

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

Comments Received By:	Date Received:	Comment/Concern/Question Summary	Response	Action Taken
<b>VERBAL COMMENTS</b>				
Council	11/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How would the By-law apply to abandoned orchards?</li> <li>2. Smaller parcel size should be considered</li> <li>3. Larger parcel size should be considered</li> <li>4. Target development</li> <li>5. How will Staff determine property lines in review of permits?</li> <li>6. Will staff or consultants provide peer review of submitted arborist reports?</li> <li>7. What is appeal process?</li> <li>8. Would a single detached building lot be subject to the By-law?</li> <li>9. Niagara Escarpment Commission should be included on mapping</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By- law would not apply. Abandoned Orchard By-law 2003-38 applies to abandoned orchards.</li> <li>2. Council directed to include a minimum property size of 0.5ha by Resolution dated September 7, 2022. Council may direct Staff to include an alternative property size through confirming resolution.</li> <li>3. Council directed to include a minimum property size of 0.5ha by Resolution dated September 7, 2022. Council may direct Staff to include an alternative property size through confirming resolution.</li> <li>4. By-law is not intended influence technical review of development applications through the Planning process. Tree removal and cutting as a result of development currently guided by Environmental Impact Studies and Tree Preservation Plans as part of planning applications. It is further noted that, as per Council Resolution, dated May 13, 2019, Planning Staff were initially directed to develop changes on an “interim” basis to provide regulation on tree cutting in advance of development applications being submitted, with long-term solutions that could guide development review directed to be developed by the Sustainability Advisory Committee.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None.</li> <li>2. No action taken, as property size consistent with Council Resolution.</li> <li>3. No action taken, as property size consistent with Council Resolution.</li> <li>4. None.</li> <li>5. None.</li> <li>6. None.</li> <li>7. None.</li> <li>8. None.</li> <li>9. Niagara Escarpment Development Control Area added to Schedule ‘A’</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Available GIS mapping and plans of survey to be relied on.</li> <li>6. Peer reviews and/or consultation with applicable Conservation Authority will be undertaken in review of any submitted arborist reports.</li> <li>7. Appeals not subject to Ontario Land Tribunal. Per “best practice”, appeals may be submitted and reviewed by Council.</li> <li>8. A standard single detached building lot would not be subject to the By-law, unless it exceeds 0.5ha in size.</li> <li>9. Noted.</li> </ul>	
<b>Sally Leppard</b>	11/07/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generally, very supportive</li> <li>2. S.2.2 should require tree studies to be completed and provide recommendations on conditions, per S.5.1.</li> <li>3. S.6 net gain principle must be a condition. More than one tree replacing one tree removed.</li> <li>4. S.6.3 Director should provide reasons as to why/why not conditions are imposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Director may specify species, size, number, and location of any required replacement trees. Net-gain principle may be utilized at Director’s discretion where deemed appropriate.</li> <li>4. With revisions to S.2.2. conditions would typically be based on arborist report, with Director discretion to include any additional conditions, as deemed appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None.</li> <li>2. Reference to Section 5.1, 6.1, and 6.3, included in S.2.2.</li> <li>3. None.</li> <li>4. None.</li> </ul>
<b>Kim Harris Gardner</b>	11/07/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports increased penalties in By-law</li> <li>2. Impression was that By-law would focus on developments or parcels to be developed</li> <li>3. Through public consultation, it was identified that ratepayers unwilling to go through permit process to cut down a tree – no appetite for it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. By-law is not intended influence technical review of development applications through the Planning process. Tree removal and cutting as a result of development currently guided by Environmental Impact Studies and Tree Preservation Plans as part of planning applications. It is further noted that, as per</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None.</li> <li>2. None.</li> <li>3. None.</li> <li>4. None.</li> <li>5. Changes previously completed prior to Public Meeting.</li> <li>6. None.</li> </ul>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
 Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. No bonusing – remove ability to pay to replant elsewhere</li> <li>5. Director of Planning cannot be administrator</li> <li>6. Loop-hole exists where piece-meal cutting can occur over time</li> <li>7. Two years to maintain replacement trees insufficient</li> <li>8. Inventory on Town lands should be included</li> <li>9. Agree with replacement trees being equal in diameter – type of tree should be clearer, including border trees</li> <li>10. Are any aggregate quarries located in settlement area?</li> <li>11. Definition of tree should include multi-stem trees</li> </ol>	<p>Council Resolution, dated May 13, 2019, Planning Staff were initially directed to develop changes on an “interim” basis to provide regulation on tree cutting in advance of development applications being submitted, with long-term solutions that could guide development review directed to be developed by the Sustainability Advisory Committee. Parcels of 0.5ha or greater generally have more development potential than those less than 0.5ha. Impossible to identify “parcels to be developed” until such a time that a development proposal is received.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Acknowledged – this consideration was part and parcel to establishing a minimum lot size of 0.5ha in order to not encumber standard residential lots in the settlement areas.</li> <li>4. Section 6.3(g)(ii) does not allow for “bonusing” – first priority is to plant on subject lot. In cases where this may not be possible or feasible, second option is to replant elsewhere (net balance still achieved across the municipality).</li> <li>5. As outlined in previous Staff Report PDS.22.064, reference to Planning and Development Services removed to allow Council discretion in what department is to administer the By-law.</li> <li>6. This provision is a standard “best practice” and allows for limited tree cutting without a permit.</li> <li>7. Two-year period is consistent, and in some cases exceeds, standard maintenance period imposed through Development process.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. None.</li> <li>8. None.</li> <li>9. Definition of “replacement tree” included.</li> <li>10. None.</li> <li>11. Definition revised to include “multi-stemmed”</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	---

