



**City of Kingston
Report to Administrative Policies Committee
Report Number AP-25-017**

To: Chair and Members of the Administrative Policies Committee
From: Paige Agnew, Commissioner, Growth & Development Services
Resource Staff: Kyle Compeau, Director Licensing & Enforcement Services
Date of Meeting: July 10, 2025
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Property Standards By-Law
Regarding Driveway and Parking Area Maintenance (Pothole Compliance)

Council Strategic Plan Alignment:

Theme: Policies & by-laws

Goal: See above

Executive Summary:

This report recommends amendments to the Property Standards By-Law to adopt a seasonal, two-tiered approach to pothole repair enforcement for driveways and private parking areas. During the period from November 1 to April 30, enforcement action will be limited to the requirement for temporary surface repairs, such as cold patching or alternative weather-appropriate materials. From May 1 to October 31 in each year, enforcement officers will initiate a 30-day review period to ensure that all temporary repairs are fully remediated using materials consistent with the original surface, such as asphalt or concrete, to meet long-term compliance standards.

This approach acknowledges the operational constraints faced by property owners and contractors during Canadian winters and reflects best practices in progressive enforcement and seasonal maintenance feasibility.

Recommendation:

That the Administrative Policies Committee recommends to Council:

July 10, 2025

Page 2 of 10

That By-Law Number 2005-100, A By-Law for Prescribing Standards for the Maintenance and Occupancy of Property within the City of Kingston, as amended, be further amended, as per Exhibit A to Report Number AP-25-017; and

That staff monitor the implementation of changes and report back to Administrative Policies Committee one year after the date of the by-law changes come into effect; and

That the City of Kingston By-Law Enforcement Policy be amended as per Exhibit B to Report Number AP-25-017.

July 10, 2025

Page 3 of 10

Authorizing Signatures:

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY COMMISSIONER

Paige Agnew, Commissioner,
Growth & Development Services

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Lanie Hurdle, Chief
Administrative Officer

Consultation with the following Members of the Corporate Management Team:

Jennifer Campbell, Commissioner, Community Services	Not required
Neil Carbone, Commissioner, Corporate & Emergency Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Fell, President & CEO, Utilities Kingston	Not required
Desirée Kennedy, Chief Financial Officer & City Treasurer	Not required
Ian Semple, Acting Commissioner, Transportation & Infrastructure Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

July 10, 2025

Page 4 of 10

Background

At its [April 1, 2025](#) meeting, Council passed a motion titled “Strengthening Property Standards for Driveway and Surface Repairs”, directing staff to review and report back on amendments to the City’s Property Standards By-Law, By-Law Number 2005-100, to address recurring issues related to poorly maintained driveways and parking areas. The full text of the motion states:

Moved by: Councillor Stephen
Seconded by: Councillor Hassan

Whereas poorly maintained driveways and parking lots contribute to vehicle damage, including tire punctures, wheel misalignment, and suspension issues, increasing maintenance costs for residents and businesses and creating unnecessary financial burdens; and

Whereas the City of Kingston has established minimum property standards through its Property Standards By-Law to ensure the maintenance and safety of private properties; and

Whereas potholes and deteriorating driveways on private property, including commercial and residential properties, have been a recurring issue requiring repeated enforcement interventions; and

Whereas some property owners are engaging in a pattern of minimal compliance, performing only temporary or insufficient repairs rather than properly maintaining their driveways and surfaces; and

Whereas property owners frequently wait to receive a free Notice of Violation before taking action, delaying compliance until the City escalates enforcement to an Order to Remedy, which extends the timeline for repairs and increases administrative burdens; and

Whereas the City has enacted a \$150 fee for issuing a Order of Remedy when a property owner fails to comply with an initial Notice of Violation, serving as an initial deterrent against inaction and encouraging timely compliance;

Therefore Be It Resolved That Council direct staff to review and report back to the Administrative Policies Committee, by the end of Q3 2025, on amendments to the *Property Standards By-Law* to require that any surface repair to driveways, parking lots and walkways be consistent with the original material; and

That Council direct staff to amend the City's By-Law Enforcement Policy to provide that when a pothole or deteriorating driveway contravenes the Property Standards By-Law, an officer will generally require the person to repair the contravention within 14 days after being served with the order to repair.

July 10, 2025

Page 5 of 10

The motion was brought forward in response to repeated enforcement challenges and growing concerns about surface deterioration leading to vehicle damage, lack of permanent fixes, and administrative inefficiencies tied to delayed compliance.

