



Report to: General Committee

Meeting Date: May 24, 2022

SUBJECT:	Tree Preservation By-law Review and Update
PREPARED BY:	Alice Lam – Director of Operations, 905.475.4857 Tanya Lewinberg – Acting Sr. Manager of Business, Fleet & Public Realm, Operations, ext. 2700

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) THAT the report and presentation entitled “Tree Preservation By-law Review and Update” be received;
- 2) THAT the recommendations for amendments to the Tree Preservation By-law and related processes in this report be approved; and
- 3) THAT Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The following report is to provide a detailed review and recommended amendments to the Tree Preservation By-law on 18 identified issues. The following issues are examined in detail: Tree Permit Expiration, Boundary Trees, Collect Securities, Permit and Application Fees, Tree Compensation, Compensation at Appeals Permit Signage, Tree Preservation Zone (TPZ) Barrier Signage, Licensing of Tree Companies/Arborists, Protection of Shrubs Size Threshold of Protected Trees, Trees Located in the Proposed Building Footprint, Proximity of Trees to Buildings, Trees Located in Rear Yards, Heritage Designation for Trees, Pool Process, Urban Design (UD) to Issue Tree Removal Permits, and Prosecution of Offences.

PURPOSE:

As noted in the City of Markham’s Streetscape Manual, “the City of Markham is committed to contributing to a healthy environment and increased biodiversity. The urban forest is integral to achieving this target. When suitably integrated, urban trees are also a valuable ‘green’ infrastructure providing tangible sustainability benefits that appreciate in value over time. As urban forests grow, their environmental, social and economic benefits increase. The urban landscape can be understood as an urban ecosystem, with each part relating to and affecting the whole.”

The purpose of the Tree Preservation By-law is to:

- Ensure the preservation of the urban canopy for air quality and ground water conservation. Trees filter carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone and particulate matter. Trees can intercept rainfall in their foliage preventing runoff, promoting absorption and filtering of the rain water infiltrating the ground;
- Achieve a tree canopy cover of 30% or greater - this lowers the heat island effect; and is the amount of canopy required for net community benefits;
- Ensure safety of people and property; and
- Encourage maintenance of trees on private property.

The City of Markham does not charge a fee for a tree permit application related to private property; rather the City offers a free safety inspection to residents to maintain trees for the good of the community as a whole. City Tree Preservation Technicians regularly meet with residents to provide information, education and suggestions about private property trees as alternatives to removal of healthy trees.

This cross commission review takes the urban forest policies and principles, tree preservation strategies, various legislation and applicable By-laws into consideration to enhance the By-law in protecting the private tree canopy.

BACKGROUND:

The Tree Preservation By-law was first approved by Council in 2008. In April 2017, Operations held a Council workshop to provide information about various aspects of the By-law such as benchmarking to other municipal private tree by-laws and highlighted the Markham tree preservation process for both development and non-development applications.

On May 9, 2017, Markham City Council passed an amendment to the Tree Preservation By-law, adding the rebuttable presumption clause, to make property owners ultimately responsible for the destruction of trees on their property. This amendment assists with enforcement of the Tree Preservation By-law.

In July 2017, staff carried out a follow-up Council workshop to address concerns related to the process to align internal processes between Operations and Planning department. This workshop also identified a number of improvements such as tree compensation, property rights and size of protection. Council directed staff to further review the By-law and report back to Council with By-law amendment recommendations.

One of the recommendations from the 2017 workshop was a review of the appeal process. The appeal process was reviewed in 2021 by the Clerks Department and a new process was approved by Council in early 2022. The new process aligned By-law appeal processes for different By-laws across the City and made the decision of the adjudicator final and binding.

OPTIONS/ DISCUSSION:

Shortly after the 2017 workshop, a cross commission team was formed. To further understand and assess the improvement areas, staff completed an informal residential survey of approximate 500 residents in the summer of 2019. The intent of the survey was to gauge support and seek feedback on the current By-law. The results were favourable, showing residential support.

In early 2020, staff further engaged and hosted a meeting with other municipal partners to benchmark processes and policies. The meeting was well attended with representatives from Vaughan, Mississauga, Richmond Hill, Oakville, Whitby and Pickering. Subsequently, staff conducted one-on-one engagement meetings with the City of Markham Council members to review the findings. The Tree Preservation By-law review

is now complete with a balancing objective to achieve a practical process while preserving the City's valuable green asset.

