couple trees on that property (property size dependent). If there a lot of trees on the property and one is removed, that is partially dead but does not meet the criteria of being dead by the City worker, no trees should need to be planted.
• Pruning of mature trees as part of a managed arbor care program should be exempt from permits.
• Removal of dead or diseased trees should be exempt from permits, but subject to notification of removal and audits to ensure healthy trees are not removed using this exemption.
• Removal of up to a fixed percentage of total tree growth on a property should be exempt from a permit but be subject to notification of removal and audits for compliance.
• Who is removing healthy trees? There are trees in the park behind our house that are not healthy, on City property, that should be removed and yet there they stand leaning, with limbs falling off in windstorms. They are dangerous to all who use the park!
• Education.
• Information provided to the homeowner of the significance and importance of that tree.
• Incentive of some kind for trees on private property- perhaps tax credit.
• Nothing it depends why the tree is being removed.
• Provide a modest tax incentive to retain substantial trees.
• Educate the public. Give reasons and examples, convince the public and property owners that the tree they have is good and needs not be removed. This is difficult because education has to occur on a case by case basis and is tree species and location specific. For example: A Black Walnut tree over a garden impedes the garden's growth. The gardener wants it gone but the neighbours love it. It is irreplaceable once removed. This is an example of a worthy tree in the wrong place or the garden in the wrong place, where education about other values of the tree might help the homeowner decide against removal, perhaps in favour of pruning, or altering landscaping plans.
• Fines! Strong fines.
• Tree removal is expensive, I do not believe healthy trees will be cut down unless necessary.
• An application fee.
• There should not be a penalty to remove trees from private property, ever.
• Inform citizen of benefit of trees and offer alternatives such as pruning or maintenance advice.

• Education. If homeowners are aware of the value of trees and for their own management, use, enjoyment and protection of their property need to take down a tree, the City should stay out of it! Underlying this whole discussion is a "we know better" attitude, that overlooks that people do not want to remove trees for no good reason. Why would you assume that people do the "wrong thing"?

• It depends on the reason for removing the tree. If there is a valid reason (e.g. safety, property damage, tree health) for removing the tree than there should be no additional costs incurred by the property owner, not a requirement to replace the tree.

• Discouraging removal of older trees is not a long-term solution in a City that is ever changing and adapting. You need to look at encouraging older (generally larger) trees with younger trees that will be of manageable size while they grow creating a spectrum of varying tree ages and types across the City.

• Steep fines required of those who injure or remove healthy trees without getting the City Permit and require that three replacement trees be planted for each one removed.

• All seems too Big Brother to me. Public education about the benefit of trees, i.e. reducing home heating costs might be a good start. Taking proper care of a tree is costly and many seniors would not be able to pay for annual trimming. I never did find out what the City would charge for replacement cost for trees since I had mine removed during the time there was a lapse in the bylaw process. I would certainly not have been able to pay more than the close to $5,000 I already had to pay.

• The City must establish clear reasons for removal of a tree. For example, what if the owner wants to plant a vegetable garden, something the City should encourage for household resilience, but a shade tree makes a garden impossible?

• Healthy trees must not be removed unless there is a very valid reason.

• Require 1:1 replacement.

• Permit fees are very high. Also, every housing development seems to clear cut the area and bulldoze the land. It is horrible and contributes enormously to habitat loss. Make developers set a better example. Secondly, make replacement trees affordable. (I am not sure if the City provides trees, and if so, at what cost?) I bought my own tree and planted it as a replacement for the birches that blew over, but it was costly.

• High fines and/or criminal charges.

• 1) Educate property owners about the value of trees and how they contribute to the overall well being of the city and its citizens. 2) If permit fees are established, they should be directed to the city tree planting program for city and/or private property. 3) Planting replacement trees could be a factor; however, there needs to be room for the trees not only when they are small but also when they are mature … so the remove one and plant three approach can be problematic if there is only room for one tree. Must be on a case by case basis and consider the species of tree and the size that it is expected to be when mature.

• If the City wants more trees, then plant them on City property.

