

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

### Executive Summary

More than 180 residents have participated in consultations regarding the Property Standards By-law Review. Data collected from the consultations has helped staff to formulate final recommendations to Committee and Council, based on the options outlined in the Property Standards Discussion Paper.

The preferred options identified in the discussion paper for several issues as outlined below were supported by these consultations:

- replacing the term “abutting property” with “neighbouring property”
- enforcement time lines of snow and ice accumulation under the Property Maintenance By-law are reasonable
- maintaining current wording of “unsightly” with respect to fences to grant Officers more flexibility to address multiple conditions of disrepair

### Consultations

One (1) in-person public consultation was planned as part of the consultation portion of the development of the by-law review. Additionally, key stakeholders and special interest groups were invited to request individual meetings, in addition to the public consultation. The consultation was held on July 10 at McNabb Recreation Centre. One additional meeting was requested by residents of Hintonburg and was held on July 19. A combined total of 14 participants attended the in-person meetings.

In addition, an online consultation was available to all residents on ottawa.ca from June 26 to July 24. Awareness of public consultations was raised through Public Service Announcements, social media, message to residents from Member of Council, and direct e-mails to community and other relevant organizations. The online consultation was the preferred option for most residents to provide feedback on proposed changes to the by-law. Online consultation materials were viewed more than 650 times, and more than 170 residents completed the online survey.

Two (2) surveys were collected from the in-person consultation and were compiled with the online results to reflect the totals presented in this document. The analytical tools included in the survey system have enabled detailed analysis of each issue covered by the by-law review to inform the recommendations of the report.

## Consultation Question and Responses

### 1. Have you filed a property standards complaint in the last 12 months?

(170 respondents)

- 18% yes
- 82% no

After making your complaint, has the problem re-occurred?

(31 respondents)

- 87% yes
- 13% no

### 2. Have you received a warning, Notice of Violation, Order or fine for a property standards violation in the last 12 months?

(168 respondents)

- 2% yes
- 98% no

### 3. How often do you feel that issues regarding property standards affect your quality of life?

(159 respondents)

- 10% Constantly
- 18% Frequently
- 36% Occasionally
- 27% Rarely
- 8% Not at all
- 1% No Opinion

How important is this issue for you?

(159 respondents)

- 41% Very Important
- 38% Somewhat Important
- 13% Neutral
- 4% Less Important
- 4% Not Important
- 1% No Opinion

4. With respect to exterior lighting, the current wording of this section of the Property Standards By-law states that installation is to be deflected away from “abutting residential properties”. The City is recommending replacing the wording “abutting” with “neighbouring” in order to address lighting concerns for properties that are not directly next to the source of light (i.e. across the road). Do you support this recommendation?

(158 respondents)

- 84% Yes. This approach is reasonable.
- 3% No. I prefer that the City adopt an alternative solution.
- 6% No. I don't support any changes to the existing wording.
- 8% No Opinion.

How important is this issue for you?

(158 respondents)

- 17% Very Important
- 38% Somewhat Important
- 28% Neutral
- 6% Less Important
- 8% Not Important
- 3% No Opinion

5. Do you think the current times permitted for the removal of snow and ice accumulation are reasonable under the Property Maintenance By-law (2005-208, as amended)?

(150 respondents)

- 59% Yes. The current enforcement process is reasonable.
- 19% No. Emergency Orders should be issued and confirmed by the Court under the Property Standards By-law.
- 22% No Opinion.

How important is this issue for you?

(150 respondents)

- 22% Very Important
- 27% Somewhat Important
- 34% Neutral
- 5% Less Important
- 4% Not Important
- 8% No Opinion

6. The City is recommending that the term “unsightly” be kept in the Property Standards By-law with respect to fences in order to give enforcement officers more flexibility to address multiple conditions of disrepair. Do you agree?

(147 respondents)

- 54% Yes. The City should keep this term listed in the fence provision of the by-law.
- 37% No. The term “unsightly” should be clearly defined.
- 5% No. Another terminology should be considered.
- 4% No Opinion.

How important is this issue for you?

(147 respondents)

- 30% Very Important
- 44% Somewhat Important
- 18% Neutral
- 3% Less Important
- 3% Not Important
- 3% No Opinion

7. The City is recommending removing graffiti from the Property Standards By-law as this issue is already covered under the Graffiti Management By-law. Do you support this recommendation?

(147 respondents)

- 69% Yes. This approach is reasonable.
- 16% No. The Property Standards By-law should also cover graffiti.
- 14% No Opinion.

How important is this issue for you?

(147 respondents)

- 14% Very Important
- 34% Somewhat Important
- 33% Neutral
- 8% Less Important
- 5% Not Important
- 5% No Opinion

8. Do you wish to provide any other comments with regards to the City of Ottawa Property Standards By-law?

Approximately 60 respondents provided additional comments to the above questions. Comments can be grouped into the following areas:

- **Lighting** – Eight respondents provided additional comments on exterior lighting with 5 residents expressing full support of the recommendation; 1 comment stating “neighbouring” doesn’t go far enough; and 2 comments were provided supporting changes to the wording but added that there should be further regulation of directional-focused lighting provided for in the by-law.
- **Enforcement** – Eight respondents commented on by-law enforcement in general. The majority of comments related to demand for more proactive enforcement and faster response times.
- **Fences** – Five respondents provided comments on fences, with 3 respondents supporting the term unsightly and interpretation of the term to be applied to the condition of the fence rather than for aesthetics; 1 comment was provided stating that the term unsightly is too broad, and 1 comment suggesting a non-exhaustive list of examples be provided in the by-law.
- **Safe Passage (snow and ice)** – Three respondents provided additional comment on safe passage (snow and ice), with 1 respondent in full support, 1 comment expressing concern that snow removal on city streets is not fast enough or accessible for emergency vehicles, and 1 comment suggesting the City maintain Canada Post boxes with respect to snow build up.
- **Graffiti** – Two respondents provided additional comments related to the regulation and enforcement of graffiti, with 1 respondent supporting less regulation regarding positive graffiti art, and 1 providing comment on regulation and enforcement of the Graffiti By-law.
- **Other Issues** – Approximately 30 respondents provided comments regarding issues un-related to the Property Standards By-law Review. The majority involved issues with overall property maintenance and matters relating to other by-laws not covered in this review. These comments have been directed to the appropriate department for further consideration.

## Demographics

In addition to the evaluation of options provided in the discussion paper, respondents were asked a number of demographic questions. This data has shown:

- 52% of respondents were female. 44% were male and 4% identified with another gender identity.
- 47% of respondents were from urban communities, 40% were from sub-urban communities and 12% were from rural communities.

- 68% of respondents lived in detached homes, 13% lived in apartments or condominiums and 18% lived in semi-detached homes.
- 67% of respondents have university degrees. 18% have college education or trades training. 7% have high school diplomas.
- The ages of respondents were:
  - 18 to 34: 14%
  - 35 to 44: 14%
  - 45 to 54: 23%
  - 55 to 64: 23%
  - 65 or older: 17%
  - Decline to answer: 9%

### **Data Retention**

Personally identifiable information collected through the survey will be retained for a period of two (2) years. General responses will be retained indefinitely for use in future reviews of the Property Standards By-law.