

---

**TO:** CITY MANAGER **DATE:** 2014 January 29

**FROM:** DIRECTOR PLANNING AND BUILDING **FILE:** 42000.20  
*Reference: Tree Bylaw*

**SUBJECT: TREE BYLAW AMENDMENTS**

**PURPOSE:** To propose amendments to the Burnaby Tree Bylaw in order to implement Council recommendations for enhancing the City's tree protection efforts.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. **THAT** Council approve the proposed Burnaby Tree Bylaw text amendments, as outlined in this report.

**REPORT****1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

On 2013 June 10, Council authorized the advancement of proposed amendments to the Burnaby Tree Bylaw, as the basis for public consultation and feedback. Key proposals included:

- Expanding the scope of the Tree Bylaw
- Redefining the size of protected trees
- Implementing new replacement tree requirements
- Enhancing enforcement provisions
- Revising Tree Permit fees

A more detailed summary of the proposed amendments is attached as *Appendix A*.

Public consultation on the proposals for enhancing the City's tree protection efforts occurred in 2013 June – September, and included the following:

- **City Webpage:** a dedicated Tree Bylaw webpage was established and received over 1,330 visits during the consultation period. The website will continue to be maintained on an on-going basis.
- **Public Information Desk:** The Planning and Building Department established an enquiry desk with a dedicated staff person available to answer questions about the proposed

amendments and provide additional resources and information during the consultation period.

- **Newspaper Notices:** Notices were published in the *Burnaby NewsLeader* and *Burnaby Now* newspapers, in print on 2013 July 5 and July 10, and online for 3 weeks. The notices advertised public information events, directed the public to information sources such as the website and enquiry desk, and encouraged the public to complete the public opinion survey. Both newspapers also ran feature articles on the proposed Tree Bylaw changes during the week of 2013 June 10.
- **InfoBurnaby:** An article highlighting public consultation activities was published in the 2013 Summer edition of *InfoBurnaby*. This edition was delivered to over 95,000 Burnaby households and businesses and was posted on the City website.
- **Public Information Display Events:** Five public information display events, staffed by the Planning and Building Department, were held in 2013 July. The four-hour long events were held during evening and weekend hours at libraries and community centres in all four quadrants of the City, as well as at City Hall. A public information display was also maintained in the City Hall lobby for the duration of the public consultation process. Over 200 residents or property owners attended the events.
- **Public Opinion Survey:** A public opinion survey was promoted, distributed, and made available both in print and online at the public information display events, the City website, and the Planning Department. A total of 158 survey responses were received.

Public comment was largely in support of the proposed amendments. On 2013 November 4, Council received the results of public consultation for consideration, and authorized the advancement of the proposed amendments to the Burnaby Tree Bylaw, as presented in the public consultation report, and the preparation of the subject report.

## 2.0 PROPOSED BURNABY TREE BYLAW AMENDMENTS

This report presents recommendations for the specific amendments to the existing Burnaby Tree Bylaw that are required to implement the changes authorized by Council on 2013 November 4.

The following addresses the required amendments to the Burnaby Tree Bylaw in terms of the scope of the bylaw, the definition of protected trees, tree replacement, enforcement, permit fees, and other minor amendments.

The amending bylaw appears elsewhere on Council's agenda for consideration of First, Second, and Third Reading.

## 2.1 Scope of Bylaw

### Adopted Approach

The existing tree protection provisions of the Tree Bylaw only apply to single and two family lots during a specified time period before and after redevelopment. The adopted approach expands the scope of the Tree Bylaw to protect significant trees on all private and public lands at all times.

### Discussion

By broadening the applicability of the Tree Bylaw, the adopted approach both strengthens and standardizes the City's tree protection requirements. In order to implement this approach, amendments are proposed to several sections of the existing Tree Bylaw, as follows:

The Section 2 definition of a "protected tree," which currently restricts that term to trees on single and two family residential lots, is revised to remove that restriction. Separate standards are added for lots that are subject to development applications and those that are not, with a larger qualifying diameter required for trees on the latter properties (see Section 2.2 below). The effect of these revisions is to expand the scope of the Bylaw to include all properties, while moderating this expansion, under the adopted approach, with higher size thresholds for protected trees on properties not subject to development applications.