As directed by Council, this report is intended to support changes to the Property Standards By-Law, By-Law Number 2005-100, that would require any surface repairs to driveways, parking lots, and walkways to be completed using materials consistent with the original installation. In addition, the motion directed staff to amend the City's By-Law Enforcement Policy to provide that when a pothole or surface defect contravenes the by-law, enforcement officers will generally require the repair to be completed within 14 days of an Order to Remedy being served. These updates aim to promote consistency, enhance safety, and encourage timely compliance with minimum maintenance standards on private property.

In response to this direction, staff have undertaken policy review and operational analysis, informed by weather-based limitations, contractor availability, and stakeholder feedback. This report outlines the proposed seasonal enforcement framework that aligns with Council's motion, balances practical repair timelines, and maintains a fair and enforceable approach to surface condition compliance.

Options/Discussion:

Potholes on private property-particularly on driveways and commercial parking lots-have been a growing concern for both residents and municipal enforcement staff. However, the reality of Canada's harsh winters and the complexity of surface repair materials make year-round enforcement of permanent fixes not only impractical but also unfair to property owners, particularly those who operate under tight financial or lease constraints. Recognizing these challenges, the City of Kingston proposes the implementation of a two-tiered, seasonal enforcement model for pothole remediation on private property, with specific timelines and expectations tailored to climate realities and stakeholder feedback.

From November 1 to April 30, the focus of enforcement will shift to ensuring that potholes are at least temporarily repaired to address immediate safety hazards. These temporary measures, such as cold patching or other forms of surface stabilization, are considered acceptable in this period given the inability to apply permanent materials like hot mix asphalt during freezing conditions. Commencing on or about May 1 each year, municipal enforcement officers will re-inspect any properties with documented or observed temporary fixes and issue compliance orders requiring permanent repairs within a 30-day period. These permanent repairs must use materials consistent with the original surface to ensure quality and longevity.

However, the City of Kingston acknowledges that even in warmer months, property owners may face significant delays in securing contractors to perform permanent surface repairs. The local construction market experiences elevated demand in the spring and summer, and contractor availability may be limited, especially for larger-scale commercial resurfacing projects. In such cases, landlords may demonstrate good faith compliance by providing documentation that they have engaged with contractors, scheduled repairs, or entered into binding service agreements

July 10, 2025

Page 6 of 10

for the repairs. Where this is evident to the satisfaction of the Property Standards Officer, enforcement timelines may be extended at the discretion of the Property Standards Officer, and landlords may also formally appeal any compliance order to the City's Appeals Committee, which may grant additional time based on the scope of the work and demonstrated effort.

It is also important to acknowledge that the City of Kingston, as one of the largest property owners and highest bidders for contracted repair work, experiences these same seasonal challenges. The timelines and procurement delays affecting the City's own municipal infrastructure projects underscore the legitimacy of the difficulties faced by private property owners. Enforcement strategies must therefore not only be fair and consistent but also rooted in the operational realities of the construction and contracting industry.

This proposed enforcement model aligns not only with operational feasibility but also with legislative benchmarks. Ontario Regulation 239/02, Minimum Maintenance Standards for Municipal Highways-while applicable to public infrastructure-offers reasonable comparison for enforcement timing. The regulation stipulates that potholes on high-traffic municipal roads must be addressed within 4-7 days if they exceed certain dimensions (e.g., 8cm deep and 1000cm squared in area), and within 30 days for lower-class roads. By adapting these thresholds into the private enforcement context, Kingston aims to maintain reasonable expectations without overburdening property owners during the most difficult time of year for asphalt work.

A key voice in shaping this proposal has been the Kingston Rental Property Association (KRPA), which represents a broad range of landlords and property managers in the city. The KRPA has outlined specific concerns regarding the financial and logistical constraints of pothole repairs, particularly in the winter. Landlords of residential properties are legally capped at specified annual rent increases under provincial legislation, yet the cost of winter pothole remediation is often disproportionately high. Cold patching in freezing conditions frequently deteriorates quickly, meaning landlords must pay three times for the same repair: once to install the cold patch, again to remove it in spring, and finally to apply hot asphalt. These costs can be significant and must often be absorbed without the ability to recoup expenses through rent increases.

