

To: Edith Tam
City of Ottawa

From: Tommy Allen / Isabelle Lalonde
Stantec Ottawa Office

Project/File: 160402067

Date: June 12th 2025

**Reference: 1010 Somerset Street West
Tree Assessment Investigation**

Stantec Consulting Ltd. was retained by the City of Ottawa to complete a Tree Inventory Report for trees growing in the vicinity of 1010 Somerset Street West, in anticipation of the rezoning and redevelopment of the site featuring an expanded recreation facility and park, a new school, and a new residential high-rise.

The property is bounded by Somerset Street West to the north, Preston Street to the east, Oak Street to the south, and O-Train Trillium Line to the west. The site is currently combining the Plant Recreation Centre, Plouffe Park, and a vacant lot with large, paved areas and buildings. The trees on-site are mostly surrounding the Plant Recreation Centre and Plouffe Park, with no trees on the western side of the site.

Trees growing around the proposed development areas were assessed to determine the species and general health condition of the existing vegetation and the potential impacts to trees during construction. In addition, our investigation included trees growing in the road right-of-way. Tree protection and tree mitigation recommendations have been developed in support of this area's development.

1 Tree Assessment

On-site tree assessment and inventories were conducted within the identified study area on October 22, 2024, February 19, 2025, and June 6th, 2025 by Stantec Consulting Ltd. All trees over 10 centimetres (cm) in diameter at breast height (DBH) were assessed and inventoried. The assessment provided in this memo and criteria applied during field investigations follows standard arboriculture techniques. All assessments were made by a visual inspection of the above ground portions of the trees viewed from ground level. No climbing, physical coring, excavation, or probing examination of the trees were made. Trees were assessed for species, quantity, trunk size, and condition.

1.1 Methodology

All existing trees growing within or near the project site boundary and with a DBH of 10cm or greater were assessed, along with some trees under 10cm that have recently been planted intentionally (such as street trees and memorial trees). When possible, trees were measured using a metric caliper. Most tree locations are based on a site survey, as well as satellite imagery available for the site, correlated with in-person observations.

Trees have been assessed and inventoried in accordance with City of Ottawa's Tree Protection By-law (By-law No.2020-340). Tree Assessment Criteria includes a visual inspection of the trunk integrity, canopy

Reference: 1010 Somerset Street West -- Tree Assessment Investigation

structure, and canopy vigor; the visual inspection uses a subjective holistic approach considering abiotic and biotic tree disorders. Tree assessment includes a visual inspection for:

- Evidence of abiotic (environmental, mechanical, and physical damage) and biotic (insects and disease) stressors,
- **Trunk integrity** (TI) including an assessment of the trunk for any defects,
- **Canopy structure** (CS) including an assessment of the scaffold branches and canopy of the tree,
- **Canopy vigour** (CV) including assessment of the amount of deadwood versus live growth in the tree crown while also considering the size, colour and amount of foliage.

The above criteria (TI, CS & CV) have been expressed per the following definitions:

Table 1 – Tree Assessment Criteria

| | |
|------|---|
| Good | Tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect within the given tree assessment criteria (TI, CS, CV). |
| Fair | Tree displays 15%-40% deficiency/defect within the given tree assessment criteria (TI, CS, CV). |
| Poor | Tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect within the given tree (TI, CS, CV). |

1.2 Observations

A total of **one hundred and sixty two** (162) trees were inventoried including fourteen (14) street trees (boulevard trees) with most of the trees growing around the Plant Recreation Centre and Plouffe Park. From the 162 trees, one hundred and seven (107) were individual trees with the remaining fifty (55) trees grouped in eight (8) different clusters mostly framing Plouffe Park along its southern and western property lines.

A total of eighteen (18) species were identified on site; tree species composition is 97% deciduous and 3% coniferous. Table 2 on the following page provides a list of the distribution of species growing on site; Appendix A provides a detailed list of all trees assessed as part of this project. No species at risk trees were identified on site.