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

			<p>Reasonable period to ensure health of replacement tree.</p> <p>8. Municipal By-law is implementation of regulations on tree removals. Preparation of a Municipal Tree Inventory would typically be considered a policy initiative – it is noted a Natural Heritage Study is considered for inclusion in 2023 budget</p> <p>9. Comment received.</p> <p>10. <i>Municipal Act</i> requires exemption for Aggregate uses. No aggregate uses currently active within settlement area.</p> <p>11. Comment received.</p>	
<b>John Ardiel</b>	11/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statement that consultation with Ag. Advisory Committee completed in 2022 is incorrect – in adequate time was afforded for the Committee to advise Council</li> <li>2. Has Settlement Area Boundary been corrected? Previous meeting with planning staff indicated technical difficulties and boundary would be corrected – planning staff do not know where the boundary is</li> <li>3. What “Director” will be responsible? If a Planner, will they be certified? No one has any idea who will be administrating the By-law</li> <li>4. Cost of permit exorbitant – cost of arborist, peer review, and enforcement</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meetings with Ag. Advisory Committee held on September 16, 2021. Joint committee meeting with S.A.C. held on January 13, 2022. Committee was generally satisfied with direction of draft By-law and provided comments to be considered, as outlined in PDS.22.064. No changes have since occurred that would alter overall application/intent of the By-law.</li> <li>2. Previous comment from Staff was to confirm Settlement Area boundary matches the Official Plan. For clarity, the Settlement Area boundary shown on Schedule ‘A’ matches the boundaries of urban land uses and serviced area outlined in the Town and County Official Plan (i.e. reflects the settlement area boundary).</li> <li>3. As noted in PDS.22.064, reference to Planning and Development removed to allow Council</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None.</li> <li>2. None.</li> <li>3. None.</li> <li>4. None.</li> <li>5. None.</li> <li>6. None.</li> <li>7. None.</li> <li>8. None.</li> <li>9. None.</li> <li>10. None.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
 Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. By-law policing tree management on private lands is an insult.</li> <li>6. Ag. And Rural community concerned once By-law is passed, can be easily extended to include entire municipality</li> <li>7. Why are properties less than 0.5ha exempted? Is this a way to get the foot in the door and then extend it?</li> <li>8. <i>Municipal Act</i> only allows Municipality to regulate trees on municipally owned properties – Ag. Committee was misinformed by Legal Services and Planning Staff. Staff have not followed through and read the <i>Municipal Act</i> – this is a serious problem that the Town has.</li> <li>9. No stakeholder meetings have been held</li> <li>10. Entire By-law is wrong and has been poorly drafted in a rush to pass it before Council term ends</li> </ol>	<p>decision/discretion on which Municipal Department will be responsible for administration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Full financial implications of By-law have not been confirmed at this time. Permit costs to be determined by Council.</li> <li>5. Comment received.</li> <li>6. Process to amend By-law includes public notice and a public meeting. This is the same process undertaken to amend the By-law through this current exercise.</li> <li>7. Property size has been discussed in previous Staff Reports and is result of Council direction per Resolution dated September 7, 2021. To reiterate, properties with minimum area of 0.5ha in the settlement area generally have greater potential for development than standard urban residential lots. This consideration was part and parcel to establishing a minimum lot size of 0.5ha in order to not encumber standard residential lots in the settlement areas and to reduce permit administration, while aiming to achieve Council goal established at on set of the exercise.</li> <li>8. Municipal authority under the <i>Municipal Act</i> has been addressed, and Legal Services’ legal opinion included, in previous Staff Reports (PDS.21.080 and PDS.22.064). No concerns regarding municipal authority.</li> <li>9. Extensive public consultation has been undertaken in development of the Draft By-law.</li> </ol>	
--	--	---	---	--