Additionally, freeze-thaw cycles common in Ontario winters further degrade repair effectiveness, and contractor availability during colder months is limited and expensive. These realities underscore the need for a more pragmatic enforcement approach that balances safety with economic feasibility.

The KRPA also emphasized the unintended consequences of rigid regulation, noting that strict enforcement policies targeting a few non-compliant landlords often penalize the broader landlord community, which is striving to meet compliance requirements. A more constructive approach, they argue, is one that incorporates education and documentation. Landlords express a willingness to provide proof of temporary fixes through photographic evidence, creating a transparent and cooperative relationship with enforcement staff during winter months.

July 10, 2025

Page 7 of 10

To support this seasonal model, two key recommendations are proposed. First, staff recommend that Council adopt a formal two-tiered enforcement framework for pothole repairs, recognizing cold patch or temporary remediation as acceptable forms of compliance from November through April, and mandating permanent repairs by the end of May. Second, staff are recommending a continued emphasis on education and warning notices prior to issuing monetary fines. This graduated enforcement strategy allows landlords time to comply in a reasonable and financially feasible manner, while still holding them accountable for long-term property standards.

In conclusion, the proposed seasonal enforcement model offers a fair, weather-aware, and stakeholder-informed approach to managing potholes on private property. It reflects both the operational constraints of Canadian winters and the fiscal pressures facing property owners, while maintaining public safety and infrastructure standards. Through collaboration with groups like the KRPA and the use of evidence-based timelines, Kingston can continue to modernize its property standards enforcement while supporting sustainable compliance across the community.

Enforcement Strategy

To ensure effective implementation of the two-tiered pothole repair enforcement model, the following enforcement strategy will be adopted by Enforcement Services:

Seasonal Initiation of Enforcement (November 1-April 30)

If violations are identified between November 1 and April 30, enforcement staff will issue an initial Order of Remedy requiring a temporary repair using cold patch or another weather appropriate material to address immediate safety concerns. This order acknowledges winter limitations and serves as an interim measure.

1. 30-Day Post-May 1 Review Period

Beginning May 1 of each year, enforcement staff will initiate a 30-day review period to assess previously issued orders or observed temporary fixes. All properties with prior cold-patch or seasonal remediation must be revisited during this period. Officers will verify that full restoration has occurred using materials consistent with the original surface (e.g., asphalt, concrete, interlock).

2. Initial Order and 14-Day Compliance

Outside of the winter period, when weather permits, enforcement staff who identify a pothole or surface deterioration that contravenes the Property Standards By-law will issue an Order of Remedy, with a standard 14-day compliance deadline. This aligns with Council's direction to encourage timely compliance and reduce enforcement delays.

July 10, 2025

Page 8 of 10

3. Extension Process Based on Contractor Feasibility

Property owners may submit documentation (e.g., service quotes, repair schedules, binding contractor agreements) to demonstrate that permanent repairs are scheduled or pending based on contractor availability. Where good faith efforts are evident, Property Standards Officers may grant discretionary extensions of timeline compliance dates.

4. Appeal Mechanism for Financial or Logistical Constraints

In cases where compliance within the required timeframe is not feasible due to demonstrated financial hardship or contractor limitations, the property owner or agent may submit an appeal to the City of Kingston's Appeals Committee. The Committee may extend compliance timelines based on the scope of work, evidence of mitigation efforts, and fairness considerations.

5. Progressive Enforcement for Non-Compliance

Continued non-compliance may result in further administrative penalties, escalation to Provincial Offences Court, or third-party remediation at the property owners' expense, where warranted.

Public Engagement

A survey was conducted on Get Involved Kingston from May 14 until June 3, 2025, as shown in Exhibit B. Users could review information about the current process and proposed amendments. Key stakeholders, including property owners, were also invited to join a public meeting at Kingston East Community Centre on June 2, 2025. Here, participants had the opportunity to meet with staff, ask questions about the proposed changes, and share their feedback.