Trees around the Plant Recreation Centre are mostly planted trees including two (2) memorial trees; only the trees 10cm or greater have been inventoried per City of Ottawa Tree By-law. Based on our review of aerial imagery available on GeoOttawa, the expansion of Plant Recreation Centre occurred between 2002 and 2005 with most of the trees growing around the building planted at that time; some of the trees growing around Plouffe Park appears on aerial imagery as early as 1976.

Groupings of trees along Oak Street are growing in a row directly adjacent to the chain link fence indicating they were planted; groupings of trees along the western property line of Plouffe Park are growing naturally and include spontaneous / opportunistic species generally spreading through seeds. Drawing L01 in Appendix B provides location of all trees inventoried.

Reference: 1010 Somerset Street West -- Tree Assessment Investigation

Table 2 – Distribution of Tree Species

| Botanical name | Common Name | Quantity | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------|------------|
| <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 29 | 17.9% |
| <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 20 | 12.4% |
| <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 20 | 12.4% |
| <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 20 | 12.3% |
| <i>Amelanchier canadensis</i> | Serviceberry | 12 | 7.4% |
| <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 12 | 7.4% |
| <i>Ulmus americana</i> | American Elm | 11 | 6.8% |
| <i>Acer saccharum</i> | Sugar Maple | 5 | 3.1% |
| <i>Celtis occidentalis</i> | Hackberry | 5 | 3.1% |
| <i>Picea pungens</i> | Blue Spruce | 5 | 3.1% |
| <i>Tilia cordata</i> | Littleleaf Linden | 5 | 3.1% |
| <i>Aesculus glabra</i> | Ohio Buckeye | 4 | 2.5% |
| <i>Quercus alba</i> | White Oak | 4 | 2.5% |
| <i>Ulmus davidiana</i> | Prospector Elm | 4 | 2.5% |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i> | Red Maple | 2 | 1.2% |
| <i>Acer platanoides</i> | Norway Maple | 1 | 0.6% |
| <i>Fraxinus sp.</i> | Ash Tree | 1 | 0.6% |
| <i>Malus sp.</i> | Apple Species | 1 | 0.6% |
| <i>Populus deltoides</i> | Eastern Cottonwood | 1 | 0.6% |
| TOTAL | | 162 | 100% |

Trees were mostly in fair to good health as indicated on the Tree Inventory Chart (refer to Appendix A). The most common health defects identified were suppressed canopy vigour, branch-tip dieback, mechanical trunk damage and crossing branches.

Trees were mainly mature in size, with 85% of trees between 10-29cm DBH and 15% at or above 30cm DBH; a total of seven (7) trees were above 50cm DBH.

Reference: 1010 Somerset Street West -- Tree Assessment Investigation

2 Proposed Development and Tree Protection Recommendations

The proposed development on this project site is to create a community hub including the expansion of the existing Plant Recreation Centre, a new elementary school, a new park, new residential towers to accommodate up to 600 new dwelling units, and internal roadway and pathway networks.

Based on current design drawings, it is anticipated that thirty-eight (38) trees will require removal to facilitate the redevelopment of this block. Anticipated tree removals are associated to the construction of the new Recreation and Cultural Facility, the expansion of the Plant Recreation Centre, and the new CEPEO school and adjacent roadway:

1. Recreation and Cultural Facility – new building

a. Eight (8) individual trees:

- i. Trees 72 to 76 – Trees 72 and 73 are Siberian elms (non-native and opportunistic species); Trees 74 and 75 are Manitoba maples (non-native); and Tree 76 is a Norway maple (non-native and invasive species). Trees 72 to 74 are 30cm DBH or greater. All these trees are in fair conditions.
- ii. Trees 81 to 83 – Tree 81 is an apple tree and Trees 82 and 83 are Manitoba maples (non-native). Trees 82 and 83 are 50cm DBH. All these trees are in fair to poor conditions.

2. Plant Recreation Centre – expansion of existing building

a. One (1) individual tree:

- i. Tree 40 – A honeylocust (non-native) with exposed roots. Tree 40 is under 30cm DBH and in good conditions.

