



**NADLAN-HARRIS PROPERTY
MANAGEMENT INC.**


SPRING 2026



Nadlan - Harris is excited to share our 2026 spring newsletter with the Board of Directors!


IN THIS ISSUE:

- **Harassment is Not a Nuisance: The Rise in Condo Manager Abuse Demands Legal Scrutiny.**
- **When Noise Becomes Neglect: What Condo Corporations Must Learn from Lozinski v. WSCC 601**
- **Preventing Crime in Multifamily Housing**
- **Property Management Isn't Entry-Level: It's a Profession That Requires Proof**
- **Fire Code Updates Impacting Condos February 2026**



*Spring arrives on quiet feet,
With blossoms waking in the street,
A tender breeze, a golden hue,
And skies reborn in hopeful blue.
The earth exhales, the frost retreats,
New life unfolds in small heartbeats,
Each bud a promise, fresh and fair,
Of brighter days and warmer air.
So let your worries drift away,
Like petals dancing into May,
For every end the cold may bring,
Finds gentle healing in the spring.*

This newsletter highlights key updates, achievements, and upcoming initiatives as we embrace the season of reflection and planning for the year ahead. I encourage you all to take a moment to review it, as it is filled with valuable information for the months to come.



Nadlan - Harris Upcoming Seminar



TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:



- Financial Statements
- Cyber Security
- Condo Authority of Ontario.

At Nadlan Harris Property Management Inc., we take great pride in hosting seminars twice a year for our managers and board members. These biannual sessions are designed to provide valuable knowledge, foster collaboration, and keep everyone informed on key aspects of condominium management.

Each seminar features experienced guest speakers and engaging discussions on a range of important topics, including financial management, legal updates, and other matters relevant to condominium corporations.

We invite you to join us for an enriching experience that includes a delicious breakfast and lunch, along with insightful presentations from industry professionals. It is a great opportunity to learn, connect, and stay ahead in the ever-evolving condominium landscape.



Harassment is not a nuisance': The rise in condo manager abuse demands legal scrutiny.

Thursday, February 12, 2026
By Sonja Hodis

Condo managers face increasing demands and rising levels of harassment. Many have left the profession because their workplaces are not safe, free of bullying and verbal abuse. Since most managers work on the condominium property, the condominium corporation must ensure a safe workplace under the Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA).

Disgruntled owners or occupants cause much of the bullying and verbal abuse over board decisions implemented by the manager. Managers are usually the first to receive these complaints. While owners and residents should be able to raise concerns, they should not express such discontent in any manner they wish. There are limits on what is considered an acceptable manner, even if the complaint is legitimate

While most condo corporations and managers will attempt to deescalate situations where individuals cross the line of acceptable conduct without commencing legal proceedings, there are situations where condo corporations will have no choice but to initiate legal action to put an end to behaviour that would be considered harassment. Condo corporations must remember that they have a duty under the Condo Act and the OHSA to do so.

When faced with such a situation, condo corporations will often first turn to s. 117 of the Condo Act. Historically, and before the amendments to the Condo Act which created s. 117(2), behaviour that was considered harassment was always treated as a safety issue and a court application was brought under what is now s. 117(1). However, with the implementation of s. 117(2) and the CAT's expanded jurisdiction there is now a distinction between s. 117(1) safety concern claims and s. 117(2) nuisance claims.



The distinction between s. 117(1) and s. 117(2) has been discussed in many CAT cases, with the CAT making it very clear that it does not have jurisdiction to deal with harassment specifically or serious claims of misconduct that raises safety issues or psychological harm, as those claims fall under s. 117(1). The CAT has clearly stated that its jurisdiction is limited to behaviour that falls under the heading of nuisance, disturbance or annoyance under s. 117(2) and can only deal with harassment if the corporation has a rule that classifies harassment under those headings.

Despite this distinction, we are seeing cases before the CAT in which condo corporations are alleging “harassment” but characterizing the conduct as a nuisance, annoyance or disturbance in order to bring it within the CAT’s jurisdiction. This practice raises many questions: Why are they doing this, and what purpose does it serve? Are we serving those in the condo industry who live and work in these communities and are subjected to harassment if we classify the behaviour complained of as an annoyance, disturbance or nuisance instead of a safety concern warranting a court application? Are condo communities really benefiting by having these claims dealt with at the CAT instead of by the courts?