The following is a summary of each improvement area and the accompanying recommendation(s).

1. Tree Permit Expiration – Currently, section 7.2.e of the By-law designates the duration of a tree preservation permit at 90 days. As a result, permit holders regularly require multiple permit extensions creating redundant work for both Tree Preservation Technicians and residents. Oakville, Mississauga and Richmond Hill have one year permit expirations while Vaughan has a 6 months permit expiration with the ability to extend the permit.

Recommendation – Extend permit validity to one year from the date of issuance, with the option to extend to the following planting season.

2. Boundary Trees - Boundary trees are on the property line between neighbouring lands. To comply with provincial legislation, specifically the Forestry Act, Subsection 10(3), development applications for large and small projects are required to obtain written consent from adjacent land owners. Currently there is not a consistent process for managing boundary trees across different municipalities. Mississauga, Oakville, and Vaughan require written permission from both neighbouring owners for boundary tree removal. Richmond Hill views boundary trees as a civil matter, but does require written permission in some cases when tree injury is expected to be significant. Toronto sends letters to both residents requesting the applicant share their drawing with the neighbour to inform the tree injury or removal request.

Recommendation – A standard letter template will be provided on the Markham website to direct all applicants to have shared tree owners and neighbours sign for acknowledgement as part of the development application for tree removals.

3a. Collecting Securities for Replanting Conditions – The Operations Department does not collect securities for replanting conditions and has a low compliance rate. Urban Design does collect securities for site plan and subdivision development application replanting conditions and has 100% compliance rate for replanting conditions. Oakville and Mississauga require security deposits for tree preservation for residential and development applications. Richmond Hill and Vaughan do not require security deposits for tree preservation for residential applications.

Markham has approximately 217 outstanding conditional replant permits that have yet to be resolved and the approximate value of these replanting permits is \$200,000.00 toward tree planting within the City. In an effort to resolve these permits. Tree Preservation staff has contacted the residents with outstanding conditional permits with a request to resolve their permits.

Recommendation – Non-construction related permits will be asked to sign an Undertaking to as an acknowledgement of their replanting conditions prior to permit release. When the permit expires, a reminder will be sent to those that have not contacted the City regarding their replanting conditions being fulfilled, those that do not request an

extension to their permit will have the cash-in-lieu value of their planting conditions tax rolled. Development related tree permits to provide a security deposit of \$600.00 per conditional replant tree. All trees must have a minimum of a one year warranty.

3b. Collecting Securities for Tree Preservation Barriers – Securities are not collected for Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) barriers. TPZ barriers are currently required to attain site plan/subdivision or infill development final approvals. For the infill process, this means that final Residential Grading and Servicing (RGS) approval cannot be issued without approved TPZ barriers being installed and approved. Collecting a Letter of Credit (LC) for the installation of TPZ barriers will allow staff to provide Residential Grading and Servicing (“RGS”) approval with the LC rather than requiring the barriers installed on site in advance of the demolition work. This will alleviate residents’ concerns about TPZ’s being an eyesore in the neighbourhood, installed years before projects commence.

Recommendation – Applicable permits will be required to submit an LC for installation and preservation of TPZ fencing. This LC will act as a safeguard to ensure TPZ fencing is installed prior to construction initiation allowing the fencing to come later in the approval process. Once installed, a percentage of the security will be kept until the end of construction to ensure TPZ’s are properly maintained throughout the project. Further the Building Department is planning to add tree preservation fencing to their list of requirements, to ensure it is installed prior to demolition.

4. Permit and Application Fees – Currently there are no Permit and Application Fees for residential tree permits. Permit and application fees could be a barrier to entry, deterring property owners from reaching out to the City to gain accessibility to tree reviews. When there is no barrier, tree reviews help residents undertake good tree care practices. To achieve the City’s canopy target, it is important to promote responsible tree ownership and community awareness by providing tree preservation service for free. Although most municipalities charge a fee for both development and residential applications, staff do not recommend this practice for residential permits. For infill developments, permit fees are charged through the Engineering Residential Grading and Servicing (RGS) process. For Site Plan/Subdivision permit and applications, fees can be charged through the Urban Design review.

Recommendation – Continue to provide residential tree permit applications as a free community service. Continue to charge a fee for development related tree removal. Staff will determine the fees for development related tree preservation permits, which are not part of the Residential Grading and Servicing (RGS) process, and will include this in the next update to the Fee By-law.