3. CEPEO School and Adjacent Roadway – new building and new roadway within Plouffe Park

a. Four (4) individual trees:

- i. Trees 66 to 68 – Siberian elms (non-native and opportunistic species). All trees are more than 50cm DBH but generally in fair conditions.
- ii. Tree 71 – a significantly large American elm (native species) of 50cm DBH; it is in fair to good condition.

b. Three (3) groupings: groupings G6 to G8 (21 trees). All trees are less than 30cm DBH and generally in fair conditions.

c. Up to two (2) trees in grouping G5. Trees are Amur maples with a DBH of less than 30cm and are generally in fair conditions.

Reference: 1010 Somerset Street West -- Tree Assessment Investigation

4. Development adjacent O-Train/MUP Corridor – new residential towers

a. Two (2) individual trees:

- i. Trees 86-87 – white oaks under 20cm DBH. All trees appeared in good conditions.

Based on our review of the proposed redevelopment plan and existing conditions, we anticipate that all existing concrete curbs aligned with the proposed parking area and associated drive aisles between the Plant Recreation Centre and future Recreation and Cultural Facility would remain unchanged; this would allow for the retention of Trees 1 to 4 and Tree 77. The existing concrete curbs are currently located inside the critical root zones of these trees and they would most likely be impacted by construction activities. We also assume that no street modifications will be completed along Somerset Street West and Preston Street to allow for the retention of the street / boulevard trees along these roadways.

Mitigation measures should be taken to limit physical damage to trees to remain including roots, overall structure, and soil conditions. All trees within the limit of construction not identified for removal shall be protected with the installation of a temporary tree protection fencing placed at or beyond the identified critical root zone as detailed on the City of Ottawa Standard Protection detail inserted as Appendix C. Additional site-specific measures to limit tree disturbance should be included during design development to adjust and refine the limits of grading and / or introducing tree well(s). Finally, measures should be taken to enhance the soil conditions of any disturbed trees to limit stress and promote continued long-term health.

It is recommended that all removed trees be compensated with new tree plantings. The recommended compensation ratio is 2:1 for trees removed with a 10-29cm DBH and 3:1 for trees removed with a DBH of 30 cm or greater. Based on the removal information provided above a total of twenty-nine (29) anticipated removals are below 30cm DBH, and nine (9) are above 30cm DBH. It is anticipated / recommended that a minimum of eighty-five (85) compensation trees are planted. Compensation trees are recommended to be tolerant of urban conditions and salt; trees species should be selected and placed appropriately considering roadway conditions (maintain sightlines, consider winter maintenance requirements, avoid roadway drainage, avoid overhead utilities and street lighting and abide by the principles of *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*). Efforts should be made to plant native species where appropriate.

Geotechnical investigations identified the presence of sensitive marine clay within the project limits. Specifically, Champlain Sea clay was identified which is typically sensitive to settlement from the water demand from trees. The species selection, including anticipated size, should follow the City of Ottawa guidelines for tree planting in sensitive marine clay. Species with aggressive water seeking roots should be avoided. In general, planting small – medium trees are preferred. However, large trees can be planted provided that the plantings are offset from foundations by a distance equal to the anticipated mature height of the tree. No trees shall be planted within 4.5m of building foundations.

Regards,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Reference: 1010 Somerset Street West -- Tree Assessment Investigation

Tommy Allen
Landscape Architect Intern
Phone: (613) 784-2239
tommy.allen@stantec.com

Isabelle Lalonde, B.LA, OALA, CSLA, AAPQ
Senior Landscape Architect
Phone: (613) 724-4369
isabelle.lalonde@stantec.com

Attachments:
Appendix A – Tree Inventory Chart
Appendix B – Mapping
Appendix C – Tree Protection Detail

Appendix A

Tree Inventory Chart



Tree Inventory & Preservation Chart

Project: 160402067 (1010 Somerset Street West)