To find answers to these questions, a comparison of the results in two recent cases from the spring of 2025 proves helpful. After reviewing these cases, it is evident that we take harassment seriously and properly characterize harassing behaviour as a safety concern—especially when the situations involve “workers” under the OHSA.

We should not water down harassment by classifying it as a nuisance, annoyance or disruption just to fit it into the CAT’s jurisdiction. The terms are not synonymous, and harassment—by definition—is conduct that is vexatious, offensive, aggressive or intimidating.

The courts have recognized that harassment is serious and can cause harm to individuals. If we accept that harassment is serious misconduct that can cause injury, then we are engaging s. 117(1) and the obligations under OHSA. As such, the proper forum for harassment claims will always be the courts, not the CAT. By taking this approach, hopefully we can achieve consistent results like those obtained in TSCC 1644 v. Zhu, rather than the outcomes observed in TSCC 2510 v. Sharma.

Contrasting outcomes

In both cases, the conduct, although not identical, could be characterized as toxic, hostile and disruptive. In each case, the conduct complained of was directed against board members and those working at the condo property. However, the results of both cases stand in stark contrast, despite the fact that the behaviours in both were equally bad. In the CAT case (Sharma), the behaviour was so serious that it led to two condo managers resigning from their positions due to the ongoing harassment.

When looking at the outcomes of cases, one obvious difference is the cost consequences imposed on the individual who engaged in harassing behaviour. In the court case (Zhu), the offending individual paid more than \$26,000 to cover the corporation's costs to address the bad behaviour and obtain compliance. In the CAT case (Sharma), the offending owner was only required to pay the \$200 filing fee paid by the condo corporation, leaving the other innocent owners to share the legal bill incurred.

From experience, we know that one of the biggest motivators for changing behaviour in condo communities is the financial impact one's actions can have. The result in the CAT case does not encourage owners who behave badly to change their behaviour, as there were no serious financial consequences for the misconduct.

Another difference between the results in the two cases can be found in the orders that were made. In Zhu, the court ordered Zhu to refrain from communicating in person or verbally with any owner, tenant, guest, or customer of the board member he was harassing, and from coming within 10 feet of any board member while on the common elements.. He was also restricted from lingering or loitering in certain common areas. The owner acknowledged that if he failed to comply with the court's orders, he could face an additional order to sell or permanently vacate the unit. The owner advised the court that he understood the consequences and he would comply.

In contrast, in Sharma, the CAT was reluctant to order that Sharma permanently cease all harassing, annoying or disturbing conduct. Instead, the CAT recommended that the board amend their bylaws to address the issues, despite finding that Sharma had violated the corporation's rules and declaration.



The CAT's order was simply that Sharma comply with the governing documents, which he is already required to do by statute. Again, the results of the cases send two very different messages regarding the consequences of equally bad behaviour. These mixed messages do not help condo communities manage inappropriate behaviours, nor do they provide reassurance to those who work in these communities that they will be protected from unacceptable behaviour.

While we cannot change the limits of the CAT's jurisdiction to deal with unacceptable conduct, we can decide as an industry to treat harassment as a serious safety risk and bring the issue to the courts under s. 117(1). This would allow us to truly hold offenders financially responsible for their actions and impose real consequences for continued bad behaviour.

We can stop diluting the definition of harassment by making it synonymous with annoyances, nuisances and disruptions. Instead, we can should show our condo managers and board members—who are usually the brunt of the harassment—that we take this type of behaviour seriously and do not treat it in the same manner as we do smoking or noise complaints.

Harassment is not a nuisance, annoyance or disruption. It is a course of conduct that is offensive or intimidating and can cause harm or injury to an individual. As we move into 2026, let's start being more consistent and treat harassment as a safety issue under s. 117(1) and not reduce its impact. Maybe then this approach will lead to more outcomes like the Zhu case, which could serve as a deterrent to those contemplating harassing behaviour. If we don't start treating harassment seriously, we cannot blame condo managers for wanting to leave the industry.

When Noise Becomes Neglect: What Condo Corporations Must Learn from Lozinski v. WSCC 601

By Nasrudin Mumin

Noise disputes are among the most common issues in condominium living and are frequently brought before the Condominium Authority Tribunal (“CAT”).