• If healthy trees are causing foundation damage or structural or infrastructure damage to private property, there should be an exemption regarding the removal of a tree.
• Our tree was very old and in very poor shape. We worked with an arborist originally to try and maintain it for as long as possible. It was also a threat to our century home. When the arborist, one year after all the pruning etc., wanted $800.00 to fertilize it for one season we decided to be done trying to save a dying tree. If you want to reduce the removal of healthy or sick but savable trees, then the costs of arborist being reasonable would go a long way towards such. We were told that our lightning struck, blackened, tree that was missing its entire upper truck except the first 12 feet may not meet the qualifications for removal, despite the fact that it threatened the house if a storm compromised it. We thought it was strange that the city was more interested in a tree than a piece of heritage. The removal of healthy trees should be supported when the request is for a specific reason. I am unclear why developers can completely clear sites for mass development, but homeowners cannot remove trees to make their space more usable or safer.

• Permit fees require replacement trees to be planted, City Hall should have a personal involvement in our treescape. Remember the 35 90-year-old trees that were cut down on the corner of Wolsely and Alymer with absolutely no community involvement? These were perfectly healthy trees working for our community to absorb carbon.

• Must volunteer at or pay for tree planting activities.

• Money or replanting is of little use when an elder tree that is healthy is removed from the canopy. The City will need to be active in educating residents on not simply seeing trees as property or commodity. It needs to become part of our culture that owning property with trees means that you have a responsibility to the community in terms of the trees under your care.

• Giving homeowners the ability to prune or trim a tree overhanging a structure, home or garage, will lessen the stress about removing the whole tree. I have 12 trees on my small lot but cannot allow them to grow over the house. Use some common sense, you all own homes and know you do not need the City to help unless the City pays for our home insurance premiums.

• A tax added to a homeowner’s property tax bill, if the homeowner does not have any healthy trees on their property. Public listings.

• Education of the public about the benefits of a healthy urban forest and the consequences of losing our trees.

• Educational programs and financial incentives for planting trees.

• Tax breaks per tree.

• Require replacement trees to be planted, provide incentives in the permit process or fees, or rebates on completion, for designs that favour the tree canopy. For example, a building footprint or design that is less harmful to surrounding trees or root systems might be approved faster or rewarded upon completion. Porous driveway/parking solutions favoured over non-porous, etc.

• All healthy trees should be protected with fines for removal of healthy trees. Exceptions should only be made with consultation and approval by the city.

• Ongoing and available conservation education.

• Cost to individual homeowners for replanting should be minimal or free in order to encourage permits. Permits should be free or low cost.

• Possible replacement based on reason why healthy tree was removed.
• An estimation within the City assessment/permit of the financial impact on the heating/cooling costs of the house once the tree is removed.
• Fine.

15. Which exemptions are reasonable for the City to consider as part of the revised by-law? Check all that apply.

| Which exemptions are reasonable for the City to consider as part of the revised by-law? |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Percentage of Participants:     | Poor tree health (e.g., dead, or in irreversible decline) | Tree safety (e.g., high-risk trees) | Tree species (e.g., certain should be considered invasive) | Minimum tree size (e.g., a tree should be over a certain size before a permit is required) | Ash trees | Fruit trees | Other (please specify) | None of the above |
| 0%                              | 85%                             | 77%                             | 70%                             | 67%                             | 36%                             | 22%                             | 18%                             | 2%                     |