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

			<p>Through the process, comments have been received from members of the development community, arborists, etc.</p> <p>10. Comment received.</p>	
<b>Julia Hinds</b>	11/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Owns a 90-acre tree farm – what jurisdiction does the Town have to stop her from stewarding her property?</li> <li>2. What impact on the tree farm will this by-law have?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Municipal authority under the <i>Municipal Act</i> has been addressed, and Legal Services’ legal opinion included, in previous Staff Reports (PDS.21.080 and PDS.22.064). No concerns regarding municipal authority.</li> <li>2. Tree removal currently subject to GSCA regulations, as majority of site is Regulated under O.Reg 151/06. Further noted that on-site trees may meet the definition of a “woodland” and be subject to the County of Grey Forest Management By-law. Moreover, property in question is designated <i>Rural</i>, per the Municipal Official Plan, whereby tree removal is exempt subject to S.3.1(b) of the Draft By-law.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None.</li> <li>2. None.</li> </ol>
<b>Bruce Harbinson</b>	11/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In attendance on behalf of Escarpment Alliance Commission</li> <li>2. If applicable to Settlement Areas, why is Castle Glen not included, as it is identified as a Settlement Area in the Official Plan?</li> <li>3. ECA strongly supports the By-law</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Trees within Castle Glen development area meet definition of “woodland” per County of Grey Forest Management By-law. Tree removal subject to County approval and/or preparation of appropriate technical studies reviewed through any future development applications. Redundant to include in Municipal By-law, as it would not apply as the lands subject to higher authority regulations.</li> <li>3. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None.</li> <li>2. None.</li> <li>3. None.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

