

Appendix 4 - Summary of Recommended Amendments

Recommended Amendment	Comments from Property Standards, Investigation & Enforcement and Forestry
<p>1. Restrict height limits to turfgrass only, with a clear definition, and apply limits solely for maintaining sightlines.</p>	<p>The Nuisance Weed and Tall Grass Control By-law 0125-2017 currently uses the term “Tall Grass” to establish maintenance height limits. The By-law is intended to mitigate risks related to public and fire safety, impaired sightlines, the creation of habitat for rodents and insects, and overall neighbourhood blight. These risks are not limited to turfgrass alone – other types of grass and ground vegetation can also contribute to such concerns. For example, ticks may inhabit tall native grasses or other vascular plants, and native vegetation can similarly obstruct sightlines.</p> <p>Where necessary, MLEOs consult with Forestry staff to support accurate identification and assessment.</p> <p>Direction to adopt this recommendation would require a corporate report to General Committee for further consideration.</p>
<p>2. Include an explicit definition of sightlines, supported by diagrams and narrative descriptions with measurements.</p>	<p>The Nuisance Weed and Tall Grass Control By-law 0125-2017 aims to mitigate risks to public and fire safety, including the obstruction of visual sightlines. The by-law establishes a maximum height of 20 cm for “Tall Grass”, which is significantly below standard sightline obstruction thresholds (typically 1 metre).</p> <p>As such, the inclusion of diagrams and detailed sightline definitions does not appear necessary. The By-law remains consistent with similar regulations across comparable jurisdictions.</p> <p>Direction to adopt this recommendation would require a corporate report to General Committee.</p>
<p>3. Incorporate clear enforcement policies, procedures, and training.</p>	<p>The Property Standards, Investigations & Enforcement (PSIE) unit reviews its standard operating procedures ahead of each tall grass season to ensure enforcement is accurate, consistent, and reflective of real-world conditions across the City. Any updates are communicated by supervisors and made available to MLEOs in advance of the enforcement period.</p> <p>This process includes reviewing case examples, consulting with internal stakeholders such as Forestry, and incorporating</p>

	<p>intergovernmental regulations to support well-informed enforcement decisions.</p> <p>Enforcement will work with 311 and Strategic Communications & Initiatives to review and enhance public-facing educational materials and related web content to improve clarity.</p>
4. Clearly outline appeal provisions and procedures.	<p>PSIE, in collaboration with Forestry, ensures that enforcement actions are only taken against properties not in compliance with the by-law. While the absence of a formal appeal process may raise concerns about the potential misidentification of prohibited plants, this risk is mitigated through internal procedures.</p> <p>MLEOs may consult with Forestry staff during investigations to confirm species identification before issuing a Notice of Contravention, helping to prevent errors. Should a property owner have concerns, they are encouraged to contact the MLEO directly to discuss the matter and clarify compliance requirements.</p> <p>Introducing a formal appeal process would require additional administrative resources, impede timely resolution and is not recommended at this time.</p>
5. Implement complaint screening to eliminate aesthetic or subjective complaints that may be unconstitutional.	<p>Complaints are initially received by 311. However, it is the responsibility of the assigned MLEO to assess compliance through a preliminary review and determine whether further investigation is warranted. MLEOs are trained to distinguish between aesthetic concerns and legitimate by-law violations and may consult with Forestry staff to support accurate identification and informed decision-making.</p> <p>To further support this process, Enforcement will work with 311 and Strategic Communications & Initiatives to review and update public-facing educational materials to enhance clarity and understanding of enforcement criteria.</p>

<p>6. Remove species from the prohibited plants list if they do not pose health or safety risks on non-agricultural lands or threaten natural areas.</p>	<p>Schedule A of the Nuisance Weed and Tall Grass Control By-law 0125-2017 references species listed under the <i>Weed Control Act</i>. The by-law does not prohibit any additional plant species beyond those identified in this legislation.</p> <p>The <i>Weed Control Act</i> serves to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the presence of noxious weeds that negatively impact agricultural or horticultural lands,• Minimize plant diseases by eliminating disease hosts, and• Address health hazards to livestock and agricultural workers caused by toxic plants. <p>The City's approach remains consistent with provincial legislation and the practices of other municipalities.</p>
--	---