“Other” Responses:
• Should include pruning too.
• There should be some wiggle room that allows a homeowner to have other reasons for removing a tree--perhaps concern about too much shade and too many mosquitoes, which can also be a health hazard. Also concerns about roots affecting plumbing, foundations, etc. We need to consider the trees in their urban environment, which includes our built environment and the people who live in it.
• Add one more: Tree is demonstrably causing or is about to cause property damage (e.g., to a basement, fence, sidewalk/pathway, driveway, or other structure) and complete removal is the only solution. In this case the owner will usually want a new tree but planted elsewhere and may love a helpful program that will help them get a new tree as opposed to one that punishes them for protecting their property.
• Many species now are considered species or are subject to multiple pests or disease, the replacement of affected trees should be more than just Ash and Emerald Ash Borer.
• we have trees that have sprouted up on their own (from bird droppings) and we should be able to remove those trees while they are young.
• Consider the spread of disease as needed (e.g. may be ash at this time but circumstances change).
• All trees are fruit trees.
• To allow for gardens - especially urban farming projects.
• I feel the minimum tree size should be re-evaluated based on species. If a tree is likely to be damaged/become unhealthy as the result of other permitted work on a property, the permit process should be looked at on a case by case basis.
• Tree is causing damage to house e.g., roots growing into foundation.
• Overcrowding on lot, plans to do something else on the property such as an addition to your home or putting in a pool.
• Permits, if absolutely required, should apply only to a limited selection of total trees. If you want to require a permit for the first five trees on a property, fine. I'm not getting a permit to manage the other 195. Especially when I planted 125 of them myself.
• If removal of trees will improve the health of the remaining trees on the property that should also be a consideration. My property has a number of mid-sized trees that were planted too closely together. Removing some of these trees will improve the overall health of the remaining trees. Technically, all of the trees are "healthy" but selective removal of a few trees would maximize the health and growth of the remaining trees. There needs to be a way to account for this without having to through the expense of retaining and arborist or another qualified professional to tell me this is the right thing to do.
• Exemptions should only be considered where no subjective judgement is required - this is where personal opinion or finding a professional to agree with you would be concerned. I've moved here from Chelsea, Quebec, outside of the Gatineau Park. You could only remove trees under 3" in diameter without a permit. Or apply to the Municipality for other reasons i.e. construction, septic beds etc.
• The property owner should decide if a tree needs to be removed.
• when roots are interfering with foundation, sewer and lifting out of the ground, they should be removed.... with no interference from city. If city wants trees the city can plant on their property at the curbside.
• I think the City needs to give serious thought as to why someone with a perfectly healthy tree would want to take it down. The premise of the bylaw is that people are indiscriminately cutting down trees, and I don't think that's the case. It's just bureaucratic meddling, it is costly to taxpayers and has no good end. If you want more trees, spend the money on doing an inventory, and seeing where there are opportunities to plant a tree. Conservation Authorities used to "reforest" large swaths of farmland (with small seedlings) to rehabilitate unused fields. Why can't the City think about approaching homeowners and asking them to plant a tree? Maybe a free one? Why the coercion?
• Trees in close proximity to a home should be considered as well given increasing ice storm and wind events. If there is a concern that the tree could cause significant damage to a home if it were to fall down, the property owner should be allowed to remove the tree at no additional cost.
• This question is confusing are you talking about exceptions to allow the tree to be removed without a permit or exceptions for trees that shouldn't be removed even if they request a permit or exceptions for when the city can require a tree to be removed? For question 13 who has to pay for the professional? Is it a city staff member at no cost to
the owner or is it another cost incurred by the homeowner? If the first yes if the second no.

- What if the owner wants to plant a vegetable garden, which would be impractical if a tree shaded the area totally?
- I am unclear as to the meaning of "exemptions" here. Does it mean exempted from assessment by the city before removal? Or exempted from the by-law and its penalties altogether? In my opinion, ALL trees being considered for removal by private landowners MUST be assessed and permitted.
- Unsafe or dead trees should require only a no-cost permit.
- Invasive species should require a no-cost permit and a reduced cost replacement. I removed 13 European Buckthorns from my property when I bought it in 1997, and I am still pulling up seedlings because the neighbours cannot afford to remove the ones on their property. People who cut down trees for cosmetic reasons should be penalized.
- Ash trees or other trees affected by invasive species or diseases need not be exempted. If the tree is healthy, the by-law should apply. If the tree is in decline as a result of insect or disease, the "poor tree health" exemption.
- Tree that are damaging cars and houses by their sap or branches or walnuts or whatever else drops from the tree.
- Thin dense planting. Too close to building.
- I have 6 kinds of trees growing on my lot and they need the occasional dead branch of section trying to grow over my roof removed. Again, the common-sense approach says the all these trees will grow to a ripe old age and benefit the house and the climate.
- Permits are best for all trees. Otherwise, landowners can cite an oversight/error, such as "Oh, I thought the tree was a Manitoba Maple!", or "I thought it the tree was dead" before the tree leafed out in the spring (like Gingkos that leaf out about a month later than most other trees). Best to not give landowners any windows of opportunity.
- There are occasions where a property owner may have planted to many trees on their property, IE newly developed property, and the trees are now a size that they have overgrown the yard and creating so much shade that a vegetable garden won't grow. The owner should be allowed to remove a tree(s) if they are making the yard unusable.
- Tree removal to provide homeowners with reasonable enjoyment of property should not be a difficult process. If the owner cannot or will not replace the tree a reasonable charge should be levied so the City can and does replace the tree elsewhere.
- High risk trees, fruit trees and ash trees should require a free permit which will bind their replacement.
16. Should the exemptions be verified by a qualified professional through the application process?