The proposed bylaw amendment defines "development application" to include rezoning, subdivision, preliminary plan approval (PPA), building permit, and demolition permit applications. The definition for "demolition permit," which is made redundant by this new definition, is deleted.

A related change is also proposed to Section 11(1) and Section 11(2), which require tree plans for demolition permits or building permits on residential lots. These sections are modified to require tree plans for all "development applications," as defined above.

The proposed amendment also revises Section 4 of the existing Tree Bylaw, which specifies when a tree cutting permit is not required. In order to broaden the scope of the Tree Bylaw consistent with the adopted approach, the following revisions to Section 4 are proposed:

- Revision of Section 4(d) to require a tree cutting permit for removal of protected trees in City parks or other public lands that are the subject of a current development application. City parks not undergoing development would continue to be exempt from tree cutting permit requirements, subject to the City's Tree Management Policy for Public Lands and normal park maintenance procedures; the proposed amendment clarifies that other lands in public use would be similarly exempt.
- Deletion of Section 4(f), which permits protected trees to be removed without a tree cutting permit, if they are located within 1.5 m (4.9 ft) of a building or structure.

- Deletion of Section 4(g), which specifies that tree cutting permits are required on residential lots only during a specified period prior to submittal of a demolition or building permit, and after the issuance of an occupancy permit.

Other Section 4 provisions that permit pruning, removal of damaged or hazardous trees, and removal of trees when required for public works are retained, with minor clarification requiring pruning to be done in accordance with accepted arboricultural practices.

Lastly, the proposed amendment removes Section 12(a) of the Tree Bylaw, which permits the Director Planning to exempt persons from tree cutting permit requirements where a tree plan has been previously approved under a Comprehensive Development (CD) plan or subdivision plan. Tree cutting permits would now be required as part of all types of development applications.

No further changes to the criteria for tree cutting permits are required to implement the adopted approach, with the exception of minor changes to terminology and the provisions for replacement trees discussed in Section 2.3 below.

### **Recommended Bylaw Amendments:**

1. **THAT** the definition of “protected tree” in Section 2 of the Tree Bylaw be revised to apply to trees on all City properties;
2. **THAT** the definition of “demolition permit” in Section 2 be deleted;
3. **THAT** a definition of “development application” that includes rezoning, subdivision, preliminary plan approval, building permits and demolition permits be added to Section 2;
4. **THAT** Section 4(d) be amended to exclude from exemption the removal of protected trees in City parks or other public lands that are the subject of a current development application;
5. **THAT** Section 4(f) and 4(g) of the Tree Bylaw be deleted;
6. **THAT** references to a “demolition permit” or “building permit” in Sections 11(1) and (2) be replaced with references to a “development application;”
7. **THAT** Section 12(a) of the Tree Bylaw be deleted.

## **2.2 Protected Tree Definition**

### **Adopted Approach**

The adopted approach provides larger qualifying diameters for protected trees on properties that are not undergoing development.

**Discussion**

Under the adopted approach, the qualifying diameter for a protected tree remains the same for properties that are subject to a development application (20.3 cm or 8 in.). However, a larger qualifying diameter is proposed for all other protected trees, including a 30.5 cm (12 in.) diameter for conifers and a 45.7 cm (18 in.) diameter for broadleaf trees. The smaller qualifying diameter for conifers acknowledges the greater contributions to the urban forest that these trees provide, and the greater diversity of broadleaf tree types and life spans.

To implement this approach, the Section 2 definition of “protected tree” is amended accordingly. Because the proposed amendment provides separate standards for conifers and broadleaf trees, definitions of these two types of trees are also added.

Under the proposed amendment, the Section 2 definition of “protected tree” continues to include covenanted trees; trees or plants in designated stream corridors; trees in the P4 Cemetery District; and replacement trees; all regardless of their size. In addition, the proposed amendment specifies that a tree planted pursuant to a landscaping plan for a development application is a protected tree, regardless of its size, as is a retained tree shown on a tree plan. For consistency, the proposed amendment redefines a stream corridor by deleting specific distance requirements and specifying it as a “streamside protection and enhancement area” as defined by Section 6.23 of the Zoning Bylaw.