5. Compensation

The team reviewed various compensation methods including: the Markham Ratio Method; the Council of Tree Landscape Appraisers (CTLA) 9th & 10th Editions Appraisal methods; the Progressive Aggregate Caliper Replacement Method and a modified version of the Aggregate Caliper Method, (a reference in the *City of Guelph Final Draft Tree Technical Manual*).

The Markham Ratio Method illustrated in Figure 1 below, requires a 2:1 replacement if the tree is 20 cm – 40 cm and increases by one tree for every 20 cm, up to 80 cm, requiring up to 5:1 replacement. The CTLA Appraisal Method is the industry standard in North America. The staff review identified that there is a significant amount of subjectivity with the CTLA Appraisal Method and the results may vary widely between arborists. The Aggregate Caliper Method (ACM) is a simple tree valuation method, which will take the total Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) of tree(s) removed to be replaced by an equal caliper of replacement trees. Staff would like a method similar to ACM, where the trees removed be replanted, while also taking the tree health or structure into consideration, similar to the CTLA Appraisal Method. The Markham ACM adds a condition and structure rating to the tree which depreciates the value of the tree to reflect its condition. The Markham ACM is a fair approach to provide a consistent outcome when used by various appraisers.

Tree DBH	Non-Construction Tree Permit	Infill Tree Permit & Minor Variances	Subdivisions, Site Plans, Severances, & Heritage Infill	Street Trees	Park Trees
0cm – 19cm	NA	NA	NA	Progressive Aggregate Caliper Replacement Method	Removal Not Allowed
≥20cm - 40cm	2:1	2:1	2:1		
>40cm - 60cm	3:1	3:1	CTLA 9th Edition Appraisal		
>60cm - 80cm	4:1	4:1			
>80cm	5:1	5:1			
Replanting ratio of 6:1 when tree is removed without a permit. No compensation is required for dead or hazard trees.					
Minimum Size for Replanting	6cm ø deciduous/ 300cm tall conifers	6cm ø deciduous/ 300cm tall conifers	6cm ø deciduous/ 300cm tall conifers	6cm ø deciduous/ 200cm tall conifers	NA
Cash-in-Lieu	\$300 per tree	\$600 per tree	\$600 per tree	\$600 per tree first 10 trees, \$500 per tree 11-20, \$460 per tree over 20	NA

Figure 1 – Current City of Markham tree compensation methods.

Currently across the City of Markham there are three different compensation methods: the Ratio Method which is used by Tree Preservation staff for infill development and non-construction related (residential) permits: CTLA 9th Edition Appraisal which is utilized by Urban Design staff and the Progressive Aggregate Caliper Replacement Method which is the method Forestry staff uses for tree valuation.

Recommendation – Adopt the City of Markham Aggregate Caliper Method (MACM) for all three departments to provide a fair and consistent method to appraise trees in Markham. It is also recommended that residents be required to replant or pay for the value of the trees they remove as demonstrated in the following examples.

Examples of Markham ACM – $(\text{DBH Tree 1} \times (\text{Structure rating} + \text{Health rating})/2) + (\text{DBH Tree 2} \times (\text{Structure rating} + \text{Health rating})/2) + (\text{DBH Tree n} \times (\text{Structure rating} + \text{Health rating})/2)$

1. White Spruce - current ratio method Conditional Replanting required 2 trees

34cm DBH, Structure = Poor=.25, Health = Poor = .25

$34 \times ((0.25+0.25)/2)$

34×0.25

$8.5/5$

=1.7 trees required through ACM (rounded to 2 trees)

2. Blue Spruce - current ratio method Conditional Replanting required 2 trees

26cm DBH, Structure = Poor = .25, Health = Good = .75

$26 \times ((0.25+0.75)/2)$

26×0.5

$13/5$

=2.6 (rounded to 3 trees)

3. Norway Maple - current ratio method Conditional Replanting required 3 trees

44cm DBH, Structure = Poor= .25 Health = Good = .75

$44 \times ((0.25+0.75)/2)$

44×0.5

$22/5$

=4.4 (rounded to 4 trees)

6. Compensation at Appeals

The issue of compensation is raised at every appeal hearing. During appeals, the deliberation committee considers trees for removal that do not qualify for removal under the Tree Preservation By-law. Therefore, a standard should be created for appeals to maintain consistency. Trees that do not qualify for removal under the By-law will have a higher MACM compensation value than those qualified.

