

Community Standards Bylaw

Public engagement options

Community standards topics

1. Wood burning appliances (limits on use and release of smoke)
2. Parking RVs on property (front yard; side yard; back yard)
3. Front/side yard appearance
4. Building appearance and maintenance
5. Fence maintenance
6. Unsightly properties and nuisance
7. Graffiti (requirement to remove)
8. Grass cutting
9. Weed and pest control
10. Fence maintenance

Community standards topics cont'd

11. Clearing a parking space designated for the exclusive use of disabled persons
12. Sidewalk clearing
13. Gutter cleaning and maintenance
14. Charity bins and collection sites
15. Idling
16. Noise control
17. Symbols of hate
18. Outdoor storage of construction materials and construction debris
19. Parking on property

Related Public Engagement to date

In February 2021, Communications included a few questions (with 637 respondents) relating to the 19 community standards topics in our SCOOP mixed topic survey. Here's what we know as of this date:

Wood burning appliances

41.3% - have them

58.7% - do not

95.7% have not had issues with neighbours regarding smoke

62% of those without wood burning appliances did not think there should be restrictions on these appliances.

SCOOP mixed topic results cont'd

Fences

People bothered by unmaintained fences:

69.6% - said yes

6.3% - said no

24.1% said sometimes

What bothered them:

94.7% - Crooked fences/falling down sections

78.8% - Missing boards

68.3% - Graffiti

51.8% - Peeling paint

33.9% - Mismatched color/style of fences when compared to adjacent areas

25.8% - Unstained/unpainted wood

SCOOP mixed topic results cont'd.

RVs (Do you own an RV)

35.4% - said yes

64.6% - said no

Of the 35.4% who own an RV, 62.9% park their RV at their home.

Of these, 66.7% park their RV at their home all year long

Everyone was asked if they had concerns about RV parking in their neighbourhood (20.4% yes, 51.4% no, 28.1 sometimes)

SCOOP mixed topic results cont'd.

Concerns about RVs included:

- 69.8% - Hard to see around the RV
- 2.8% - Parking on the road for longer than 36 hours
- 52.8% - Trailers illegally parked unattached on the roadway
- 50.0% - Aesthetics of the neighbourhood
- 49.7% - Cords running across the sidewalk from RV to house
- 48.6% - Parking on front/back lawn or landscaped area

SCOOP mixed topic results cont'd.

Paved front yard/side/or side yard (on if it bothers people):

45.5% - said yes

54.5% - said no

Concerns about paved front yard/side or side yard included:

- Curb appeal is not desirable – looks like a parking lot
- Yards should have grass which is more aesthetically pleasing
- Limited drainage from snow/rain

SCOOP mixed topic results cont'd.

On should new residential properties in the County be required to have a trees/trees in the front yard:

55% - said yes

45% - said no

On whether or not residential properties in the County should be required to keep a certain percentage of greenery in the front yard:

60.4% - said yes

39.6% - said no

SCOOP mixed topic results cont'd.

The top four things that bother people about appearances of residential buildings:

- 93.9% - Garbage and litter
- 82.9% - Graffiti on buildings or fences
- 76.8% - Broken/missing windows
- 73.3% - Unused vehicles or vehicle parts

On whether or not there should be minimum standard for residential building/upkeep

- 66.6% - said yes
- 12.5% - said no
- 20.9% - said not sure

SCOOP mixed topic results cont'd.

Top four things that bother people about appearances of commercial buildings:

- 87.4% - Broken windows
- 84.3% - Graffiti on buildings and fences
- 72.8% - Broken garage doors
- 66.6% - Peeling paint

On whether or not there should be minimum standard for commercial building/upkeep

- 82.2% - said yes
- 7.8% - said no
- 10.0% - said not sure

Option 1

Legislative and Legal Services prepares the bylaw
with minimal public engagement

- No public engagement will take place aside from specific SCOOP mixed topic survey questions regarding this bylaw.
- The bylaw will be based on other municipalities' bylaws and bylaw-drafting best practices.
- Estimated timeline to present to Council: Sept. 1, 2021
- Estimated cost: Existing staff time
- Estimated advertising costs: \$5000

Option 2

Communications will undertake a public engagement process on all the 19 topics as directed by Council

- Requires significant public engagement and communication resources. A variety of public engagement techniques could be used such as surveys, digital face-to-face meetings, focus groups, non-statutory public hearings, etc.
- Estimated timeline to present to Council: June 2022
- Estimated cost: Existing staff time as well as costs to contract a public engagement consultant (\$50,000 - \$75,000)
- Estimated advertising costs: \$5,000 - \$10,000

Option 3

Communications will undertake a public engagement process on five topics that have the possibility to be controversial (fence maintenance standards, yard appearance and maintenance, wood burning appliances, parking RVs on residential property)

- Requires a fair amount of public engagement and communication resources. A variety of public engagement techniques could be used such as surveys, digital face-to-face meetings, focus groups, non-statutory public hearings, etc.
- Estimated timeline to present to Council: March 2022
- Estimated cost: Existing staff time as well as costs to possibly contract a public engagement consultant (\$25,000 - \$30,000)
- Estimated advertising costs: \$5,000

Option 4

Council could choose to hold an advertised non-statutory public hearing and hear from members of the public using a process similar to statutory public hearings. This option could be combined with any of the above three options.

- Estimated timeline for draft bylaw presentation to Council: September 1, 2021
- Estimated staffing cost: Existing staff time
- Estimated advertising costs: \$5000 to advertise the hearing

Next steps

Recommendations to Council on March 23, 2021

- Option 1 – costs can be absorbed
- Option 2 or 3 – a budget request will be required (for 2021/22) - cannot be absorbed by Communications
- Option 4 – costs can be absorbed

Several topics have the potential to be very controversial (besides those mentioned in option 3) and could require much more extensive public engagement:

- Weed and pest control
- Symbols of hate
- Noise

Questions?