The engagement was promoted with the community in a variety of ways including:

- News release to news subscribers and local media
 - Picked up by two local news outlets (one digital article + one radio mention)
- Social media posts across Facebook, Instagram, X and LinkedIn
- Paid digital advertisements on Facebook and Instagram
- Kingston This Week print ad
- Inclusion in Get Involved Kingston newsletter
- Graphic and link on City's digital screen network
- Link on City's Road Maintenance Webpage and "Report a Pothole" knowledge article on MyCity App
- Targeted email invitations to 110+ contacts identified as key stakeholders including commercial property owners, engineers, developers and companies that provide surface repair standard services

July 10, 2025

Page 9 of 10

Who we heard from

- 156 participants completed the survey
- 61 participants provided feedback via email, phone, CRM and social media
- 1,001 aware participants visited the project page to learn more
- 10 participants engaged with the City for the first time on Get Involved Kingston
- 4 participants attended the public meeting
- Locations of participants:
 - 52 Central-East Kingston (K7K)
 - 50 Southwest Kingston (K7M)
 - 27 Central-South Kingston (K7L)
 - 23 Northwest Kingston (K7P)
 - 3 Rural Kingston (K0H)
 - 1 Other (K7G)

What we heard

The feedback received from the survey is mostly opposed to the proposed property standards amendments, with some conditional support identified. Participants share strong concern for the proposed timeline and materials, enforcement surface repair standards on private driveways, and many expressed dissatisfactions with condition of public roads and sidewalks, citing the City's own repair standards as an area of major concern.

Based on the nature and extent of the changes proposed by this set of by-law amendments. Staff will closely monitor the implementation of the by-law and propose to report back to Council, via Administrative Policies Committee, in a year's time.

By-Law Enforcement Policy

In accordance with Council's direction, the Commissioner of Growth & Development Services, as approval authority under the By-Law Enforcement Policy, will amend the the City's By-Law Enforcement Policy to provide that when a pothole or deteriorating driveway contravenes the Property Standards By-Law, an officer will generally require the person to repair the contravention within 14 days after being served with the order to repair upon Council approval of the associated by-law changes. City staff will be enforcing this by-law on a complaint basis.

Climate Risk Considerations

Climate-related factors, including freeze-thaw cycles, increased precipitation, and more frequent extreme weather events, have a direct impact on the deterioration of driveway and parking surfaces. These conditions accelerate pothole formation, undermine temporary surface repairs, and increase the complexity and cost of long-term remediation. The proposed seasonal enforcement framework recognizes these climate risks and aims to provide a more resilient and adaptable enforcement model that supports timely hazard mitigation in winter, while allowing for proper restoration during warmer, more stable weather periods.

July 10, 2025

Page 10 of 10

Existing Policy/By-Law

City of Kingston By-Law Number 2005-100, The Property Standards By-Law

City of Kingston By-Law Enforcement Policy

Financial Considerations

None

Contacts:

Kyle Compeau, Director, Licensing & Enforcement, 613-546-4291 extension 1343

Steve Mothersell, Manager, Enforcement Services, 613-546-4291 extension 1307

Other City of Kingston Staff Consulted:

Karen Santucci, Director, Public Works & Solid Waste Services

Speros Kanellos, Director, Facilities Management & Construction Services

Adam McDonald, Operations Manager, Public Works & Solid Waste Services

Therol Peterson, Manager, Facilities, Facilities Management & Construction Services

Exhibits Attached:

Exhibit A By-Law to Amend By-Law Number 2005-100

Exhibit B Public Engagement

City of Kingston By-Law Number 2005-100

***By-Law to Amend City of Kingston By-Law Number 2005–100,
A By-Law for Prescribing Standards for the Maintenance and Occupancy of
Property within the City of Kingston***

Whereas:

The Corporation of the City of Kingston (the “**City**”) is a single-tier municipality incorporated pursuant to an order made under section 25.2 of the *Municipal Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.45.

The powers of a municipality must be exercised by its council (*Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 (the “**Municipal Act, 2001**”), s. 5 (1)).

A municipal power must be exercised by by-law unless the municipality is specifically authorized to do otherwise (*Municipal Act, 2001*, s. 5 (3)).

A single-tier municipality may provide any service or thing that the municipality considers necessary or desirable for the public (*Municipal Act, 2001*, s. 10 (1)).

On May 17, 2005, council for the *City* passed *City of Kingston By-Law Number 2005–100*, “*A By-Law for Prescribing Standards for the Maintenance and Occupancy of Property within the City of Kingston*”.

Council for the *City* (“**council**”) considers it necessary and desirable for the public to amend *City of Kingston By-Law Number 2005–100*.