Recommendation – Trees evaluated for appeals will be valued using the MACM. Owners will be charged for the actual value of the tree.

Examples of MACM for trees that do not qualify for removal under the By-law -

DBH Tree $1 \times (\text{Structure rating} + \text{Health rating})/2$

1. Blue Spruce, 40cm DBH, Structure = Fair, Health = Good

$40 \times ((0.5+0.75)/2)$

40×0.625

$25/5$

=5 trees

2. Norway Spruce 53cm X Structure = Good = .75, Health = Fair = .5

$53 \times ((0.75+.5)/2)$

53×0.625

$33.125/5$

=6.625 trees

3. Little Leaf Linden 50cm X Structure = Good = .75, Health = Fair = .25

$50 \times ((.75+.5)/2)$

50×0.625

31.25/5
=6.26 trees

7. Permit Signage

Tree removals are often reported as illegal removals even when there is a permit for the removal. Both Councillors and residents inquired about whether the permits can be made available for viewing on the City's website. Multiple entries into the AMANDA program can distort the ability to see if a tree permit has been issued. The team considered signage and website view ability and agreed it is important to provide information to our citizens on tree permit status. The implementation of signage would help to address concerns about illegal removals and would implement transparency of permit issuance.

Oakville issues large green signs to permit holders which must be posted for 5 days prior to the tree removal. Oakville has found it helpful for residents to know when to call regarding trees being removed illegally. Mississauga requires permit holders to post the permit on site. Richmond Hill requires the permit to be posted in a conspicuous place on the subject property and for the permit to remain in place until the tree removal work is complete. Vaughan does not require permit signage.

Recommendations –

1. Require signage to be placed on site in a visible location from the street. The signage will include the tree location information and, for development sites, the Tree Assessment and Preservation Plan (TAPP). Developers and residents are to use the same signage (at different sizes depending on the size of the project), which will provide contact information for the appropriate department. A small fee will be applied for the signage.
2. Provide easy and clear access to find approved tree removal permits on the Markham website.

8. Tree Preservation Zone (TPZ) Barrier Signage

TPZ barrier signage is required on both development and infill development sites. Once TPZ's barriers have been installed, an inspection for approval is required. Inspected TPZ barriers have signage applied to the barriers indicating they are accepted and approved. This signage will be installed by the contractor and signed off by the appropriate department.

Recommendation – Provide specifications for signage in developer packages. TPZ signage to include contact information for the inspector in case the TPZ barriers come down for any reason.

9. Licensing of Tree Companies/Arborists

Currently, licensing of tree companies/arborists is not required. Licensing has been suggested as a way of ensuring good tree practices. Ensuring good tree practices can sometimes present a problem for property owners. Tree companies that do not know how to properly prune trees can injure them to the point of destruction. However, property owners who want to remove trees themselves and have a permit to do so can run into licensing issues if licenses are required. A licensing system could be exclusionary and could dissuade companies from working in Markham which limits service availability for

our residents. Oakville licenses arborists through their By-law Services. Mississauga, Richmond Hill and Vaughan do not require licenses.

Recommendation – Allow tree companies to continue to work without licenses but offer a voluntary licensing program. In order to promote the use of good arboricultural practises, the Operations Department will ensure that a list of licensed arborists who provide service in Markham is available online for residential access. The program will be opt in and companies can choose to participate annually.

10. Protection of Shrubs

Shrubs and hedges are not protected under the Tree Protection By-law. Oakville regulates hedges with stems of 15cm (Oakville's size of protection). Mississauga, Richmond Hill and Vaughan are not currently protecting hedges.

Recommendation – Do not protect individual shrubs. Compensation of a hedge to be based on the number of stems that are 20 cm or greater. When trees ≥ 20 cm DBH stems form a hedge (cedar, elm or beech), if it is to be maintained during construction per review assessment, preservation or compensation would be required.

11. Size Threshold of Trees Protected under the By-law

Currently, all privately owned trees ≥ 20 cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) are regulated. All municipal trees are regulated regardless of size.

Oakville and Mississauga protect all trees over ≥ 15 cm DBH; Vaughan, Richmond Hill, Newmarket and Burlington protect trees ≥ 20 cm DBH; and Toronto protects all trees > 30 cm DBH. Markham has a reasonable and justifiable size of protection at ≥ 20 cm DBH, similar to the majority of GTA municipalities.