**Recommended Bylaw Amendments:**

- 8. **THAT** the definition of “protected tree” in Section 2 of the Tree Bylaw be amended to specify that the diameter of a protected tree is 20.3 cm (8 in) for properties that are subject to a development application; and 30.5 cm (12 in) for a conifer and 45.7 cm (18 in) for a broadleaf tree on all other properties;
- 9. **THAT** the definition of “protected tree” in Section 2 of the Tree Bylaw also include a retained tree, as defined elsewhere in Section 2, and a tree planted pursuant to a landscaping plan for a development application;
- 10. **THAT** subsection (iii) of the definition of “protected tree” in Section 2 of the Tree Bylaw be amended to delete specific distance requirements and refer instead to a streamside protection and enhancement area as defined in the Zoning Bylaw.

**2.3 Tree Replacement**

**Adopted Approach**

Replacement planting is currently a discretionary condition of a tree cutting permit, and varies with space constraints and the condition of the trees being replaced. The adopted approach requires mandatory replacement planting for tree cutting permits, with an exception for single and two family residential properties that are not undergoing development, and a minimum

replacement ratio that increases with the size of tree removed. It further establishes an option for cash-in-lieu, allocated to the Civic Tree Reserve Fund, for instances where replacement trees cannot be accommodated on site.

### **Discussion**

In order to implement this approach, amendments are proposed to several sections of the Tree Bylaw, as follows:

Section 13 is revised to make replacement planting mandatory on properties on which a protected tree is removed. As noted, replacement planting would remain a discretionary condition where tree removal occurs on a single or two family residential lot that is not undergoing development. In exceptional cases, the Director Planning may require replacement planting on these lots.

The proposed amendment also provides for cases where the Director Planning determines that it is not feasible to plant all of the replacement trees required under Section 13. In this case, an in lieu payment may be made to the Civic Tree Reserve Fund, in accordance with a newly revised Schedule A, which contains the specified fees. As proposed, the in lieu fee would be \$500 per replacement tree.

In addition, the proposed amendment broadens Section 6(2)(a) to permit the Director Planning to require replacement of a protected tree that was previously cut down in contravention of the Tree Bylaw.

Under the adopted approach, Section 13 is further revised to provide minimum replacement ratios, based on the diameter of the protected tree that was removed. These ratios require one replacement tree for protected trees equal to or less than 30.5 cm (12 in); two replacement trees for protected trees greater than 30.5 cm (12 in) and equal to or less than 61 cm (24 in); and three replacement trees for any other protected trees that are removed.

Size requirements for replacement trees remain the same, with some changes to terminology and one minor modification that restricts the provision of two replacement trees not less than 2.5 cm (1 in) in diameter to fruit trees only. In addition, the pertinent subsection [Section 15(2)] is consolidated with Section 13 for clarity.

As the proposed Section 13 contains all of the required standards for replacement trees, references to these standards throughout the Tree Bylaw are revised to refer only to this section. The result is that all replacement requirements are standardized, whereas currently different requirements apply. For instance, Section 15(1), which applies to unauthorized removal of protected trees, requires replacement trees to be of the same species as that removed, and to be planted “in approximately the same location as the tree cut down.” These provisions are unique to this section and do not apply to replacement trees planted under a tree cutting permit. The proposed amendment replaces this provision with a reference to Section 13, in which the appropriate standards are defined.

In order to ensure that the replacement tree provisions are followed, the Tree Bylaw currently requires posting of a security deposit of \$800 or 120% of the estimated cost of the required replacement trees, whichever is greater. The proposed amendment retains this fee, but moves it to the fee schedule (Schedule A) so that it can be more easily amended in the future. It also specifies that any security deposited forfeited to the City is to be deposited into the Civic Tree Reserve Fund.