Therefore, council enacts:

1. Amendment

1.1 *City of Kingston By-Law Number 2005-100* is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection 4.22 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“4.22 All areas used for vehicular traffic, parking spaces, driveways, walkways and other similar areas shall be covered with asphalt, concrete, crushed stone, paving stones arranged in an open

By-Law to Amend By-Law Number 2005–100

pattern, or gravel surfacing. Surface conditions shall be maintained in good repair and:

- (a) kept free of dirt;
- (b) kept level, stable, and free of potholes, rutting, erosion, or other hazards; and
- (c) maintained, repaired and restored using the same material as the original surface, which shall include full resurfacing where required.

Despite the foregoing, the obligation to keep surface conditions in good repair includes the following maintenance practices appropriate to seasonal conditions:

- (i) subject to clause (ii) below, during the period from November 1 to April 30, the obligation to keep surface conditions in good repair may include the use of temporary surface treatments, such as cold patch asphalt or gravel fill to address potholes, rutting, erosion or other hazards, provided that such temporary surface treatments address immediate hazards or unsafe surface conditions, as determined by the Director; and
- (ii) as of May 31 in each year, all temporary repairs made during the period from November 1 to April 30 shall be permanently restored using the same material as the original surface, including full resurfacing where required.”

2. Coming into Force

- 2.1 This by-law will come into force and take effect on the date that it is passed.

By-Law to Amend By-Law Number 2005–100

1 st Reading	date
2 nd Reading	date
3 rd Reading	date
Passed	date

Janet Jaynes
City Clerk

Bryan Paterson
Mayor

Reporting Out – Driveway and Surface Repair Standards

Why we engaged

On April 1, City Council passed a motion that directed staff to review potential amendments to the [Property Standards By-law](#) regarding the maintenance of privately-owned driveways, parking lots and walkways. Proposed amendments include:

- Requiring surface repairs to be consistent with the original materials, and
- Enforcing a 14-day repair timeline once a formal Order to Remedy is issued

Currently, if a violation of property standards is identified, By-law staff issue a Notice of Violation, which outlines the deficiency and provides a specific timeframe for repair. This approach emphasizes education, with the ultimate goal of compliance. If the deficiency is not repaired within the specific timeframe, staff issue an Order to Remedy.

Oftentimes, the surfaces are repaired to minimum standards, causing a recurring pattern of the same issue. This not only imposes a significant administrative burden on staff, but it also causes ongoing frustration from residents that continue to encounter poorly maintained, and often unsafe, surfaces.

To inform these proposed By-law amendments, staff sought public feedback on the impacts of surface deficiencies and repairs from residents, drivers, property owners and contractors.

How we engaged

The survey was open on Get Involved Kingston from May 14 until June 3, 2025. Users could review information about the current process and proposed amendments and complete a survey. Key stakeholders, including property owners, were also invited to join a public meeting at Kingston East Community Centre on June 2, 2025. Here, participants had the opportunity to meet with staff, ask questions about the proposed changes, and share their feedback.

The engagement was promoted with the community in a variety of ways including:

- News release to news subscribers and local media
 - Picked up by two local news outlets (one digital article + one radio mention)
- Social media posts across Facebook, Instagram, X and LinkedIn
- Paid digital advertisements on Facebook and Instagram
- Kingston This Week print ad
- Inclusion in Get Involved Kingston newsletter

- Graphic and link on City’s digital screen network
- Link on City’s Road Maintenance Webpage and “Report a Pothole” knowledge article on MyCity App
- Targeted email invitations to 110+ contacts identified as key stakeholders including commercial property owners, engineers, developers, pavers and companies that provide surface repair standard services

Who we heard from

- 156 participants completed the survey
- 61 participants provided feedback via email, phone, CRM and social media
- 1,001 aware participants visited the project page to learn more
- 10 participants engaged with the City for the first time on Get Involved Kingston
- 4 participants attended the public meeting
- Locations of participants:
 - 52 Central-East Kingston (K7K)
 - 50 Southwest Kingston (K7M)
 - 27 Central-South Kingston (K7L)
 - 23 Northwest Kingston (K7P)
 - 3 Rural Kingston (K0H)
 - 1 Other (K7G)

What we heard

The feedback received from the survey is mostly opposed to the proposed property standards amendments, with some conditional support identified. Participants share strong concern for the proposed timeline and materials amendment, enforcement of surface repair standards on private driveways, and many expressed dissatisfactions with condition of public roads and sidewalks, citing the City's own repair standards as an area of major concern.