![Bar chart showing 72% of participants agree, 28% disagree.]

17. It is important to replant a new tree (or trees) if a healthy tree is removed in order to ensure the conservation of the urban tree canopy

![Bar chart showing 68% strongly agree, 17% somewhat agree, 5% neither agree nor disagree, 5% somewhat disagree, 5% strongly disagree.]

18. How should the City achieve the replacement of healthy tree removed from private property? Check all that apply

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>How should the City achieve the replacement of healthy tree removed from private property?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require the property owner to plant replacement(s) of the same species or native tree(s) of similar stature or other appropriate species from an approved list</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide incentives to the property owner to promote replanting native, large stature, long-lived trees</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require fees to cover the cost of replanting tree(s) in other locations</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

“Other” Responses:

- Ensure that if replacements are required that the city is following up within a certain time period (i.e., a year) to confirm that the accepted replacements have indeed been planted.
- The city should be made aware of how many trees are removed so that they can contribute to replanting and budget for it.
- The city should offer trees to be planted at a low cost to the property owner.
- Collect a list of homeowners who would like to see a tree planted on their property--publicly fund planting of trees on private property to replace removed trees.
- There should be options for the homeowner which might include planting trees in other locations. Again, recognizing this may be a cumbersome expense for some homeowners. Incentives, such as a break on property taxes might be a better approach.
- I’d love a tree-planting program. I want more trees planted on the city-owned land surrounding my property but it is unclear to me how to get them. I can take care of my own tree-planting on my own property.
- Options should be provided because there may not be space to replant. Replanting should occur within a certain distance. Front yard or boulevard trees should be considered. Tree replanting should be greater than 1:1 for certain situations, if healthy native trees must be removed.
- If trees are tied to tax rates more people will replant trees.
- The major difficulty is replacing a large tree canopy. A small tree will not replace a large one. Need a formula that would consider this...cannot cut down a 40-year-old tree and replace it with a 5-year-old.
• Allow the property owner to either plant a replacement tree of reasonable maturity, from an approved list on their own property or provide cash in lieu to the city to establish a tree appropriately located elsewhere within the city.
• A nice incentive would be a tax credit on the owners municipal tax bill for the amount of any tree planting they do after a removal.
• Provide incentives to all property owners. Some property owners will choose to have more trees than others. The City's goal should be to retain (or increase) the overall tree count in the city, not the tree count on each individual property.
• Point 1: Option 3 (recover the cost to replant in other locations) is not a desirable course of action for me. I am concerned that this strategy would lead to a less homogeneous distribution of trees in the urban forest and negate some of the benefits associated with trees listed in Q2. Point 2: We need to have a flexible direction in this policy regarding species selection. Many trees we are actively using to replant in the Peterborough community have invasive forest pests threatening other communities in Ontario and I hope we are able to learn from the Emerald Ash Borer invasion. Point 3: One important concept here that is missing is the idea of building DIVERSE tree communities. During EAB spread, we lost entire streets worth of mature trees due to monoculture plantings of single species. The same was true for other communities during Dutch Elm Disease spread. Our current approach of planting the same species clusters does not sufficiently protect us from losing entire species which is a very likely outcome in the next decade and beyond. I hope this bylaw provides us with an opportunity to promote greater diversity and build resilience into our urban forest (e.g. no less than 3 species for every 5 individuals planted in an area.
• Is the city still planting trees? The cost to run a household is getting tougher and tougher here. When trees become another expense, people want to eliminate the expense. Trees require maintenance. Honestly, our tax dollars should be used for the tree planting in our city.
• Require fees to cover the cost of replanting tree(s) in other locations, if the City is recovering cost of replanting trees, the applicant should have some say in the new location & it should be in close proximity of the address in question. Or if the property owner is interested in re-planting native large stature, long-lived trees, the city should work with the owner to achieve this (assume some of the cost).
• I think this needs to be in moderation. If a relatively small lot has one enormous tree that needs to be taken down, the previous bylaw may say you need to plant 4 new trees, but the lot may not support that amount of trees without totally dominating the space. So the replanting requirement needs to be reasonable.