**Recommended Bylaw Amendments:**

11. **THAT** Section 13 of the Tree Bylaw be amended to require replacement planting on properties on which a protected tree is removed;
12. **THAT** Section 13 of the Tree Bylaw be further amended to provide the following minimum replacement ratios for protected trees:
  - one replacement tree for protected trees equal to or less than 30.5 cm (12 in) in diameter;
  - two replacement trees for protected trees greater than 30.5 cm (12 in) and equal to or less than 61 cm (24 in) in diameter;
  - three replacement trees for all other protected trees;
13. **THAT** the replacement size criteria provided in Section 15(2) of the Tree Bylaw be consolidated into Section 13 of the Tree Bylaw, and that these criteria be further amended to permit the provision of two replacement trees not less than 2.5 cm (1 in) in diameter only if those trees are fruit trees;
14. **THAT** all references to replacement tree standards be amended to refer to Section 13 of the Tree Bylaw;
15. **THAT** Section 12(a) of the Tree Bylaw be deleted and substituted with language allowing the Director Planning to exempt single and two family residential lots that are not the subject of a current development application from the requirements of Section 13 of the Tree Bylaw;
16. **THAT** Section 13 of the Tree Bylaw be amended to permit in lieu payment, at the rate of \$500 per replacement tree, where the Director Planning determines that planting of all the required replacement trees is not feasible;
17. **THAT** Section 6(2)(a) be amended to permit the Director Planning to require replacement of a protected tree that was previously cut down in contravention of the Tree Bylaw;
18. **THAT** Section 7(a)(i) of the Tree Bylaw be amended to remove the specified security deposit and refer instead to Schedule A of the Bylaw; and

19. **THAT** Section 7(g) of the Tree Bylaw be amended to specify that any security deposit forfeited to the City be deposited in the Civic Tree Reserve Fund.

## 2.4 Enforcement

### Adopted Approach

The adopted approach maintains all of the existing enforcement provisions while adding a maximum fine amount and strengthening the City's ability to inspect properties.

### Discussion

Section 16 of the existing Tree Bylaw currently states that employees or agents of the City may enter onto private land for inspections; however, it does not explicitly state that they must be *allowed* to enter. The proposed amendment strengthens this provision by requiring any owner or occupant to permit any employee or agent of the City to enter their property for the purposes of enforcing the Tree Bylaw. The effect of this amendment is to make refusal of entry an offense subject to the fines provided in Section 19.

Section 19 currently provides a minimum fine of \$2,000 for violation of any Tree Bylaw provision, but no maximum fine. The proposed amendment retains the minimum fine and adds a maximum fine of \$10,000, in order to better clarify the scope of penalties available under prosecution. These fines would apply where a conviction is obtained in a Court prosecution of an offence under the *Offence Act*.

It is noted that the adopted approach also recommends increasing the penalty for unauthorized cutting of a protected tree from \$300 to \$500. This recommendation will be addressed in a forthcoming report to amend the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw.

### Recommended Bylaw Amendments:

20. **THAT** Section 16 of the Tree Bylaw be amended to require any owner or occupant to permit any employee or agent of the City to enter their property for the purposes of enforcing the Tree Bylaw;
21. **THAT** Section 19 of the Tree Bylaw be amended to set a maximum fine of \$10,000 for violation of the provisions of the Tree Bylaw.

## 2.5 Permit Fees

### Adopted Approach

The adopted approach calls for a variable fee structure depending on the size and type of property and its development status. As such, a revised fee schedule is needed to accommodate the broader scope of the proposed amendments.



**Discussion**

Permit fees are provided in Schedule A to the Tree Bylaw. Currently, they include a \$69 fee for the first protected tree included in a tree cutting permit application and \$37 for each subsequent tree, with a maximum fee of \$253 for the first half hectare that contains the subject protected trees and \$206 to \$253 for each additional affected hectare.

The proposed Schedule A distinguishes between lots that are subject to a development application and those that are not. The proposed application fee for lots not under development is \$70 per tree with a maximum fee of \$500 regardless of zoning. This fee structure simplifies and standardizes the calculation of fees while representing a modest increase depending on the size of property. The application fee for single and two family residential lots that are subject to a development permit is \$150 per tree with a maximum fee of \$1,000. This fee more closely reflects the cost of processing tree cutting permits on these types of residential lots, and recognizes the wider range of tree retention options available to properties undergoing development.