Recommendation – Maintain ≥ 20 cm DBH size of protection on private property. The size of protection in Markham is reasonable and known to the community.

11.1 Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) of Multi-Stem Trees

The current multi-stem DBH calculation in the By-law leads to the protection of small trees. It also increases the value of large multi-stem trees above the industry standard. Under the current By-law definition the DBH of a multi-stem tree is calculated by adding the DBH's of the three largest limbs. This method leads to elevated DBH's, influenced compensation value and minimum tree protection zones for these trees. However, there is an industry standard in arboriculture for calculating the DBH of the multi-stem tree.

Recommendation – Revise the current multi-stem DBH calculation to the industry standard quadratic equation.

$$\text{Sqr}\sum(n^2\dots) = \text{Effective DBH.}$$

$$(40^2 + 40^2 + 40^2) = \sqrt{4800} = 69\text{cm DBH}$$

Example: A large multi-stem tree with three stem diameters of 40, 40 and 40 is valued as a 120 cm DBH tree. According to the widely practiced arboricultural calculations the tree would be viewed as a 69 cm DBH tree. This then influences compensation value and the size of the minimum tree protection zone.

12. Trees Located in the Proposed Building Footprint

Trees located in the building footprint are exempt from replanting conditions in the Tree Preservation By-law 2008-96. The exemption of trees within the building footprint (where there is no planning application) results in net canopy loss and creates an inconsistency in compensation between tree reviewing departments across the City. Currently Urban Design requires compensation for trees located in the building footprint for Site plan and Subdivision development.

In alignment with Building Code, it requires trees within the building footprint to be approved for removal, but does not address compensation. Removing the exemption for trees within the building footprint will prevent the net canopy loss the City is currently experiencing. Requiring compensation for trees within the building footprint will create consistency across the City, as well as encourage design development to preserve trees.

Recommendation – Remove the exemption in the Tree Preservation By-law 2008-96 for trees within the building footprint and require compensation for trees located within the building footprint.

13. Proximity of Trees to Buildings

Residents often complain about trees being too close to their houses and the question of an exemption in the Tree Preservation By-law based on proximity to buildings and other infrastructure. Allowing residents to remove trees that are in close proximity to their buildings will help residents to feel safe, as well as to achieve home maintenance goals. Oakville, Richmond Hill and Mississauga evaluate trees on a case-by-case basis and do not have an exemption related to proximity of buildings and infrastructure. The City of Burlington exempts trees within 2m of the building, measured from the edge of the building to the centre of the tree.

These removals will be subject to conditions. Tree roots extend far beyond the immediate proximity, and beyond their dripline. Interaction with tree roots will not be addressed through proximity, but will rather lead to a feeling of community safety.

Recommendation – Allow trees to be removed if they are $\leq 1.5\text{m}$ from centre point of the tree at DBH (1.37 m above the ground surface) to building edge of primary dwelling only.

14. Trees Located in Rear Yards

All GTA municipalities with Tree By-laws protect trees in the front, side and rear yards. There were no municipalities found exempting trees in rear yards. 54.5% of the 2019 permit requests were for trees located in the rear yard. Trees in rear yards are often larger, providing increased benefit to the community. The average DBH size of a tree for which a permit is requested for removal is:

Front yard: 38.8cm

Side yard: 37.7cm

Rear yard: 44.3cm

There is concern from some members of the community that the municipality should not have the right to regulate trees in rear yards. The City's canopy goal of 30% canopy cover will not be met without the contribution of trees in rear yards. There will be a severe canopy loss if trees in rear yards are not protected.

Recommendation – Continue to protect trees in rear yards. Maintain By-law protection rate at the same level as other similar GTA municipalities.

15. Pool Process

Currently the City receives several pool applications annually requiring tree removals to install a pool. There is no mechanism through the By-law to allow tree removals because of pool installations or other major site construction projects. These projects will be managed in the same way the RGS applications for infill housing development are managed.

Recommendation – Provide a mechanism in the By-law to allow trees to come down for major site construction. During the process, Operations Department staff will work with residents to minimize tree removal. A Tree Permit will be granted based on an approved Pool Enclosure Permit being granted. If site construction does not require a pool enclosure permit, Operations Department staff will work with the residents to determine their needs in finding a trackable way to confirm development activities.