A recent CAT decision serves as an important reminder that condominium corporations must have proper procedures in place to investigate noise and when necessary, enforce compliance. In Lozinski v. Wentworth Standard Condominium Corporation No. 601, Snow, 2026 ONCAT 1, the applicant unit owner (“Lozinski”) filed a CAT application because he believed he was experiencing persistent, unreasonable noise in his unit (e.g., stomping, machine noise) from the respondent’s unit (“Snow”). Lozinski also felt that the condominium corporation (“WSCC 601”) failed to take appropriate action to address his noise complaints.

Lozinski documented his noise incidents in a noise log over several months. The CAT accepted Lozinski’s evidence that he experienced unreasonable noise. However, the CAT did not conclude that the noise came from Snow’s unit, specifically, because there was no objective evidence (e.g., noise investigation) that the source of the noise was Snow’s unit.

Despite this, the CAT found that WSCC 601 acted contrary to its Rules and the Condominium Act, 1998 (the “Act”) by failing to take appropriate steps to investigate Lozinski’s noise complaints. For example, WSCC 601 provided no evidence that it either attended the units to investigate the noise, assess whether the alleged noise was unreasonable, or determine the source of the noise.

The CAT’s decision is clear; condominium corporations have a statutory duty to enforce their governing documents (i.e., Declaration, By-Laws, Rules) and address noise nuisances. By failing to investigate noise complaints, WSCC 601 effectively allowed the unreasonable noise to continue. As a result, the Tribunal ordered WSCC 601 to:

- Develop and provide a written protocol for investigating future noise complaints raised by Lozinski within 30 days;
- Respond in writing to any future noise complaint from Lozinski within 7 days; and,
- Reimburse Lozinski's \$200 Tribunal filing fee.

Key Takeaways for Condominium Corporations

This CAT decision highlights the following important considerations for condominium corporations:

Investigate noise complaints promptly and directly: A condominium corporation should investigate noise complaints as they occur. If necessary, a noise specialist should be called in. A condominium corporation cannot rely on assumptions about whether noise exists or where the noise originates.

Document everything: Keeping clear records (e.g., noise log, communications) demonstrates that a condominium corporation is acting diligently and consistently in response to noise complaints.

Establish a formal noise investigation protocol: A standardized, objective noise investigation process ensures fairness, consistency, and compliance with the Act.

Condominium corporations must recognize that noise disputes are not just neighbour to neighbour issues; they are condominium governance issues. When a condominium corporation fails to properly investigate noise complaints, the consequences can be significant. Seeking guidance from a condominium lawyer can help design a robust, legally compliant noise investigation procedure, and avoid potential liability at the CAT.



Preventing crime in multifamily housing

Proven strategies to reduce risk, improve security, and protect residents

By Karim Vellani, CPP, CSC



Apartment communities are more than just places to live—they're microcosms of urban life. But behind the hum of elevators and the glow of porch lights lies a challenge that property managers know all too well: crime.

Apartment communities face unique security challenges due to shared spaces, high resident turnover, and environmental factors. Traditional security measures like video surveillance, security personnel, and access control systems often show mixed effectiveness, especially in preventing violent crime, according to an academic paper published by the International Association of Professional Security Consultants. To address these challenges, property managers should consider adopting evidence-based place management strategies that focus on operational practices, tenant engagement, and environmental design.

What is place management?

Place management refers to the strategies and actions undertaken by individuals, such as landlords, property managers, or staff, who are responsible for overseeing specific locations to ensure smooth operations and maintain order. When we think of crime prevention at apartments, place management involves activities like monitoring the property, enforcing rules, regulating access, addressing maintenance issues, and fostering a sense of community to deter crime and promote secure living environments.



Key strategies for property managers

So, in practice, what can residential property managers do? Here are some examples.

Criminal background checks

In 2015, an apartment community in Dallas, Texas, was plagued by violent crime and burglaries. A new property manager did not rely solely on more security cameras; they made criminal background checks for new tenants standard. Within a year, stranger-on-stranger violent crime dropped by 83%. By 2017, it had vanished entirely. Knowing who's living on the property—and who shouldn't be—played a role in reducing violent crime in this complex.

Walkarounds

Property managers can also incorporate routine property inspections to identify unauthorized access, maintenance issues, and security vulnerabilities. These walk-arounds can uncover subtle signs of trouble: a broken lock, an unregistered car, a vacant unit that's been mysteriously disturbed. Managers who walk the grounds regularly build trust with residents and catch problems before they escalate.

Parking lots are often overlooked, but they can be hotspots for unauthorized access. Requiring vehicle registration and enforcing parking rules can make a surprising difference.