Date of Field Work: Oct. 22, 2024

* Trunk Integrity (TI) Canopy Structure (CS) Canopy Vigor (CV)
*Condition: Good Fair Poor

| ID # | Botanical Name | Common Name | Total Coun | DBH (cm) | Tree Count (by DBH Range) | | | Condition | | | Remarks | | Ownership | Construction Requirement |
|------|------------------------|--------------|------------|----------|---------------------------|---------|--------|-----------|----|----|--|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| | | | | | 10-29cm | 30-49cm | 50cm + | TI | CS | CV | Defects: Biological / Structural / Mechanical | Other | | |
| 1 | Fraxinus sp. | Ash Tree | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | P | F | F | mechanical trunk damage, Emerald Ash borer damage, suppressed canopy vigor, natural lean | | Municipal | Retain |
| 2 | Ulmus pumila | Siberian Elm | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | F | suppressed canopy vigor | Overhead wires | Municipal | Retain |
| 3 | Ulmus americana | American Elm | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | codominant branches & stems | Multi-stem, overhead wires | Municipal | Retain |
| 4 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | exposed roots, weak union | Overhead wires | Municipal | Retain |
| 5 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 38 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | G | F | suppressed canopy vigor | Overhead wires | Municipal | Retain |
| 6 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | F | suppressed canopy vigor | Overhead wires | Municipal | Retain |
| 7 | Ulmus americana | American Elm | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | Multi-stem | Municipal | Retain |
| 8 | Amelanchier canadensis | Serviceberry | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | mechanical trunk damage, natural lean | | Municipal | Retain |
| 9 | Ulmus americana | American Elm | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | codominant branches & stems, weak union, crossing branches | Multi-stem | Municipal | Retain |
| 10 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | reduced canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 11 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | reduced canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 12 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | F | suppressed canopy vigor, branch tip dieback | | Municipal | Retain |
| 13 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | G | G | | Overhead wires | Municipal | Retain |
| 14 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | F | crossing branches, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 15 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 39 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | F | crossing branches, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 16 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | F | exposed roots, suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 17 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches, asymmetrical crown Shape | | Municipal | Retain |
| 18 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches, vertical branches, asymmetrical crown Shape | | Municipal | Retain |
| 19 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | G | G | | Specimen Tree | Municipal | Retain |
| 20 | Ulmus pumila | Siberian Elm | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | weak union, codominant branches & stems, vertical branches, leaf spots | | Municipal | Retain |
| 21 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 22 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 23 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | mechanical trunk damage | | Municipal | Retain |
| 24 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | crossing branches, vertical branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 25 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | crossing branches, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 26 | Picea pungens | Blue Spruce | 1 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 27 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 28 | Picea pungens | Blue Spruce | 1 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 29 | Picea pungens | Blue Spruce | 1 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 30 | Ginkgo biloba | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | G | crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 31 | Picea pungens | Blue Spruce | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 32 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 33 | Picea pungens | Blue Spruce | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 34 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | frost cracks | | Municipal | Retain |
| 35 | Acer saccharum | Sugar Maple | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 36 | Ulmus pumila | Siberian Elm | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | F | leaf spots, branch tip dieback, exposed roots | | Municipal | Retain |
| 37 | Acer saccharum | Sugar Maple | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | exposed roots | | Municipal | Retain |
| 38 | Ulmus americana | American Elm | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 39 | Ulmus americana | American Elm | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | codominant branches & stems, crossing branches, weak union | | Municipal | Retain |
| 40 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | exposed roots | | Municipal | Remove |
| 41 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | asymmetrical crown Shape, suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 42 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 35 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | G | crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 43 | Gleditsia triacanthos | Honey Locust | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | exposed roots | | Municipal | Retain |