• The city could provide and plant the tree, perhaps for a fee. It is sometimes hard to find healthy young potted trees of the right species for sale. And not everyone can do the work to plant a tree themselves. Perhaps this could be a partnership with Ptb Green-Up Ecology Park? I don't want to see it privatized where people pay a landscaping company to plant a tree. Also if a new tree is to be planted it should be of a minimum height and specify that it must be healthy at time of planting. Agree there should be a list of approved species.
• Modest tax breaks for maintaining substantial trees.
• Provide incentives to the property owner to promote replanting native, large-stature, long-lived trees, Havelock Belmont-Methuen provides about 50 free maple trees every two years to tax-payers. They do their part and I do mine.
• City can plant more trees at their cost on city properties. (curbside).
• Provide incentives to the property owner to promote replanting native, trees of a variety of types and sizes. The harder you make it to remove a tree the harder it will be to get people to replant them.
• The first one should state "of similar stature at maturity". It would be impractical to plant a fully mature large tree.
• In addition, sometimes it is not possible to replant a tree on a property even if one is removed. This may be because the original planting site was not safe/ideal (e.g. between two driveways) or if the area soil was possibly contaminated with disease from the old tree. In cases such as these, off-site plantings could occur at a reasonable rate or shrub plantings could be considered if the property is small.
• Healthy trees should not be removed other than for reasons of safety, disease, or invasive species. Cosmetic reasons are not good reasons. ANY tree that is removed should be replaced at reasonable cost. Note: not sure what option 3 means...? What "other locations"? incentives are always a good idea. If the Peterborough Horticultural Society can obtain seedlings for about $5.00 per tree, so can the city! Have a "Plant a tree day" for property owners, provide low cost trees, advice on how to plant them, and follow up. And ignore the complaints from Home Depot garden centre and similar places - or engage them in the process. Wherever possible, work with local businesses: Horlings, Johnston's, Griffin's, etc. Make it a positive experience.
• Has to be determined on a case by case basis. If there is room for a tree as it matures, replanting would be good. If there are incentives (e.g. a modest property tax credits) that would be good as well. If there is no room for a mature tree, perhaps a contribution to the city tree planting program is ok too. In terms of trees on private property … while they benefit the landowner, they also benefit broader society so the financial burden of tree planting should not fall just to the property owner. If the landowner wants to remove a tree to build an extension to a house or a garage, it could still be on a case by case basis with any of the three options above applying depending on specific circumstances.
• If the city wants to replant more trees than do it on city property.
• The City should enable NGOs and other partners/organizations to plant trees on public land, and should make the approval for tree planting to be simply, prompt, and straightforward. The City should allow residents to work together during replanting. E.g., if a resident removes a tree, allow for replanting on a neighbouring property. The City should make the process of applying and replanting to be simple and inexpensive for residents and for partners/NGOs to plant trees. Additionally, the City should provide incentives for homeowners to purchase trees and plant them on their own property, regardless of whether they are removing trees. The list of approved tree species according to the City should be more publicly accessible and easier to find.
• The city should have an active plan to add to the tree canopy not contingent on the case of removal of tree from private property. In addition to city plans for planting the promotion of planting trees suitable for creating a healthy and widely beneficial forest canopy should be undertaken.
• Replacing trees is good, but so is replacing a tree with a garden of some other sort.
• Plant trees in public spaces and on city property.
• The item about incentives is great and if the homeowner plants one and the city plants one for each live health tree removed then that would flow well into the cities plan which would go toward the city planting 3000 trees on public lands over the next 2 years. Seniors can only do so much with fixed pensions!
• If the property owner is removing a healthy tree for whatever reason, they may not want to plant another tree on the property. They should have the option to pay a fee to have the city plant a tree in another location. The fee should be based on the average cost of purchasing a tree locally. The labour cost should be covered by the annual budget for the department.
• Don’t penalize those of us who have already planted trees in our back yard.
• If the City requires a replacement tree, it should be provided to the homeowner at no cost by the City.
• I agree with the first option however I would amend this to allow for trees of smaller stature to be a substitute to allow for older, larger trees to be replaced by several smaller, younger trees - due to cost and ease of planting and placement throughout the person’s property.