Staff training and education

At another apartment community in Houston, crime was a constant until new owners took over in 2018. Their approach? Empower the staff. Maintenance workers and leasing agents were trained in crime prevention, guest-policy enforcement, and emergency response. Workshops kept them sharp, and partnerships with law enforcement ensured they weren't working alone.

The result: a 40% drop in violent crime and a noticeable decline in burglaries.

Community engagement

Security isn't just a property management issue—it's a community effort. Property managers who host crime prevention meetings, launch apartment watch programs, and appoint building captains can turn passive tenants into active participants. When residents feel heard and informed, they're more likely to report suspicious activity and follow security protocols.

Transparency is key. Letting residents know about ongoing issues—and what's being done—builds trust and encourages vigilance.

Environmental design

Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) isn't just theory—it's practical. Well-lit pathways, trimmed bushes, and clear sightlines discourage loitering. Deadbolts, door viewers, and layered security systems create barriers that criminals don't want to cross. Even small upgrades, like installing LED lighting, can have outsized effects.

Collaboration with law enforcement

Property managers should consider partnering with law enforcement for crime prevention training and coordinated responses to incidents. For example, in Houston, the Blue Star Multi-Housing Program, administered by the Houston Police Department, offers an optional certification for apartment communities that meet specific crime prevention and security standards. It involves property manager training, a security-focused inspection aligned with CPTED principles, and community engagement through resident-focused social events to promote security awareness. It represents a proactive public safety initiative and a shared commitment between property management and law enforcement to reduce or prevent crime within the community.

Another example is the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's Crime Prevention Division, which collaborated with Clark County officials to develop and enact ordinances requiring a two-hour police-conducted training program focused on property management practices critical to preventing illegal activity on rental properties. As part of the Crime-Free Multi-Housing (CFMH) program, the ordinances tied business licensing to the designation of a property manager who was required to complete this training, which included environmental design and other crime prevention strategies. To further encourage compliance, targeted nuisance abatement notices were issued to properties with high volumes of police service calls, with the threat of business license revocation used to expedite compliance.

Data tracking and analysis

Crime isn't always random. By documenting incidents and analyzing patterns, property managers can identify crime hotspots and tailor interventions. Whether it's adjusting access control or refining guest policies, data helps managers systematically track crime incidents and analyze patterns to identify high-risk areas and tailor interventions.

Resident communication

For more on evidence-based security practices (EBSP), view the papers here.

Property managers should consider notifying residents about chronic crime problems at the property to ensure that they are aware of potential risks and can take appropriate precautions. When communicating such issues, management should clearly describe the nature of the problem and outline any steps being taken to address or prevent recurrence. This helps build transparency and trust within the community.

An essential consideration is how incident information is conveyed to residents. Transparent, timely communication can enhance trust, raise awareness, and provide residents with practical security tips. However, failure to inform tenants about elevated threat levels, particularly involving violent crime, may be viewed in litigation as a breach of the property manager's duty of care. This highlights the importance of balancing transparency with the risk of causing unnecessary alarm or exposing the property to liability.

Property activity coordinators

A property activity coordinator, particularly in larger apartment communities, could serve as a dedicated liaison between management, residents, and third parties (e.g., security officers or law enforcement), ensuring that property policies and lease terms are consistently enforced. Responsibilities include monitoring resident activity, maintaining criminal records, processing lease terminations, conducting grievance hearings, and fostering open communication with tenants. This role can significantly improve community relations, accountability, and overall property management efficiency.



Conclusion

The impact of place management in crime reduction is evident. When apartment communities adopt proactive operational practices alongside thoughtful environmental design, they help create safer and more resilient communities. Property managers can play a central role in this effort by investing in staff training, applying evidence-based strategies, and building strong partnerships with residents, law enforcement, and security professionals. Collaborating with security consultants can further help identify vulnerabilities and align practices with current research and industry standards.

Beyond immediate security benefits and reduced crime costs, the consistent application of place management strategies offers valuable opportunities to advance the field through ongoing evaluation. By integrating implementation with rigorous research, stakeholders can continuously refine their approaches and deepen their understanding of crime prevention in apartment settings. These efforts not only enhance security but also contribute to building stronger, more sustainable communities.

By incorporating training, education, and targeted crime prevention strategies, managers, staff, and landlords can more effectively reduce crime and enhance security. Operational security measures that strengthen guardianship are essential for identifying and mitigating risks. These steps enable managers to address security concerns, foster a sense of community, and, when applied systematically, create secure environments that support resident well-being. By implementing these recommendations, property managers can minimize costs while establishing lasting crime prevention strategies and building thriving, safe communities through effective place management.