16. Heritage Designation for Trees

Under the Ontario Heritage Act trees must be connected to “cultural heritage value” and must meet one or more of the criteria under Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act, to be protected.

The process of designation would be to identify and document the tree's cultural heritage value, submit to Heritage Markham Committee for consideration and, if deemed worthy of protection, follow a similar process as is current practice for a building or structure.

Recommendation – Heritage Planning to explore this opportunity further.

17. Urban Design Division to Issue Tree Permits

Developers often request advance tree removals to avoid nesting season and to make the most of the construction season. In the absence of development agreements that grant permission to remove trees, applicants seek permission to remove trees through Site Alteration (SALT) Permits, which is primarily intended for engineering works. The Urban Design Division collects securities for tree compensation and preservation through the SALT permit, with associated conditions. However a separate process to permit removal of trees prior to the execution of a development agreement is beneficial, as long as the development application review has progressed enough to ensure tree removals are as per acceptable tree preservation plans.

Recommendation – Facilitate Urban Design Division to process tree permits for development sites, to either permit or deny the requests based on the status of their review to help developers undertake tree removals at their schedule. Tree securities will be collected prior to any removals.

When development applications are submitted into ePLAN and a formal circulation is initiated, all trees will be under Urban Planning approval until maintenance acceptance. Developers who choose to utilize a tree permit, rather than waiting until a conditional site plan or subdivision approval is granted, will be required to submit a final Tree Appraisal and Preservation Plan (TAPP) at the end of the approval process. The final TAPP will be compared to the tree permit TAPP. If there are trees which could have been preserved based on the final TAPP, the developer will be required to pay an additional full compensation value for each tree unnecessarily removed. The current Appeal process, where the deliberation committee considers a tree for removal that does not qualify for removal under the Tree Preservation Bylaw, will not be applicable to tree permits on development sites.

18. Prosecution of Offences

The following are the By-law offences regarding trees:

- Illegal Removals
- Illegal Tree Injury
- Failure to Install Tree Preservation Fencing – *new* – To be added to The Administrative Monetary Penalty System (AMPS) By-law
- Failure to Install Tree Preservation Signage – *new* – To be added to AMPS By-law

Recommendation – Add *Failure to Install Tree Preservation Fencing* and *Failure to Install Tree Preservation Signage* as new offences to the AMPS By-law.

18.1 Illegal Removals

When a tree is removed illegally the appropriate department will respond. If there is an active development application on the site, the Urban Design Division will be contacted regarding the illegal removal, otherwise the Operations Department will be contacted. The MACM will be the appraisal guideline when evaluating the illegally removed trees.

Recommendation – Residents or developers who remove trees without a permit will be required to replant either twice the ACM value of the tree or, if no evidence remains, the trees will be evaluated as perfectly healthy to determine the amount of replanting required.

18.2 Illegal Tree Injury

When a tree is injured illegally, if there is an active development application on the site the Urban Design Division will be contacted, otherwise the Operations Department will be contacted. Mitigation is often established through an arborist report provided by the applicant's arborist, the report will contain information about the injury and the required mitigation, for example below grade safety requirements.

Recommendation – Issue By-law Order to the tree owner to mitigate the illegal tree injury. If multiple injuries occur, the tree owner may be required to remove the tree and the full value of the tree be required for replanting or compensation.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will draft the new By-law with all required definitions and policies for Council Approval through the By-law amendment process in Q1 2023.

Staff understand the importance of a well informative public education campaign to achieve the City's canopy goal. The updated Tree Preservation By-law will be accompanied by a communication campaign to publicize the By-law.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Not Applicable

HUMAN RESOURCES CONSIDERATIONS

Not Applicable

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:

The services provided by the Tree Preservation By-law illustrates Markham's commitment to the environment providing tree preservation as a community cost is the way to encourage tree planting as a community value. The tree preservation By-law promotes sustainability through preserving trees on private property. All funds received from cash-in-lieu of planting are returned to the tree canopy through planting and other related activities.

BUSINESS UNITS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Urban Design, By-laws, Legal, Parks and Forestry are consulted through the cross commission working group.

RECOMMENDED BY:

Alice Lam,
Director, Operations Department
Community Services Commission

Morgan Jones
Commissioner, Community Services
Commission

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A - Tree Preservation By-law Review Presentation