

## ARBORIST REPORT

---

<b>Project:</b>	1575 HURONTARIO STREET Mississauga, Ontario Proposed Residential Development	<b>Date:</b>	11.Dec.2017
	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 conducted on May 10, 2017. 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<sup>1,2</sup> 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 new entrance to parking lot. A total of Two (2) trees on private property and One (1) on neighbouring property will require removals. No 'Tree Removal Permit' will be required as no more than five (5) trees are being removed in this calendar year as per City of Mississauga requirement.

#### Road Allowance/City Owned Trees:

No road allowance/City Owned trees will be affected.

#### Private Trees:

Two (2) privately owned trees over 15cm DBH on the development site require removal due to their positioning in the new proposed 7.0m mutual driveway.

#### Neighbouring Trees:

One (1) neighbouring tree requires removal due to its positioning in the new entrance to parking lot.

### 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 Three (3) new Street Trees are along Hurontario Street and a significant number of trees and shrubs 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-01 for planting burlapped 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 and One (1) neighbouring tree require removal to facilitate the new construction.

#### **Site Inventory and Report prepared by:**



Bruce Bostock, ISA Certified Arborist ON-0823 A and Michael E. Presutti, OALA CSLA

**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**

<b>INVENTORY OF TREES</b>						
<b>Municipal Address of Property: 1575 Hurontario Street, Mississauga</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Botanical Name</b>	<b>Common Name</b>	<b>DBH (cm)</b>	<b>Condition</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Category</b>
1	Acer Platanoides	Norway Maple	±35	Fair to Good		2
2	Acer Platanoides	Norway Maple	±35	Fair		2
3	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±15	Poor	Severe galls, very sparse	2
4	Morus Alba	Mulberry	±23	Poor to Fair	Leans on fence, damaged trunk	1&2
5	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±15	Poor	Severe galls, very sparse	2
6	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±25	Fair		2
7	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±32	Poor to Fair	Very sparse low down	2
8	Picea Glauca	White Spruce	±25	Poor	Very sparse	2
9	Fraxinus pp.	Ash	<15	Poor	6 stems all dead or very near death	1&2
10	Fraxinus pp.	Ash	±15	Poor	Dead	2
11	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	±42	Fair	Co-Dominant at ±6 m	2
12	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±15	Fair		2
13	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±15	Poor	Central leader missing	2
14	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Fair		2
15	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±18	Fair		2
16	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	>15	Fair		2
17	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±18	Fair		2
18	Populus x canadensis	Carolina Poplar	±28	Good		2
19	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±16	Fair		2
20	Acer Platanoides	Norway Maple	±25	Poor	Dead	2
21	Populus x canadensis	Carolina Poplar	±65	Fair to Good		1
22	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	26.4	Poor	Very 1-sided, leans south	1
23	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	38.5	Poor	Very 1-sided, leans south	2
24	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±41	Fair	1 sided	2
25	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±28	Poor	Very 1-sided, half dead	2
26	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±45	Poor	Over 75% dead	2
27	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±22	Poor	Dead	2
28	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±28	Poor	Dead	2
29	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	±55	Poor	Cut back to lot line	2
30	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±25	Poor	Dead (is behind fence)	2
31	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Poor	Very sparse	2
32	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Poor to Fair	Sparse	2
33	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±20	Poor to Fair	Sparse	2
34	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±65	Poor to Fair	Tri-Dominant at 3 m	2
35	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±35	Poor		2
36	Acer negundo	Manitoba Maple	±26	Poor	Severe lean to west	2

37	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor	Severe lean to south	2
38	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor	Leans north	1&2
39	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor		2
40	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±28	Poor	Very sparse	1&2
41	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±35	Poor to Fair	Leans north	1&2
42	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±35	Poor	Poor scaffold	1&2
43	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±50	Poor	Very poor scaffold	2
44	Acer Rubrum	Native Red Maple	±18	Poor	Co-Dominant at 1.8m	2
45	Picea Abies	Norway Spruce	±20	Poor		2
46	Ulmus Pumila	Siberian Elm	±57	Poor	Poor scaffold	2
47	Gleditsia triacanthos	Honey Locust	±16	Poor to Fair	Poor scaffold	2
48	Robinia pseudoacacia	Black Locust	18.0 + 15.1	Poor to Fair	Poor scaffold, co-dominant close to grade	1
49	Picea pungens	Col. Blue Spruce	34.9	Poor to Fair	1-sided, sparse	1