| ID # | Botanical Name | Common Name | Total Coun | DBH (cm) | Tree Count (by DBH Range) | | | Condition | | | Remarks | | Ownership | Construction Requirement |
|------|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----|----|---|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | 10- 29cm | 30- 49cm | 50cm + | TI | CS | CV | Defects: Biological / Structural / Mechanical | Other | | |
| 44 | <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 1 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | exposed roots | | Municipal | Retain |
| 45 | <i>Tilia cordata</i> | Littleleaf Linden | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 46 | <i>Tilia cordata</i> | Littleleaf Linden | 1 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | G | natural lean | | Municipal | Retain |
| 47 | <i>Populus deltoides</i> | Eastern Cottonwood | 1 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 48 | <i>Tilia cordata</i> | Littleleaf Linden | 1 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | suckering, natural lean, suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| 49 | <i>Tilia cordata</i> | Littleleaf Linden | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | mechanical trunk damage | | Municipal | Retain |
| 50 | <i>Acer saccharum</i> | Sugar Maple | 1 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 51 | <i>Tilia cordata</i> | Littleleaf Linden | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | G | G | suckering, exposed roots | | Municipal | Retain |
| 52 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 53 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | F | reduced canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 54 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 55 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | F | reduced canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 56 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 57 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 58 | <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | P | P | mechanical trunk damage, reduced canopy vigor, branch tip dieback | | Municipal | Retain |
| 59 | <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | P | F | mechanical trunk damage, reduced canopy vigor, branch tip dieback | | Municipal | Retain |
| 60 | <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | mechanical trunk damage, natural lean, reduced canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 61 | <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 62 | <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 63 | <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 64 | <i>Acer saccharum</i> | Sugar Maple | 1 | 43 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 65 | <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> | Ginkgo Tree | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 66 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 1 | F | F | F | weak union, mechanical trunk damage, suppressed canopy vigor | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| 67 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 1 | G | F | G | codominant branches & stems | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| 68 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 1 | F | F | F | exposed roots, codominant branches & stems, suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches, vine in crown | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| 69 | <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 70 | <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 1 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 71 | <i>Ulmus americana</i> | American Elm | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | G | F | F | asymmetrical crown Shape, natural lean, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Remove |
| 72 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | 42 | 0 | 1 | 0 | F | F | F | natural lean, suckering, leaf spots | | Municipal | Remove |
| 73 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | F | reduced canopy vigor, leaf spots | | Municipal | Remove |
| 74 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 32 | 0 | 1 | 0 | P | F | F | crossing branches, suppressed canopy vigor, suckering, weak union | Multi-stem. Growing through fence. | Municipal | Remove |
| 75 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | crossing branches, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Remove |
| 76 | <i>Acer platanoides</i> | Norway Maple | 1 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | crossing branches, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Remove |
| 77 | <i>Ulmus americana</i> | American Elm | 1 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 1 | F | G | G | exposed roots | | Municipal | Retain |
| 78 | <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | P | reduced canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| 79 | <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 80 | <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 81 | <i>Malus sp.</i> | Apple Species | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | vine in crown, crossing branches, branch tip dieback, suckering | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| 82 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | F | F | F | natural lean, weak union, suckering | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| 83 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | P | F | G | mechanical trunk damage, natural lean, weak union, suckering | Growing through fence | Municipal | Remove |
| 84 | <i>Ulmus davidiana</i> | Prospector Elm | 1 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | branch tip dieback | | Municipal | Retain |
| 85 | <i>Ulmus davidiana</i> | Prospector Elm | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | P | P | branch tip dieback, reduced canopy vigor, lost leader | | Municipal | Retain |
| 86 | <i>Quercus alba</i> | White Oak | 1 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | vine in crown | | Municipal | Remove |
| 87 | <i>Quercus alba</i> | White Oak | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | G | vine in crown | | Municipal | Remove |
| 88 | <i>Aesculus glabra</i> | Ohio Buckeye | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Federal | Retain |
| 89 | <i>Aesculus glabra</i> | Ohio Buckeye | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Federal | Retain |