This paper was published by the International Association of Professional Security Consultants, and co-written by Katherine Perez, PhD; Steve Kaufer, CPP; Michael A. Silva, CPP, CSC; Karim Vellani, CPP, CSC; and Alan W. Zajic, CPP, CSP. The entire paper is available here.

Property Management Isn't Entry-Level: It's a Profession That Requires Proof

February 20, 2026

By Robin Hardman, CPM, CLO, RSG.D, President, REIC/ICI



Property management is one of the most overlooked disciplines in real estate and one of the most consequential.

It isn't glamorous. It doesn't generate headlines. No one celebrates a building that simply runs the way it should. And yet, property management is where asset value is either protected or quietly eroded. It's where tenant trust is earned or lost. It's where ethical decisions are tested, not in theory, but in the small, daily choices that compound over time.

While much of the industry focuses on acquisitions, leasing velocity, and capital deployment, property management is responsible for what happens after the deal is done. It is where spreadsheets meet lived experience for tenants, residents, employees, vendors, patrons, and owners alike.

That responsibility deserves far more respect, education, and ethical grounding than the industry currently gives it.

Property managers are fiduciaries. They make decisions every day that affect millions of dollars in asset value. They are responsible for legal and regulatory compliance, health and safety obligations, and life-safety outcomes. They marry tenant livelihoods, business continuity, owner reputation, and risk exposure.

Their judgment determines how leases are interpreted, how operating costs are allocated, how disputes are resolved, how vendors are selected, and how decisions are communicated. These are not administrative tasks. They are professional judgments with real financial, legal, and human consequences.



And yet, property management is still too often treated as an operational afterthought.

More concerning is a practice that has quietly become normalized across the industry: promoting junior staff or administrators into management roles before they are ready or hiring inexperienced managers simply because a vacancy exists and someone needs to fill the seat. Somebody is better than nobody.

This approach isn't just inefficient. It's unethical.

To be clear, junior roles, particularly administrative and coordinator positions are essential. The industry does not function without them, and many excellent property managers begin their careers in these roles, gaining valuable exposure to systems, processes, and day-to-day operations.

But exposure is not the same as readiness.

Management requires judgment. It requires ethical reasoning. It requires financial literacy, legal awareness, conflict-resolution skills, and the ability to balance competing interests without compromising trust. It requires understanding that owners have different goals, different risk tolerances, and different reasons for holding real estate and that management decisions materially affect those outcomes.

These capabilities are developed through education, mentorship, and deliberate professional development. They are not developed through urgency-driven promotion.

Filling a role with the wrong candidate might relieve short-term pressure, but it creates long-term damage. We see the consequences repeatedly: missed lease obligations, weak contract administration, inconsistent enforcement of rules, tenant frustration, reputational harm, reactive maintenance replacing asset planning, poor financial controls, cost overruns, audit exposure and, increasingly, burnout and turnover among young professionals.

None of this is inevitable. It is the predictable outcome of putting people into positions of authority without equipping them for the responsibility that comes with it. The most serious consequence of underprepared management isn't operational inefficiency. It's ethical drift.

Ethical drift doesn't announce itself loudly. It accumulates quietly and shows up in how complaints are handled or avoided. It shows up in how costs are allocated or blurred. In how vendors are selected or repeatedly re-selected. In how transparency is practiced or selectively withheld. It shows up in how conflicts of interest are recognized or ignored.

AN ACMO 2000 COMPANY

These are learned skills. Ethical decision-making is not intuitive. It requires standards, training, reinforcement, and the confidence to slow down and make defensible decisions under pressure. Without that foundation, people default to what feels expedient, not what is right.

Property management is not something you should be expected to “figure out as you go.”

The industry is increasingly vocal about a shortage of skilled property managers. But this shortage didn't happen by accident. We created it. We underinvested in structured education. We failed to define clear career pathways. We normalized excessive workloads and burnout. We rewarded availability over competence.

Young professionals aren't avoiding property management because they lack interest. They're avoiding it because they see the risk being underprepared, unsupported, and exposed in roles that carry real accountability.

At the same time, others are drawn in for the wrong reasons. They are receiving exceptional salaries, quick promotion, and the perception that time served can substitute for education. When employer desperation replaces standards, the profession suffers.