Question 1: Demographics

- 11 respondents self-identified as commercial property owners (retail, industry, multi-residential)
- 130 respondents self-identified as private property owners (private home or residence)
- 53 respondents self-identified as vehicle operators
- 9 respondents selected “none of the above”
- No respondents self-identified as contractors who offer surface repair services

Question 2: Have you ever encountered potholes or deteriorating surfaces on commercial parking lots, private driveways, or walkways in your neighbourhood?

- 128 participants selected “yes” (82.1%)
- 28 participants selected “no” (17.9%)

Question 3: If yes, how often?

- 51 participants selected “daily” (39.8%)
- 41 participants selected “monthly” (32%)
- 16 participants selected “monthly” (12.5%)
- 18 participants selected “a few times per year” (14.1%)
- 2 participants selected “less than once per year” (1.6%)

Question 4: Have these conditions caused you or someone you know any issues (e.g. vehicle damage, mobility concerns).

- 49 participants selected “yes” (38.3%)
- 79 participants selected “no” (61.7%)

Question 5: Do you have any comments on issues caused?

69 participants provided comments on issues caused. Summary of main themes identified:

- **Maintenance of Roads and Sidewalks/City Criticism (25 comments):** Sentiment that private standards should also apply to public property, with many concerned about potholes on city roads. Some respondents expressed concerns about sidewalks, with mentions of safety hazards and others sharing that repair work has not been done despite informing the City of the issues.
- **Car Issues (18 comments):** Specific car issues mentioned include wear and tear and damage to tires, suspension, breaks, struts, rims, exhaust, alignment, etc.
- **Accessibility and Safety (17 comments):** Mentions of dangerous areas and perceived safety hazards, potential of injuries for pedestrians, cyclists and those who use mobility aids.
- **Support for Proposed Changes (10 comments):** Recognition of recidivism, acknowledgment of many parking lot surfaces being sub-standard, support for enforcing this for commercial/multi-residential properties.
- **Private Driveways (9 comments):** Concerns about regulation of private driveways, and suggestions to separate commercial and residential regulations.
- **Specific Location (7 comments):** Some respondents identify specific locations where surface deficiencies/potholes are of concern.

- Other:
 - **Cost as barrier to repairs (4)**
 - **Concerns about enforcement standards (1)**

Question 6: Do you believe property owners should be required to repair surface deficiencies using the same or similar material as the original surface (e.g., asphalt with asphalt, concrete with concrete)?

Responses were mixed, with 51% of participants “strongly” or “slightly” **agreeing** and 34% of participants “strongly” or “slightly” **disagreeing**.

- 47 participants selected “strongly agree” (30.1%)
- 32 participants selected “slightly agree” (20.5%)
- 24 participants selected “neither agree nor disagree” (15.4%)
- 19 participants selected “slightly disagree” (12.2%)
- 34 participants selected “strongly disagree*” (21.8%)

*Note that in the initial version of the survey, an error resulted in no “strongly disagree” option being available. Approx. 8 participants submitted responses prior to the change. The error was quickly remedied and has been accounted for in reporting.

Question 7: Do you have any comments on repair materials?

87 participants provided comments on repair materials. Summary of main themes identified:

- **Support for flexibility in Materials (29 comments):** Including cost-effective options and updating surfaces with materials that are more environmentally friendly. Many believe this should not be enforced and should be up to the property owner.
- **Support for Proposed Changes (24 comments):** Respondents agree that there should be a standard adhered to and that repairs should maintain surface integrity, acknowledging that some repairs are inadequate. Many comments are conditional, with preference for separating private residences and commercial properties.
- **Private vs. Public Property (21 comments):** There is widespread sentiment that repairs for private residential driveways should not be enforced, and that homeowners should have the option to make their own decisions for repair materials.
- **Criticism of City (20 comments):** Many respondents reference dissatisfaction with maintenance of City roads and sidewalks, as well as the perceived double standard on private vs. public repairs. Some participants also identified concerns

with by-law staff duties of enforcement and perceived overreach of regulating private properties.

- **Cost (16 comments):** Some respondents feel cost is prohibitive to repairs, support for less expensive solutions. Other concerns include lack of funding for capital costs from multi-residential properties, discrepancies in cost for (and enforcement of) small fixes vs. full parking lots.
- **Function vs. Aesthetic (8 comments):** Support for repairs being functional over cosmetic; some respondents perceive that enforcement focuses on aesthetics.
- **Accessibility and Safety (7 comments):** Respondents believe repair materials should only be enforced if it poses a safety risk, acknowledging that repairs should be safe and efficient.
- Other:
 - **Concerns about enforcement (5 comments)**
 - **Specific locations of concern (4 comments)**
 - **Timeline not sufficient (4 comments)**
 - **Car issues (1 comment)**

Question 8: Do you think 14 days is a reasonable amount of time for property owners to complete repairs once they've received an order?