| ID # | Botanical Name | Common Name | Total Coun | DBH (cm) | Tree Count (by DBH Range) | | | Condition | | | Remarks | | Ownership | Construction Requirement |
|------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----|----|---|-------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | 10- 29cm | 30- 49cm | 50cm + | TI | CS | CV | Defects: Biological / Structural / Mechanical | Other | | |
| 90 | <i>Ulmus davidiana</i> | Prospector Elm | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Federal | Retain |
| 91 | <i>Celtis occidentalis</i> | Hackberry | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | suppressed canopy vigor | Multi-stem | Federal | Retain |
| 92 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | suppressed canopy vigor | | Federal | Retain |
| 93 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | suppressed canopy vigor | Multi-stem | Federal | Retain |
| 94 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | G | suppressed canopy vigor | Multi-stem | Federal | Retain |
| 95 | <i>Ulmus davidiana</i> | Prospector Elm | 1 | 32 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | G | suppressed canopy vigor, asymmetrical crown Shape | Multi-stem | Federal | Retain |
| 96 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | P | F | G | suppressed canopy vigor | Multi-stem | Federal | Retain |
| 97 | <i>Acer saccharum</i> | Sugar Maple | 1 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | G | F | G | suppressed canopy vigor | Multi-stem | Federal | Retain |
| 98 | <i>Acer rubrum</i> | Red Maple | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Federal | Retain |
| 99 | <i>Celtis occidentalis</i> | Hackberry | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Federal | Retain |
| 100 | <i>Celtis occidentalis</i> | Hackberry | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Federal | Retain |
| 101 | <i>Celtis occidentalis</i> | Hackberry | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | G | suckering | Multi-stem | Municipal | Retain |
| 102 | <i>Celtis occidentalis</i> | Hackberry | 1 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 103 | <i>Quercus alba</i> | White Oak | 1 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 104 | <i>Quercus alba</i> | White Oak | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | | Municipal | Retain |
| 105 | <i>Aesculus glabra</i> | Ohio Buckeye | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | suckering | Adjacent property | Federal | Retain |
| 106 | <i>Aesculus glabra</i> | Ohio Buckeye | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | branch tip dieback | Adjacent property | Federal | Retain |
| 107 | <i>Acer rubrum</i> | Red Maple | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | G | G | | Adjacent property | Federal | Retain |
| G1 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 4 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | natural lean, suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches, weak union | | Municipal | Retain |
| G2 | <i>Ulmus americana</i> | American Elm | 4 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches, weak union, exposed roots | | Municipal | Retain |
| G2 | <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> | Honey Locust | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | G | F | F | suppressed canopy vigor, crossing branches | | Municipal | Retain |
| G3 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 7 | - | 7 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | codominant branches & stems, reduced canopy vigor, suckering, leaf spots | | Municipal | Retain |
| G4 | <i>Amelanchier canadensis</i> | Serviceberry | 11 | - | 11 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | natural lean, mechanical trunk damage, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Retain |
| G5 | <i>Acer ginnala</i> | Amur Maple | 7 | - | 7 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | codominant branches & stems, mechanical trunk damage, crossing branches, reduced canopy vigor | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| G6 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | natural lean, suppressed canopy vigor, exposed roots | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| G6 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | natural lean, weak union, suppressed canopy vigor | Growing on fence | Municipal | Remove |
| G6 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | G | natural lean, weak union, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Remove |
| G7 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | exposed roots, suppressed canopy vigor, weak union, suckering | Multi-stem | Municipal | Remove |
| G7 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 1 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | P | exposed roots, suppressed canopy vigor, weak union, suckering | Growing on fence | Municipal | Remove |
| G7 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | suckering, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Remove |
| G7 | <i>Ulmus pumila</i> | Siberian Elm | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | mechanical trunk damage, suppressed canopy vigor | | Municipal | Remove |
| G8 | <i>Acer negundo</i> | Manitoba Maple | 14 | - | 14 | 0 | 0 | F | F | F | natural lean, exposed roots, mechanical trunk damage, suppressed canopy vigor, vine in crown | Growing on fence | Municipal | Remove |

Appendix B







Mapping



Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Legend

-  EXISTING DECIDUOUS TREE AND IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
-  EXISTING CONIFEROUS TREE AND IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
-  CRITICAL ROOT ZONE (CRZ)
-  EXISTING VEGETATION GROUPING
-  PROPERTY LIMIT
-  PROJECT LIMIT

Notes

- AERIAL MAPPING FROM MICROSOFT BING MAPPING. AERIAL IMAGE 2024.
- LOCATION OF TREES ARE BASED ON THE SITE SURVEY COMBINED WITH ON-SITE OBSERVATIONS.