Ethical industries don't rely on accidental competence. They don't treat judgment-based roles as interchangeable. They build standards, credentials, mentorship, and accountability into the system.

Property management should be no different.

We need to insist on formal education for those aspiring to management roles, ongoing professional development grounded in ethics and fiduciary responsibility. Mentorship models and clear expectations around judgment, transparency, and accountability need to be worked on as growth develops.

This isn't gatekeeping. It's stewardship. And stewardship only works when standards are not just encouraged but visible and verifiable.

One of the simplest ways to reinforce professional standards in property management is to normalize credential verification. Education, designations, and professional development matter - but they only build trust when they are visible, current, and verifiable. That's where independent credential verification services, such as REIC Verified™, play an important role.

Verification does not replace education. It strengthens it. It ensures that when someone claims professional standing, that claim can be confirmed clearly and consistently through an independent, trusted body.

For the property manager, verification reinforces credibility. It recognizes the time and effort invested in professional education and signals to employers, clients, and peers that their qualifications are real, current, and meaningful. In a market where job titles can vary widely, verification helps professionals stand out based on demonstrated competence, not just role descriptions.

For the firm employing them, verified credentials reduce hiring risk and strengthen organizational standards. It allows companies to confidently demonstrate to owners and investors that their teams meet recognized professional benchmarks. In an environment where management quality directly affects asset performance, compliance exposure, and reputation, verification becomes a practical governance and risk-management tool.

For the client or owner hiring a manager, verification provides clarity and reassurance. Owners entrust property managers with financial decisions, regulatory compliance, tenant relationships, and long-term asset value. Independent verification replaces assumption with assurance, helping clients confirm that the person responsible for their asset is supported by recognized professional grounding.

And for the industry as a whole, widespread credential verification helps shift property management from a title-driven profession to a standards-driven one. It strengthens public confidence, supports ethical consistency, and reinforces the message that property management is not an interchangeable operational function, it is a professional discipline requiring demonstrated competence and accountability.

This is exactly the role organizations like the Real Estate Institute of Canada were created to serve: to set standards, support professional development, and provide the independent validation that builds trust across the industry.

When verification becomes normal practice, it closes the gap between what the industry says it values and what it actually measures.



Legislative Newsflash



Fire Code Updates Impacting Condos February 2026

Ontario Regulation 87/25 updates the Ontario Fire Code, with key provisions that took effect January 1, 2026. For condos, the impact is not a one-time retrofit; it's about higher long-term expectations around exit doors, life-safety testing, and, you guessed it, more paperwork.

What Boards and property managers should watch for:

1) Exit doors: the net is wider now

The rules for locking/latching/fastening apply to all exit doors—not just the “main” or “required” exits. Do a walk-through of stair doors, exit discharge doors at grade, and any door on an egress route affected by access control or upgrades.

Pay extra attention to electromagnetic/access-controlled locks: doors must still be easy to open from the inside, and you should keep any approvals/documentation on file.

2) Fire alarm testing: expect more consistent (and more detailed) reports

Service contractors will be working from more standardized forms and reporting expectations. Reports should clearly separate deficiencies from general notes and show what was fixed, when, and by whom.

Battery testing documentation is expected to go beyond a simple voltage reading in many cases. If your current service contractor reports are thin, now is the time to update the scope so your records are “inspection-ready.”

3) Integrated systems: modern buildings may get a closer look

If your building has integrated sequences (alarm tied to HVAC shutdown, smoke control, voice evac, generator, access control release), make sure your annual testing includes those “real world” sequences - not just device checks - and that results are clearly documented.

4) CO alarms: confirm if the new placement rules apply to your building

Some fuel-burning/forced-air setups can trigger more specific placement requirements (including corridors/service rooms in certain configurations).

Clarify who is responsible for supply/testing/replacement (corporation vs unit owners) and document the approach.

5) Faster consequences for ignoring deficiencies

Municipalities may use Administrative Monetary Penalties (AMPs), which raises the stakes on fixing deficiencies quickly and keeping proof of completion.

6) Fire Safety Plans: don't forget the paperwork

If CO alarm locations or testing protocols change for your building, make sure your Fire Safety Plan is updated to match.

Conclusion

Use the January 1, 2026 changes as a prompt to do a quick exit-door audit, tighten up life-safety vendor reporting, update the Fire Safety Plan where needed, and run a clean “deficiency close-out” process so you're ready when the inspector asks.