<b>Lucy Richmond (Blue Mountain Watershed Trust)</b>	11/07/2022	1. Refer to written comments below.		
<b>June Porter</b>	11/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Director of Planning should not be administrator</li> <li>2. Not clear how Director will be satisfied tree removal will not result in drainage impact.</li> <li>3. Draft By-law is weak</li> <li>4. Needs to include border trees</li> <li>5. Need consistency around experts determining which trees may be cut/saved</li> <li>6. "Replacement trees" needs to be better defined so people can pre-emptively plant trees</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As noted in PDS.22.064, reference to Planning and Development removed to allow Council decision/discretion on which Municipal Department will be responsible for administration.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Comment received.</li> <li>4. Boundary Trees are subject to Section 10(3) of the <i>Ontario Forestry Act</i>.</li> <li>5. Comment received.</li> <li>6. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None.</li> <li>2. Reference to Section 5.1, 6.1, and 6.3, included in S.2.2.</li> <li>3. None.</li> <li>4. None.</li> <li>5. Additional reference to qualified persons included in S.2.2 and S.4.1(c)</li> <li>6. Definition of replacement trees included.</li> </ol>
<b>WRITTEN AGENCY COMMENTS</b>				
<b>Bluewater District School Board</b>	14/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed amendments would be onerous for the board with respect to Beaver Valley Community School property</li> <li>2. Request school sites be exempt from the permit process so that flexibility can be provided when tree works are required in an expedited manner</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. Exemption included.</li> </ol>
<b>County of Grey</b>	04/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider defining 'good arboriculture practices', 'replacement trees', 'environmental impact study', and 'professional forester'</li> <li>2. Section 2.1(a) and 3.2(a) – wish to clarify this would not inhibit County's ability to maintain County owned lands</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Definitions added.</li> <li>2. Confirmed - By-law would not apply to any actions of the County, on County owned lands per S.3.2(a)</li> <li>3. Comment received.</li> <li>4. Comment received.</li> <li>5. Comment received.</li> <li>6. Correct.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Definitions added.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. Revision included.</li> <li>4. Clarification included for where tree removal may be subject to County, NEC, or C.A.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Section 3.1(c) – consider amending to include “or any successor thereto”</li> <li>4. Clarification when Town vs. County By-law would apply may be needed under 3.1(c).</li> <li>5. Should Section 3.1(e) also include O.Reg 172/06 with respect to NVCA?</li> <li>6. Appears Section 4.1(e) should reference 4.1(c) rather than 5.1(c)</li> <li>7. 5.4(a) and (b) – consider exemption speaking to pre-application process where limited tree clearing is required for technical studies, etc.</li> <li>8. Appears Section 6.1(e) should reference 6.3 rather than 7.3</li> <li>9. Section 6.3(d) – if same species are not available for replacement trees, other options should be defined as suitable alternatives</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Section 2.3 of Draft By-law permits issuance of a permit prior to <i>Planning Act</i> approval for technical purposes. S. 5.4(a) and (b) refer to Section 2.3.</li> <li>8. Correct.</li> <li>9. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Reference to O.Reg 172/06 included.</li> <li>6. Reference corrected.</li> <li>7. Additional clarity included in Section 2.3 to outline examples of technical reasons for permit issuance.</li> <li>8. Reference corrected.</li> <li>9. Additional alternatives included in Section 6.3(d)</li> </ol>
<b>WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS</b>				
<b>Blue Mountain Watershed Trust</b>	12/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Urgently request the Town enact a By-law as soon as possible</li> <li>2. Trees are integral to the function of watershed and in carbon sequestering, oxygen production, inter-species communication, and cleaning water</li> <li>3. Trees help to provide natural stormwater management – trees must be preserved in Open Spaces, Wetlands, and Hazard areas</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Comment received.</li> <li>4. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> </ol>



**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

		4. In review of intent and wording of proposed By-law, we encourage TBM to enact such legislation as soon as possible		
<b>Nicholas Clayton</b>	6/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seems intent of by-law should protect Castle Glen Forest from being developed</li> <li>2. This matter should be laid out, providing much needed updating and overriding of the 2006 OMB decision to provide Official Plan approvals for the Castle Glen development</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing trees/forests located on Castle Glen property meet definition of “woodland”, per Municipal Act and County of Grey Forest Management By-law 4341-06. As such, tree removal currently regulated by the County of Grey and Municipal By-law would not apply.</li> <li>2. By-law has no authority to revoke or otherwise impede any existing approvals under the <i>Planning Act</i>.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> </ol>
<b>Howard Cole</b>	7/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mature forests are the jewel of this area</li> <li>2. Must be protected at all costs for many reasons</li> <li>3. Town needs to do everything we can to protect these forests</li> <li>4. Castle Glen’s development should not be “grandfathered” and should not be able to proceed</li> <li>5. Agree with Bruce Harbinson’s letter</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Comment received.</li> <li>4. By-law has no authority to revoke or otherwise impede any existing approvals under the <i>Planning Act</i>.</li> <li>5. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> <li>5. None required.</li> </ol>
<b>James Dobbin</b>	7/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree with Bruce Harbinson’s letter</li> <li>2. Niagara Escarpment provides immense benefits to the area</li> <li>3. Must protect the natural escarpment corridor as a connected ecological corridor</li> <li>4. Forest cover on Castle Glen settlement area needs to be protected and preserved as an integral piece of escarpment corridor</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Comment received.</li> <li>4. Existing trees/forests located on Castle Glen property meet definition of “woodland”, per Municipal Act and County of Grey Forest Management By-law 4341-06. As such, tree removal currently regulated by the County of Grey and Municipal By-law would not apply.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