| | | | | |
|----------|----------------------|----|-------|----------|
| 2 | RE-ISSUED FOR REVIEW | BL | IL | 25.06.12 |
| 1 | ISSUED FOR REVIEW | TA | ILL | 25.02.19 |
| Revision | | By | Appd. | YY.MM.DD |

| | | | | | |
|------------|----------------------------|------|-------|------|----------|
| File Name: | XR_160402067_L_Extrees.dwg | BL | ILL | TA | 24.11.05 |
| | | Dwn. | Chkd. | Dgn. | YY.MM.DD |

Permit-Seal

Client/Project

CITY OF OTTAWA
1010 SOMERSET STREET WEST
REZONING AND REDEVELOPMENT

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Title

CURRENT VEGETATION PLAN

Project No.
160402067

Drawing No.

Scale
1:500


Sheet

Revision

L01

1 of 2

2

- Legend**
- EXISTING TREE TO BE REMOVED
 - EXISTING DECIDUOUS TREE AND IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
 - EXISTING CONIFEROUS TREE AND IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
 - CRITICAL ROOT ZONE (CRZ)
 - EXISTING VEGETATION GROUPING
 - VEGETATION GROUPING TO BE REMOVED
 - PROPOSED BUILDING
 - PROPOSED WALKWAY
 - SITE PLAN BY OTHERS
- PROPERTY LIMIT
--- PROJECT LIMIT

Notes

- THE LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN HAS BEEN DEVELOPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT: PRELIMINARY GEOTECHNICAL REPORT - PROPOSED LAND DEVELOPMENT AT 1010 SOMERSET STREET W, OTTAWA, ONTARIO - FEBRUARY 19, 2025.
- THE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION CONFIRMS THE PRESENCE OF SENSITIVE MARINE CLAY SOILS ON THE PROPERTY INCLUDING LOW PLASTICITY LEAN CLAY AND CLAY WITH HIGH PLASTICITY. AS SUCH, CITY OF OTTAWA GUIDELINES FOR TREE PLANTING IN SENSITIVE MARINE CLAY SOILS APPLY.
 - AVOID PLANTING TREE SPECIES WITH AGGRESSIVE WATER SEEKING ROOTS.
 - NO TREE PLANTINGS WITHIN 4,500mm OF BUILDING FOUNDATIONS.
 - LARGE TREE PLANTINGS OFFSET FROM FOUNDATIONS BY A DISTANCE EQUAL TO THE ANTICIPATED MATURE HEIGHT OF THE TREE.
 - SMALL TREES MUST BE PROVIDED WITH A MINIMUM 25m³ OF AVAILABLE SOIL VOLUME.
 - MEDIUM TREES MUST BE PROVIDED WITH A MINIMUM 30m³ OF AVAILABLE SOIL VOLUME.
- ELEVATIONS OF THE UNDERSIDE OF FOOTINGS TO BE DETERMINED DURING THE SITE PLAN STAGE. PER CITY OF GUIDELINES FOR TREE PLANTING IN SENSITIVE MARINE CLAY SOILS, THE FOUNDATION WALLS OF BUILDINGS ARE TO BE REINFORCED AT LEAST NOMINALLY WITH A MINIMUM OF TWO UPPER AND TWO LOWER 15m BARS TO PROVIDE DUCTILITY.
- TREE SPECIES SELECTION INCLUDING THE GRADING TO TREES TO BE DETERMINED DURING THE SITE PLAN STAGE.
- THE CONCEPT LANDSCAPE DESIGN IS FOR REFERENCE ONLY. REFER TO PLANNING, ENGINEERING & ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS.
- LOCATION OF EXISTING TREES ARE BASED ON THE SITE SURVEY COMBINED WITH ON-SITE OBSERVATIONS.

| | | | | |
|----------|----------------------|----|-------|----------|
| 2 | RE-ISSUED FOR REVIEW | BL | ILL | 25.06.06 |
| 1 | ISSUED FOR REVIEW | TA | ILL | 25.02.21 |
| Revision | | By | Appd. | YY.MM.DD |

