

### Scenarios for Tree Preservation on Private Properties

Information provided by Canadian municipalities that have implemented their own Private Tree Bylaws helped to inform potential scenarios and implications for Edmonton.

**Scenario 1:** Private Tree Bylaw that would regulate trees on private property.

<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Drawbacks</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases tree preservation expectations and biodiversity on private property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases fees/permits for development and development timelines</li> <li>Increases regulatory complexity</li> <li>Requires staff resources for planning, implementation, enforcement and engagement</li> <li>New permitting system would require funding for development, testing, training and delivery</li> <li>Creates an increased burden on infill developers and reduces densification, contrary to The City Plan's vision</li> <li>An appeal process would need to be established and the City would need to either create a new board or add tree permit appeals to an existing board</li> </ul>

**Scenario 2:** Zoning Bylaw regulations that would regulate tree removal on private property. Note: This is out of scope for the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative and could be a post-renewal project.

<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Drawbacks</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases tree preservation expectations and biodiversity on private property</li> <li>Ties into the existing development permit system, which decreases costs relative to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases fees for development</li> <li>Increases development permit timelines</li> <li>Increases regulatory complexity</li> <li>Requires resources to draft amendment and new</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1

<p>a standalone Private Tree Bylaw</p>	<p>process/permit, in addition to associated engagement, communications and marketing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Requires resources to implement the service (cost recovery or to be funded by the tax levy)</li> <li>● Creates an increased burden on infill developers and has the potential to disincentivize densification, which falls out of alignment with The City Plan</li> <li>● Subdivision and Development Appeal Board may need training and additional funding to address appeals</li> </ul>
--	--

**Scenario 3:** Administration focuses its efforts on communicating current landscaping requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Drawbacks</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increases awareness and effectiveness of current landscaping regulations</li> <li>● Utilizes existing administrative processes</li> <li>● Promotes infill development and increased densification in line with The City Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● May require funding for marketing/communications</li> </ul>