For other lots that are undergoing development, the fee per tree is also \$150; however, a graduated base fee also applies. This base fee starts at \$600 for properties that are less than 1000 m<sup>2</sup> (10,764 ft<sup>2</sup>) and increases incrementally up to \$3,000 for properties greater than 20,000 m<sup>2</sup> (215,280 ft<sup>2</sup>). The maximum fee also increases incrementally from \$1,000 for properties that are less than 1000 m<sup>2</sup> (10,764 ft<sup>2</sup>) to \$10,000 for properties over 10,000 m<sup>2</sup> (107,640 ft<sup>2</sup>). This fee structure recognizes that application review and processing costs increase with the size and complexity of development proposals.

**Recommended Bylaw Amendment:**

**22. THAT** Schedule A to the Tree Bylaw be amended according to the attached *Appendix B*.

**2.6 Minor Changes**

**Adopted Approach**

A number of terms and references in the Tree Bylaw are outdated or require clarification. The adopted approach necessitates a general updating of the Tree Bylaw to accompany the more substantial amendments.

**Discussion**

As much of the Tree Bylaw was written in 1996, many terms and references are now outdated. Examples include references to the *Municipal Act*, which has since been superseded by the *Community Charter* and *Local Government Act*, and an earlier version of the *Land Title Act* (RSBC 1979), which has since been revised. The proposed amendment updates these and a number of other terms and references.

To: City Manager  
From: Director Planning and Building  
Re: Tree Bylaw Amendments  
2013 January 29.....Page 10

In addition, some terms are not clearly defined. For instance, references to the “City’s Zoning Bylaw” do not provide the correct citation for that document. The proposed amendment adds a new definition of “Zoning Bylaw,” which references the correct citation (“*Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965*”).

Lastly, some minor changes are required to adjust section references and other wording to reflect the proposed amendments and provide internal consistency.

**Recommended Bylaw Amendments:**

**23. THAT** all sections be updated and clarified to reflect current terms and references.

**24. THAT** minor changes be made as necessary.

**3.0 CONCLUSION**

The above amendments to the Tree Bylaw are proposed in order to implement the approach authorized by Council on 2013 November 04 to enhance the City’s tree protection efforts. It is recommended that Council approve the proposed text amendments and adopt the necessary amendments to the Tree Bylaw, as outlined in Section 2.0 of this report. These amendments will substantially result in the implementation of the adopted approach. The amending bylaw appears elsewhere on Council’s agenda for consideration of First, Second, and Third Reading. In addition, the approved amendment of the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw to increase the penalty for unauthorized cutting of a protected tree will be advanced in a forthcoming report. Implementation of enhanced Local Areas Service Program (LASP) opportunities for boulevard trees will be addressed administratively, with proposed fees for this program to be presented in a forthcoming report.

  
Lou Pelletier, Director  
PLANNING AND BUILDING

LF:

***Attachments***

cc: Deputy City Manager  
Director Engineering  
Director Finance  
Director Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services  
Chief Building Inspector  
Chief Licence Inspector  
City Solicitor  
City Clerk

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BURNABY TREE BYLAW  
AMENDMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES – 2013 JUNE 03**

Burnaby's Tree Bylaw was established in 1996 to protect the City's trees and neighbourhood character. Council has proposed a number of amendments to the Tree Bylaw to enhance the City's approach to tree protection.

The Tree Bylaw is based on the following principles:

- **A Balanced Approach:** The Bylaw should provide a balance between the use and enjoyment of private property, while addressing the need to protect trees.
- **Reasonable Cost:** The Bylaw should not impose an unreasonable financial burden on property owners or on the City in administering the Bylaw.
- **Simplicity and Effectiveness:** The Bylaw should be easily understood and capable of effective enforcement.
- **The Urban Forest:** The Bylaw should recognize that trees on both private and public lands are an important component of the urban forest and ecology of the city.

The proposals, outlined below, have been developed in an effort to better protect "significant" trees within the City and ensure an adequate amount of replacement trees to enhance the urban forest.

***Summary of the Proposed Burnaby Tree Bylaw Amendments and Administrative Changes***

The proposed amendments to the Tree Bylaw are as follows:

- A. Expanding the Scope of the Tree Bylaw
- B. Defining the Size of "Protected Trees"
- C. Implementing Replacement Tree Requirements
- D. Enhancing Enforcement Provisions
- E. Revising Tree Permit Fees
- F. Adding Opportunities for Boulevard Trees in the Local Area Service Program (LASP)

***Proposed Amendment A: Expanding the Scope of the Tree Bylaw***

Existing Approach:

The existing Tree Bylaw applies to single- and two-family lots that are *only* subject to a development application or Demolition Permit.