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------------|------|-------|------|----------|
| File Name: | 160402067_01 | TA | ILL | BL | 25.06.03 |
| | | Dwn. | Chkd. | Dgn. | YY.MM.DD |

Permit-Seal


Client/Project

CITY OF OTTAWA
1010 SOMERSET STREET WEST
REZONING AND REDEVELOPMENT

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Title

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT &
CONSERVED VEGETATION PLAN

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|---|---|----|-----|
| Project No. | Scale | 0 | 5 | 15 | 25m |
| 160402067 | 1:500 |  | | | |
| Drawing No. | Sheet | Revision | | | |

L02

1 of 1

2

Appendix C

City of Ottawa
Tree Protection Detail



TREE PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS:

1. PRIOR TO ANY WORK ACTIVITY WITHIN THE CRITICAL ROOT ZONE (CRZ = 10 X DIAMETER) OF A TREE, TREE PROTECTION FENCING MUST BE INSTALLED SURROUNDING THE CRITICAL ROOT ZONE, AND REMAIN IN PLACE UNTIL THE WORK IS COMPLETE.

2. UNLESS PLANS ARE APPROVED BY CITY FORESTRY STAFF, FOR WORK WITHIN THE CRZ:
 - DO NOT PLACE ANY MATERIAL OR EQUIPMENT - INCLUDING OUTHOUSES;
 - DO NOT ATTACH ANY SIGNS, NOTICES OR POSTERS TO ANY TREE;
 - DO NOT RAISE OR LOWER THE EXISTING GRADE;
 - TUNNEL OR BORE WHEN DIGGING;
 - DO NOT DAMAGE THE ROOT SYSTEM, TRUNK, OR BRANCHES OR AN TREE;
 - ENSURE THAT EXHAUST FUMES FROM ALL EQUIPMENT ARE NOT DIRECTED TOWARD ANY TREE CANOPY.
 - DO NOT EXTEND HARD SURFACE OR SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGE LANDSCAPING

3. TREE PROTECTION FENCING MUST BE AT LEAST 1.2M IN HEIGHT, AND CONSTRUCTED OF RIGID OR FRAMED MATERIALS (E.G. MODULOC - STEEL, PLYWOOD HOARDING, OR SNOW FENCE ON A 2"x4" WOOD FRAME) WITH POSTS 2.4M APART, SUCH THAT THE FENCE LOCATION CANNOT BE ALTERED. ALL SUPPORTS AND BRACING MUST BE PLACED OUTSIDE OF THE CRZ, AND INSTALLATION MUST MINIMISE DAMAGE TO EXISTING ROOTS. (SEE DETAIL)
4. THE LOCATION OF THE TREE PROTECTION FENCING MUST BE DETERMINED BY AN ARBORIST AND DETAILED ON ANY ASSOCIATED PLANS FOR THE SITE (E.G. TREE CONSERVATION REPORT, TREE DISCLOSURE REPORT, ETC). THE PLAN AND CONSTRUCTED FENCING MUST BE APPROVED BY CITY FORESTRY STAFF PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK.

5. IF THE FENCED TREE PROTECTION AREA MUST BE REDUCED TO FACILITATE CONSTRUCTION, MITIGATION MEASURES MUST BE PRESCRIBED BY AN ARBORIST AND APPROVED BY CITY FORESTRY STAFF. THESE MAY INCLUDE THE PLACEMENT OF PLYWOOD, WOOD CHIPS, OR STEEL PLATING OVER THE ROOTS FOR PROTECTION OR THE PROPER PRUNING AND CARE OF ROOTS WHERE ENCOUNTERED.

ALL CITY-OWNED TREES ARE PROTECTED UNDER THE MUNICIPAL TREES AND NATURAL AREAS PROTECTION BY-LAW (2006-279). WITHIN THE URBAN AREA, PRIVATELY-OWNED TREES GREATER THAN 50CM DIAMETER ON LOTS 1HA IN SIZE OR LESS, AND TREES GREATER THAN 10CM DIAMETER ON LOTS >1HA, ARE PROTECTED UNDER THE URBAN TREE CONSERVATION BY-LAW (2009-200).

