

ARBORIST REPORT

Project:	1575 HURONTARIO STREET Mississauga, Ontario Proposed Residential Development	Date: 11.Dec.2017 Rev. 15.Oct.2019 Rev. 05.Aug.2021
	MEP Project No 17-448	

1.0 Introduction

The following is an Arborist report for the redevelopment of the subject site located at 1575 Hurontario Street., in Mississauga, Ontario. The purpose of this report was to ascertain the potential impacts of a residential development on the trees on, and near, the subject site.

2.0 Methods

An on-site inspection was originally conducted on May 10, 2017 and a follow-up site review conducted on June 11, 2021. The sizes of each individual trees were measured as diameter at breast height (DBH), breast height being 140 cm from ground level. The locations of these trees are indicated on the Existing Tree Survey Plan TS-01. The data (Table 1.0) collected includes Plant Condition and comments addressing the condition rating of each tree^{1,2} if applicable.

3.1 Discussion

Further to the proposed development of the subject site, some existing trees will be impacted by the proposed construction activity relating to the new proposed 7.0m mutual driveway and a retaining wall proposed by the Civil Engineer. A total of Four (4) trees on private property and Sixteen (16) on neighbouring property will require removals.

Road Allowance/City Owned Trees:

No road allowance/City Owned trees will be affected.

Private Trees:

Four (4) privately owned trees over 15cm DBH on the development site require removal. Trees #22 and #23 have been proposed to be removed due to their poor conditions. Tree #30 will require removal due to the proposed retaining wall. Trees #46, 47, 48 and #49 require removal due to their positioning in the new proposed mutual driveway.

Neighbouring Trees:

Sixteen (16) neighbouring trees require removal. Trees #30 to #43 will require removal due to the proposed retaining wall. Trees #46 and #47 need to be removed due to their positioning in the new proposed driveway.

3.2 Tree Protection

It is necessary to protect all trees designated for preservation during both demolition and construction. Since trees on the development site require tree protection, a tree protection plan TS-01 has been provided.

Tree protection can be accomplished by protecting the said trees with *tree protection barriers*. The minimum tree protection zone (TPZ) radius is based on the diameter of the tree ($TPZ \approx 0.06_{m/cm} \times DBH_{cm}$). Tree barriers would be composed of a 1.2 metres (4 ft) plastic safety fence secured at each T-Bar with three 3.5mm tie wires on 40x40x5mm T-Bar at 2000mm max o.c. When excavation is needed near trees, hand digging or low pressure hydro-vac and root pruning are required.

3.3 Replacement Trees

MEP Design Inc. has developed a landscape plan for the proposed subject site. A total of Thirty-Four (34) new Trees are proposed throughout the site. The new trees would be of large calliper (60-70 mm) nursery grown stock. The trees would be planted in accordance with municipal tree planting specifications and according to the Tree Planting Details on Drawing L-02 for planting bur lapped or balled trees. These trees are to be maintained in good condition. Supplemental watering may be required during the drier periods of the year, especially during the first two or three years after their transplantation.

4.0 General Note

Prior to the commencement of any site activity the tree protection barriers, only if applicable, on this plan must be installed and written notice provided to Urban Forestry. The tree protection barriers must remain in effective condition until all site activities including landscaping are complete. Written notice must be provided to Urban Forestry prior to the removal of the tree protection barriers.

5.0 Conclusion

In summary, in order to allow for the development of the subject site at 1575 Hurontario Street., Two (2) privately-owned trees over 15cm DBH and Sixteen (16) neighbouring trees require removal to facilitate the new construction. The existing neighbouring trees along the north-west property boundary may be impacted by the proposed future underground parking garage depending on the exact method of construction the applicant proposes during the detailed Building Permit application Phase. It is recommended that at the time of detailed structural engineering and shoring design that our office is engaged to ascertain a more precise assessment of the impacts to the tree root structures that may have negative impacts to the existing boundary trees.

Site Inventory and Report prepared by:



Michael E. Presutti, OALA CSLA
and
Bruce Bostock, ISA Certified Arborist ON-0823
Per: MEP Design Inc.

8.0 References

- 1-Council of Tree Landscape Appraisers. 2006. Guide for Plant Appraisal. 10th Edition. International Society of Arboriculture.
- 2- International Society of Arboriculture of Ontario. 2000. Ontario Supplement to Guide for Plant Appraisal 9th Edition. Ontario Chapter, International Society of Arboriculture.

--END OF REPORT---

Table 1.0

#	Botanical Name	Common Name	DBH (cm)	Condition	Comment
1	Acer Platanoides	Norway Maple	±35	Fair to Good	
2	Acer Platanoides	Norway Maple	±35	Fair	
3	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±15	Poor	Severe galls, very sparse
4	Morus Alba	Mulberry	±23	Poor to Fair	Leans on fence, damaged trunk
5	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±15	Poor	Severe galls, very sparse
6	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±25	Fair	
7	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±32	Poor to Fair	Very sparse low down
8	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±25	Poor	Very sparse
9	Fraxinus pp.	Ash	<15	Poor	6 stems all dead or very near death
10	Fraxinus pp.	Ash	±15	Poor	Dead
11	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	±42	Fair	Co-Dominant at ±6 m
12	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±15	Fair	
13	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±15	Poor	Central leader missing
14	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Fair	
15	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±18	Fair	
16	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	>15	Fair	
17	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±18	Fair	
18	Populus x canadensis	Carolina Poplar	±28	Good	
19	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±16	Fair	
20	Acer Platanoides	Norway Maple	±25	Poor	Dead
21	Populus x canadensis	Carolina Poplar	±65	Fair to Good	
22	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	26.4	Poor	Very 1-sided, leans south
23	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	38.5	Poor	Very 1-sided, leans south
24	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±41	Fair	1 sided
25	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±28	Poor	Very 1-sided, half dead
26	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±45	Poor	Over 75% dead
27	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±22	Poor	Dead
28	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±28	Poor	Dead
29	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	±55	Poor	Cut back to lot line
30	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±25	Poor	Dead
31	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Poor	Very sparse
32	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Poor to Fair	Sparse
33	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Poor to Fair	Sparse
34	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±65	Poor to Fair	Tri-Dominat at 3 m
35	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±35	Poor	
36	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	±26	Poor	Severe lean to west
37	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor	Severe lean to south

38	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor	Leans north
39	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor	
40	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor	Very sparse
41	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±35	Poor to Fair	Leans north
42	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±35	Poor	Poor scaffold
43	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±50	Poor	Very poor scaffold
44	Acer Rubrum	Native Red Maple	±18	Poor	Co-Dominant at 1.8m
45	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±20	Poor	
46	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±57	Poor	Poor scaffold
47	Gleditsia triacanthos	Honey Locust	±16	Poor to Fair	Poor scaffold
48	Robinia pseudoacacia	Black Locust	18.0 + 15.1	Poor to Fair	Poor scaffold, co-dominant close to grade
49	Picea pungens	Col. Blue Spruce	34.9	Poor to Fair	1-sided, sparse