Proposed Approach:

The proposed scope expands the applicability of the Tree Bylaw to *all* private and public lands at all times. Therefore a Tree Cutting Permit would be required for the removal of Protected Trees.

**NOTE:** The bylaw standards would also apply to the management of City-owned lands in public use, that are not undergoing development, in alignment with the Council's *Tree Management Policy for Public Lands*, which will be updated to be consistent with the Tree Bylaw amendments. Public lands include City parks, road allowances, public easements, open space, conservation lands, lands accommodating City facilities, and other municipal public venues. The bylaw would otherwise apply to all remaining City-owned lands and City lands advancing through the development process.

***Proposed Amendment B: Defining the Size of "Protected Trees"***

Existing Approach:

The existing Tree Bylaw defines a "Protected Tree" as: *"a tree, located on a residential lot, the diameter of which is greater than 20.3 cm (8 inches)..."*

Proposed Approach:

It is proposed that Burnaby's Tree Bylaw be amended to specify two different size classes of "Protected Trees", depending on whether or not the property is subject to a development application:

- On properties subject to a development application, a Tree Cutting Permit would be required to remove ***any tree 20cm (8 inches) or greater in diameter.***
- On properties not subject to a development application, a Tree Cutting Permit would be required to remove ***any conifer tree 30cm (12 inches) or greater in diameter, and any broadleaf tree 45cm (18 inches) or greater in diameter.***

***Proposed Amendment C: Implementing Replacement Tree Requirements***

Existing Approach:

Currently, Replacement Trees *may* be applied as a condition of a Tree-Cutting Permit.

Proposed Approach:

The proposed Tree Replacement requirements would be as follows:

1. Replacement Trees would be applied as a condition of ***all*** Tree-Cutting Permits (with the exception of non-development related tree removal on single- and two-family properties).
2. Removal of larger trees would require more replacement trees to be planted, as outlined below:

Size of Tree to be Cut	Number of Replacement Trees Required
20cm (8") to 30cm (12")	1
30cm (12") to 60cm (24")	2
60cm (24") or more	3

3. If it is not feasible to plant the required number of Replacement Trees on a subject property, a **cash in-lieu contribution** to a proposed Civic Tree Fund would be required. The Civic Tree Fund would be used exclusively to finance planting new trees on City lands.
4. In the case of non-development related tree removal on single- and two-family properties, the policy for Replacement Trees would be a condition that **may** be applied, subject to consideration of the characteristics and site constraints of the property.

***Proposed Amendment D: Enhancing Enforcement Provisions***

Existing Approach:

The current approach to enforcement of the Tree Bylaw includes several “tools” to address non-compliance, including compensatory Replacement Tree planting, retention of bonds held for replacement trees, ticketing, and legal prosecution and fines.

Proposed Approach:

In an effort to ensure that the objectives of the Tree Bylaw are achieved, the following enhanced enforcement provisions are proposed:

1. ***Mitigation planting for trees cut in contravention of the Tree Bylaw:*** A land owner may be required to plant Replacement Trees. If planting replacement trees on the subject property is not feasible, a contribution as cash-in-lieu to the Civic Tree Fund would be required.
2. ***Withholding a bond*** for Replacement Tree planting. (Consistent with existing approach)
3. ***Ticketing for Tree Bylaw infractions:*** The penalty for cutting a Protected Tree without a valid Tree Cutting Permit is proposed to be increased from \$300 to \$500. (The maximum allowable under enabling legislation.)
4. ***Tree Bylaw penalty:*** The penalty specified in the Tree Bylaw, for a prosecution under the Offense Act be **increased from a minimum of \$2000 to a maximum of \$10,000.** (The maximum allowable under enabling legislation.)

**Proposed Amendment E: Revising Tree Permit Fees**

Existing Approach

A Tree Cutting Permit, applied to the development of single- and two-family properties, is defined in the existing Tree Bylaw to include the following Tree Permit Fees:

- \$67 for the first tree, \$36 for each subsequent tree, up to a maximum of:
  - \$265 for the first 0.5 hectare;
  - \$240 for each of next 2.5 hectares;
  - \$195 for each of next 3.5 hectares of the area of land containing the “Protected Trees” which the application for a tree cutting permit is made.