<p><b>Elizabeth Marshall</b></p>	<p>6/07/2022</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed By-law violates a number of Acts including Municipal Act, British North America Act, Forestry Act, Conservation Land Act, Public Lands Act, etc.</li> <li>2. Refers to Council Resolution of “Climate Emergency” – mockery of climate change, seems attempt of Council and/or Staff to mislead residents</li> <li>3. If in interest of “climate emergency”, should be expected that the By-law encompass entire community</li> <li>4. If this By-law is to stop development and/or housing, as expressed in newspaper articles, would this not be Council and Staff doing indirectly what they cannot affect directly?</li> <li>5. Some who promote the By-law do so at detriment to fellow human beings.</li> <li>6. Municipality does not have authority</li> <li>7. Delegation to Director – how is it delegated already, when By-law is not yet in effect?</li> <li>8. Why isn’t Director of Planning named as Director in the By-law?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Municipal Authority outlined in Staff Report PDS.21.080, as provided based on legal opinion of Municipal Solicitor.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Council direction to apply to Settlement Area and properties 0.5ha and above.</li> <li>4. By-law is not intended to impede any development – intent is to provide a level oversight to prevent unnecessary tree cutting in advance of development etc.</li> <li>5. Comment received.</li> <li>6. Municipal authority outlined in Staff Report PDS.21.080.</li> <li>7. By-law 2010-68, in its current form, delegates authority to Director of Planning. Reference to Planning removed in response to public comments. Council to decide which Department/Director is most appropriate for administration.</li> <li>8. See comment response above.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> <li>5. None required.</li> <li>6. None required.</li> <li>7. None required.</li> <li>8. None required.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Bruce Harbinson</b></p>	<p>6/07/2022</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. President of Escarpment Corridor Alliance</li> <li>2. ECA strongly in favour of the tree by-law</li> <li>3. Official Plan review and resident surveys also point to overwhelming support for environmental leadership</li> <li>4. Support predicated on By-law applying to Castle Glen</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Comment received.</li> <li>4. Existing trees/forests located on Castle Glen property meet definition of “woodland”, per Municipal Act and County of Grey Forest Management By-law 4341-06. As such, tree removal currently regulated by the County of Grey and Municipal By-law would not apply.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Pamela Spence</b></p>	<p>19/07/2022</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Research has proven trees are valuable because of improved air/water quality, prevention of</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

		<p>erosion/flooding, shade to control temperatures, wildlife habitat, medicinal properties, aesthetics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Official Plan policy D.8.2 speaks to tree protection, enhancement, expansion of canopy. OP review as confirmed resident desire to preserve environment</li> <li>3. Blue Mountains Future Story – page 10 outlines goal to “Create Climate Solutions” to reduce GHG’s and ensure health. Preserving trees goes a long way to address this</li> <li>4. Econ. Strategy, page 10, includes goal “Environmental Resiliency”.</li> <li>5. Support changes to the By-law, and urge Council to adopt this policy.</li> <li>6. Prefer By-law cover all trees and agree by-law be applicable to half acre lots. However, given degree of change, current by-law is acceptable</li> <li>7. Exemptions are appropriate to not encumber agricultural uses and woodlands</li> <li>8. Castle Glen must be included</li> <li>9. Implementation needs to be addressed – one year grace period should be included for education prior to implementation/enforcement</li> <li>10. Fees should be minimal, penalties strict</li> <li>11. “Director” should not be Planning</li> <li>12. Border trees should be included; “may” should be changed to “shall”, where appropriate</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Comment received.</li> <li>4. Comment received.</li> <li>5. Comment received.</li> <li>6. Comment received.</li> <li>7. Comment received.</li> <li>8. Existing trees/forests located on Castle Glen property meet definition of “woodland”, per Municipal Act and County of Grey Forest Management By-law 4341-06. As such, tree removal currently regulated by the County of Grey and Municipal By-law would not apply.</li> <li>9. Comment received.</li> <li>10. Permit fee to be determined by Council at future date.</li> <li>11. Comment received. Current working draft removes reference to planning and allows appropriate Director to be named by Council.</li> <li>12. Boundary Trees are regulated under Section 10(3) of the <i>Ontario Forestry Act</i>.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> <li>5. None required.</li> <li>6. None required.</li> <li>7. None required.</li> <li>8. None required.</li> <li>9. Staff Recommendation includes a one-year grace period for implementation and recommendation for community education/communication program</li> <li>10. None required.</li> <li>11. None required.</li> <li>12. None required.</li> </ol>
<b>Richard Lamperstorfer</b>	13/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No longer support the By-law changes</li> <li>2. Potential tool to stifle development (i.e. NIMBYism)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> </ol>
<b>Jane and John Pratt</b>	7/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In favour of By-law – trees important to environment and character</li> <li>2. Support predicated on inclusion of Castle Glen</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Existing trees/forests located on Castle Glen property meet definition of</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