19. Do you have any other ideas on how a by-law can protect the City’s tree canopy?
• A tax rebate to homeowners with trees. Fees and penalties should be balanced with incentives and rebates
• Prioritizing the maintenance of diverse tree communities. This was also noted to include specifically species with a positive contribution to biodiversity, provenance and ecoregion
• The by-law should help regulate tree removal and ensure compliance with the replacement of indigenous tree species as opposed to policing homeowners.
• Adopt a 5 or 10 year no net loss strategy where trees planted following a tree cut down must double (or triple) the lost tree canopy in the city within a 5-10-year period.
• Allow flexibility to have replacement trees planted in other, similar sites, or in collaboration with neighbours.
• Conduct a best practice review that includes London ON.
• The by-law can only be as successful as the by-in and therefore an educational campaign is needed for Council and the public
• Education and incentive programs can include City staff actively approaching homeowners who may have space and have a tree planted.
• Clear communication is needed about what can and cannot be done without a permit
• Encourage tree management as the best option before complete removal
• The decision making process should be fast (i.e. under 10 days)
• Heritage tree designations
• Hire by-law officers in that field so they can review trees health
• Look for opportunities to turn unused paved surfaces into green spaces like the DBIA is doing downtown
• Have more public education events at the ecology garden.
• Help promote neighbourhood gardens like the one on Bonnacord St.
- Every time a child is born a tree should be planted
- Hire students to inspect properties
- By-Law: compulsory #trees per property
- Make raingardens compulsory
- Ensure new developments have a minimum standard for trees and greenspace guideline
- Incentives to register trees to enforce by-law
- Fees collected as a result of the by-law could be used to pay for invasive species control on public and private properties
- Protection needs to be meaningful towards conservation goals and not focus on single trees
- Create an education flyer that communicates the by-law and how it fits into a larger strategy and mail to every household
- Slow the population growth
- By the homeowners being required to have a professional arborist keep the trees manicured.
- Not with a bylaw. Designate open areas to plant trees.
- Initiate a strong education process for the general public. Start a replanting project along city streets to fill in the canopy.

20. How should the cost of protecting trees, including administration, enforcement and education of the potential by-law be covered? (please select one)

- Fees for applications and permits as well as general property tax revenue to share the cost between the applicants and the broader community (44%)
- Through the general property tax revenue, spread across the entire tax base as a community cost (29%)
- Recovering costs through fees for applications and permits (16%)
- Other (please specify) (10%)

“Other” Responses:
- Read my other answers.
- Penalties for transgressions.

21. What would discourage you from wanting a City tree outside your property?
- Risk that the tree becomes damaged and affects homeowners financially
• Inability to participate in the selection process of tree species and location. A few people indicated not wanting non-native species
• Overly restrictive maintenance
• Aesthetics
• Interference with water intake
• Interference with access to light to the home
• Debris from leaves and fruits
• Concern for shade over a garden areas
• Concern about invasive root systems
• Concern that it could affect essential city and private services infrastructure
• More opportunity for the City to plant trees in parks and along boulevards
• Lack of confidence that the City would maintain the tree
• Nothing - I love trees as long as my arborist is allowed to do the maintenance.
• Nothing
• I would welcome any and all trees.

22. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us that you think needs to be considered in the revised tree by-law?

• If homeowners are going to be held accountable for maintaining and improving the tree canopy, the City should do their part in a highly visible way and maintain trees on City properties
• add more berry brushes, native trees and evergreens to the City
• Arborists should have an exemption but also shouldn’t have too much of a say in the development of the by-law. The by-law should protect trees from arborists that wish to remove trees for monetary gain
• Come up with a better strategy for the tree cover in the downtown core.
• Consider subsidies based on household income
• part of the frustration felt by residents was lack of clarity, transparency, and efficiency when going through the process.
• Consider the qualifications and experience of a landowner. Do not order a landowner through a by-law to only use a certified arborist. If a tree is a certain height or diameter where adjacent properties/structures could potentially be damaged, then the landowner should provide the method through notification on how the tree will be removed safely. The by-law should require notification. It should not require a permit process. There should only be a requirement to replace what is removed with a list of recommended species of forest cover.
• Enhance speciation and diversity to limit potential risk to disease.
• Consider climate change when planting that looks to 2100. This will allow for tree species currently on the northern fringe of its habitat in the region to be expanded into Peterborough.
• Financial assistance for the removal of Ash Trees affected by Emerald Ash Borer
• Very concerned that people will let diseased or damaged trees fall to avoid costly permits.
• Find a way to increase tree canopy in several "underserved" areas.
• Frame the messaging as an essential tool supporting the Peterborough Climate Change Action Plan and the City's declaration of a Climate Emergency.
• Offer arborist information services and species suggestions for those of us with tree issues
• It should be made illegal to remove ANY trees from private property in the Old Teachers' College Neighbourhood, Old West End, Downtown and ANY other neighbourhoods with heritage trees
• Begin with a small-scale replacement program for Norway maple on city property. There should also be a list of preferred species for planting that would not include trees like Manitoba maple. Native trees that are desired and identified as species at risk (like butternut and, maybe one day soon, ash) should be on the list with additional modest property tax credit. The city could budget a modest amount for "tree" tax credits each year and when those credits run out the program is done for that year.
• Minimum diameter of trees, pruning vs. removal and species should be considered.
• Consider a two-tiered permit/penalty system. A lower or waived fee for the removal of unhealthy, invasive or unsafe trees. A higher fee for permits to remove healthy trees with a SUBSTANTIALLY higher penalty for illegal removal of healthy trees.
• Make the list of approved tree species more accessible and available to the community
• There is a fungus that has decimated the entire sugar maple tree population on our street in the south end. There should be a way to have better communication to deal with problems like this.
• There should just be a distinct division between taking down healthy vs. unhealthy trees. You should not be charged for the unhealthy trees
• Work with the local cemeteries to stop allowing caskets to be buried in the ground and encourage families to plant trees in honour of their loved ones instead.
• Questions:
  • Do replacement trees have to be planted on the same property? What if I cut down a tree but my neighbour plants a tree?
  • The trees on my property keep seeding themselves, so I cut down seedlings each year. Would that require a permit?
  • Can we boil sap outside over a wood fire pit and finish the maple syrup inside? 4 mature trees would give lots of syrup!
  • Why is the city spending (I was told $500.00 per ash tree)?
  • Mature trees on homeowners' properties need to be pruned and maintained by qualified arborists.
• City plant trees in open areas.
• Educate the people and adopt the bylaw. Have to educate developers too. Also eliminate the exemption to prevent developers from removing existing trees before a site plan is submitted.
23. Are you a resident of the City of Peterborough?

Are you a resident of the City of Peterborough?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Do you work for a business and/or community group with a specific interest in the revised tree by-law?

Do you work for a business and/or community group with a specific interest in the revised tree by-law?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. What are the six digits of your postal code? (enter with no spaces)

The following shows a heat map of respondents’ postal codes.

26. Do you like the idea of the City planting trees in the right-of-ways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>