Proposed Approach

The proposed approach consists of revising the fee structure to a variable “cost-recovery” model, depending on the type of property and whether or not it is subject to development. The following chart summarizes the proposed Tree Permit fees:

	Proposed Tree Permit Fee	Maximum Fee
<b>NO DEVELOPMENT</b>		
1 and 2 Family Lots	\$70 per tree	\$500
Other than 1 and 2 Family	\$70 per tree	\$500
<b>DEVELOPMENT</b>		
1 and 2 Family Lots	\$150 per tree	\$1000
Other than 1 and 2 Family Lots, up to 1000m <sup>2</sup> (10,764 sq.ft.)	\$600 base fee + \$150 per tree	\$1000
Other than 1 and 2 Family Lots, 1000m <sup>2</sup> (10,764 sq.ft.) to 5000m <sup>2</sup> (53,820 sq.ft.)	\$1200 base fee + \$150 per tree	\$5000
Other than 1 and 2 Family Lots, 5000m <sup>2</sup> (53,820 sq.ft.) to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> (107,640 sq.ft.)	\$1800 base fee + \$150 per tree	\$5000
Other than 1 and 2 Family Lots, 10,000m <sup>2</sup> (107,640 sq.ft.) to 20,000m <sup>2</sup> (215,280 sq.ft.)	\$2400 base fee + \$150 per tree	\$10,000
Other than 1 and 2 Family Lots > 20,000m <sup>2</sup> (215,280 sq.ft.)	\$3000 base fee + \$150 per tree	\$10,000

***Proposed Amendment F: Adding Opportunities for Boulevard Trees in the Local Area Service Program (LASP)***

**Existing Approach:**

The City of Burnaby currently has an existing Local Areas Service Program (LASP) that provides civic cost-sharing with residential property owners to apply for the improvement of their street, including street paving, installation of curbs and sidewalks, and planting of Boulevard Trees.

**Proposed Approach:**

In order to enhance the existing program, it is proposed that residential property owners, with a previously improved street, could apply for the installation or replacement of Boulevard Trees, the cost of which would be shared with the City under a LASP.

## SCHEDULE "A"

## PART I TREE PERMIT FEES

	Tree Permit Fee (based on protected trees removed)	Maximum Fee
<b>A. <u>No Development Application</u></b>		
(i) residential lot	\$70 per tree	\$500
(ii) site other than residential lot	\$70 per tree	\$500
<b>B. <u>Development Application Pending</u></b>		
(i) residential lot	\$150 per tree	\$1,000
(ii) site other than residential lot		
(a) site area up to 1000m <sup>2</sup> (10,764 sq.ft.)	\$600 base fee plus \$150 per tree	\$1,000
(b) site area greater than 1000m <sup>2</sup> (10,764 sq.ft.) or equal to 5000m <sup>2</sup> (53,820 sq.ft.)	\$1,200 base fee plus \$150 per tree	\$5,000
(c) site area greater than 5000m <sup>2</sup> (53,820 sq.ft.) or equal to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> (107,640 sq.ft.)	\$1,800 base fee plus \$150 per tree	\$5,000
(d) site area greater than 10,000m <sup>2</sup> (107,640 sq.ft.) or equal to 20,000m <sup>2</sup> (215,280 sq.ft.)	\$2,400 base fee plus \$150 per tree	\$10,000
(e) site area greater than 20,000m <sup>2</sup> (215,280 sq.ft.)	\$3,000 base fee plus \$150 per tree	\$10,000



**PART II PAYMENT TO CIVIC TREE RESERVE FUND (s. 13(5))**

Per Tree - \$500.00

**PART III MINIMUM SECURITY FOR TREE REPLACEMENT (s. 7(a)(i))**

\$800.00

**PART IV COPIES OF DEPARTMENTAL RECORDS**

Copy fees subject to all applicable taxes

\$1.20 per page for copies 8.5 x 11  
inches

\$5.65 per page for copies 11 x 17  
inches or larger