- 48 participants said "yes" (30.8%)
- 108 participants said "no" (69.2%)

Question 9: Do you have any comments on the time frame for repairs?

115 participants provided comments on the time frame for repairs. Summary of main themes identified:

- **Concern for 14-day deadline (45 comments):** Many comments state that 14 days is unrealistic, especially for private homeowners and larger or more complex repair projects. Barriers cited include contractor shortages, seasonal limitations and long wait times (often 1-6 months). Some provided suggestions for 30 days, 60 days, 6 months or even one year as reasonable alternatives.
- **Calls for Flexibility (38 comments):** Respondents think there should be flexibility based on size and scope of repair, weather conditions, contractor availability and financial situation. Many recommend allowing extensions if proof of effort (i.e. contractor quotes, scheduled work) is provided.
- **Public Surfaces/City Accountability (19 comments):** Numerous respondents are concerned that the maintenance of City roads/repairs on public property do not adhere to 14-day timeline and that private lands should not be held to higher standard.

- **Financial Concerns (14 comments):** Some respondents highlight the high cost of repairs and the economic strain this could place on property owners. There is also concern that tight timelines could lead to price gouging. Some suggest the City could offer financial assistance or perform repairs at cost.
- **Support for Proposed Changes (12 comments):** Some respondents suggest that 14-days is a reasonable timeline to have small surface deficiencies repaired. Most support is conditional, with flexibility for size of repairs, weather, etc.
- **Distinction between property types (10 comments):** Many agree commercial properties should be held to higher standards (due to public access). However, private residential driveways are widely seen as being outside the City's jurisdiction (unless there's a clear safety hazard).

Question 10: Do you have any other comments or suggestions related to driveway, parking lot, or walkway maintenance on private property?

102 participants provided other comments. Overall, the comments reflect concerns and suggestions already mentioned above in questions 5, 7 and 9. The following is a summary of responses:

- **Opposition to regulating private residential property (36 comments)**
- **Criticism of City's own infrastructure and priorities (36 comments)**
- **Environmental and practical considerations (17 comments)**
- **Concerns about enforcement of property standards (16 comments)**
- **Other comments including reiterating concerns about timeline and materials and cost, plus mentions of specific locations in need of repairs (15 comments)**
- **Support for regulation of commercial properties (13 comments)**
- **General support for proposed changes (7 comments)**

General feedback (CRM, email, social media)

Some community members commented on social media posts related to this engagement, or submitted feedback via email and phone. The following is a summary of these comments:

- **Overwhelming frustration with condition of public roads** as well as anger with City's responsiveness to concerns
- **Criticism of municipal priorities** and spending on other projects over essential road repairs
- **Opposition to regulation of private property**, perceived double standard with enforcing private property and not repairing public surfaces

- **Calls for better quality and accountability in repairs** (specific to roads), with mentions of higher quality materials and modern repair techniques
- **Acknowledgment of impact that surface deficiencies have on residents** include vehicle damage and safety concerns

Public Meeting Feedback

4 participants attended the public meeting on June 2, representing two key stakeholder groups: contractors who repair surface deficiencies and commercial property owners. Staff offered background information on where these proposed changes came from, and where they face challenges with respect to enforcement and short-term temporary fixes.

Overall, participants expressed strong concerns about the feasibility of a 14-day repair timeline, citing contractor availability, seasonal limitations, and high costs for repair. There was also acknowledgement that small pothole repairs would likely not be a priority job.

There was agreement amongst the group that public and private standards should be consistent, and that the City should lead by example in maintaining its own infrastructure. One participant also mentioned potential conflict arising between property owners and contractors when attempting to act proactively ahead of enforcement. Some suggestions included allowing more time to show progress, not just completion, and exploring coordinated repair efforts between the City and contractors.

Participants expressed appreciation for the City working directly with key stakeholders to receive feedback and find solutions that work for all parties.

Next steps

Feedback has been shared with the project team for consideration. Staff will take a report with recommendations on the proposed changes to the Administrative Policies Committee in July.