			“woodland”, per Municipal Act and County of Grey Forest Management By-law 4341-06. As such, tree removal currently regulated by the County of Grey and Municipal By-law would not apply.	
<b>Mike Robbins</b>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree with Bruce Harbinson’s letter</li> <li>2. By-law should also apply to Castle Glen</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Existing trees/forests located on Castle Glen property meet definition of “woodland”, per Municipal Act and County of Grey Forest Management By-law 4341-06. As such, tree removal currently regulated by the County of Grey and Municipal By-law would not apply.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> </ol>
<b>Shelly Hobson</b>	23/06/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about time of Public Meeting and ability for people to attend</li> <li>2. By-law should go after developers, not individuals</li> <li>3. Should be no limit on cutting for firewood</li> <li>4. Should be no limit on removal of hazard trees</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. By-law applies to larger lands within Settlement Area boundary, which generally have more development potential. Intent is to prevent large-scale tree removals in advance of development applications and completion of appropriate studies (i.e. EIS/Tree Preservation Plans).</li> <li>3. Personal firewood exempted from permit requirements to a maximum of 25 stacked cubic metres annually. Permit required to exceed 25 stacked cubic metres. This only applies to lands located within the Settlement Area. Commercial firewood subject to County Forest Management By-law.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

			4. Hazardous trees exempted from By-law (S.3.1(k)).	
<b>Lorraine Sutton</b>	6/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Town needs to monitor existing flora and fauna to compare change in the Tree By-law – will there be fewer species based on new tree protection?</li> <li>2. Essential to understand consequences of proposed By-law – is it actually achieving a better canopy?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Natural heritage study to be completed by Town.</li> <li>2. Monitoring to be considered in development of implementation/administration of By-law</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> </ol>
<b>Tree Trust</b>	7/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current proposed By-law is step in the right direction</li> <li>2. Urge ‘next steps’ following passing to address other areas that are beyond scope of the By-law</li> <li>3. Section 10 – public should be informed and able to appeal permit issuance</li> <li>4. Section 5.1 – older, significant trees in good condition should be added to conditions as restrictive issuance of a permit</li> <li>5. Section 2.3 – clarify/list specific circumstance Director has discretion to issue a permit</li> <li>6. Section 2.2 – deepen qualifications required to support tree removal (not all arborists have expertise in preservation)</li> <li>7. Section 1 and 2.1 – multi-stemmed trees are not addressed in definition</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Best Practices do not include public appeal process for the issuance of Permits.</li> <li>4. Director has ability to deny permit, subject to S.5.</li> <li>5. Comment received.</li> <li>6. Comment received.</li> <li>7. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> <li>3. None required.</li> <li>4. None required.</li> <li>5. Additional clarity included in Section 2.3</li> <li>6. Clause revised to require a report prepared by a landscape architect or qualified forestry consultant, as deemed appropriate by the Director.</li> <li>7. Definition revised.</li> </ol>
<b>Adriene Veninger</b>	12/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Importance of trees and environment cannot be underestimated</li> <li>2. Need leadership to undertake decisions to protect trees and ecosystems</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment Received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> </ol>
<b>Sarah Waggott</b>	6/07/2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Urgent and passionate support for the proposed by-law</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment received.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None required.</li> <li>2. None required.</li> </ol>

**P463 Municipal Tree By-law Update  
Comment Response Matrix (July 11 2022 Public Meeting)**

		2. Details fall short to adequately protect all of urban canopy from rapid development, but support any by-law protecting from clear-cutting		
--	--	--	--	--