TREE CONSERVATION REPORT

630 Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario.

MP Project No.: CCO-21-4432

Prepared for:

MB Group and Associates
657 Boulevard Cure-Labelle,
Laval, QC H5V 2T8

Prepared by:

McINTOSH PERRY

McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineers Ltd.
2010 Winston Park Drive, Suite 400
Oakville, Ontario L6H 5R7

TREE CONSERVATION REPORT

630 Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared for:

MB Group and Associates
657 Boulevard Cure-Labelle,
Laval, QC H5V 2T8

Prepared by:

McINTOSH PERRY

McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineers Ltd.
2010 Winston Park Drive, Suite 400
Oakville, Ontario L6H 5R7

August 11, 2021

Prepared by:

Ken Burrell
Senior Biologist

Reviewed by:

Kenneth Jobity
Manager Natural Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figures

Tables

Appendices

1.0 INTRODUCTION

McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineers Ltd. (McIntosh Perry) has been retained by MB Group and Associates to complete a Tree Conservation Report in support of an in-fill development application. The subject property is located in the City of Ottawa, legally described as 630 Montreal Road. The subject property is 0.10 ha in size and is bounded to the north by Montreal Road, Borthwick Avenue to the west, and residential properties to the south and east.

This Tree Conservation Report has been prepared in accordance with the City of Ottawa's Tree Protection By-law No. 2020-340. The report outlines the condition of all existing vegetation on site, any impacts of the proposed development on the vegetation, and the associated mitigation measures recommended to minimize impacts and preserve conserved trees.

An inventory of the subject property was conducted on May 7, 2021 by Erik Pohanka, Terrestrial Biologist at McIntosh Perry to review trees within the study area (where access permitted), including documenting conditions of the vegetation growing at 630 Montreal Road, Ottawa.

The objectives of the Tree Conservation Report include the following:

- To describe the existing trees (≥10 cm diameter at breast height) growing on-site, including species composition, size (diameter at breast height), age, and condition and health of the trees;
- To identify vegetation that will be retained and the rationale to support this decision;
- To assess the impact of the development on the conserved portions of vegetation;
- To describe mitigation measures that will be used to promote the long-term survival of retained trees, and any other measures as required based on the site conditions;
- To describe protection measures being implemented on-site; and
- To provide a planting and/or compensation overview of the impacted tree(s).

2.0 CURRENT VEGETATION

A tree inventory and assessment was conducted by McIntosh Perry Staff, E. Pohanka on May 7, 2021. The tree inventory and assessment included all trees located within the subject property, as well as trees off-site on adjacent lots which have critical root zones overlapping or potentially overlapping with the subject property. Photos of the tree investigation areas can be found within **Appendix A**.

The subject property is developed in its entirety, consisting of two (2) dwellings and asphalt parking areas that cover the entire property. The subject property lacks any natural vegetation communities and there are no trees on the site.

The inventory data included tree species identification, a general health condition assessment, and data on tree diameter at breast heigh (DBH) measurements. All specimens with a DBH of 10 cm or greater were included in the inventory. DBH measurements were taken at approximately 1.4 m above ground surface at the base of each tree.

The tree health assessment was graded on a scale ranging from Dead, Poor, Fair and Good based on characteristics such as trunk integrity, canopy structure and canopy vigour. Outlined below are the detailed guidelines utilized for the classification / condition rating:

Good: (Healthy)
No major branch mortality: crown is reasonably normal with less than 25% branch or twig mortality; little to no evidence of decay

Fair: (Light – Moderate Decline)
Branch mortality, twig dieback in 26-50% of the crown: broken branches or crown missing based on presence of old snags is 50% or less; decay evident.

Poor: (Severe Decline)
Branch mortality, 50% or more of the crown dead: broken branches or crown area missing based on presence of old snags in more than 50%; decay resulting in potential hazard.

Dead:
Tree is dead, standing and is considered a potential hazard to public health and safety.

3.0 TREE RESOURCE DESCRIPTION

The tree inventory conducted for the subject property resulted in findings that there are no trees located within the property boundary; however, four (4) trees were identified and documented off-site that may be impacted by the proposed development (**Figure 1**). **Table 1** outlines the inventoried trees that are directly adjacent to the subject property.

Table 1: Tree Resource Composition								
Tree No.[1]	**Tree Species Common Name (*Scientific Name*)**	**Status**	**DBH (cm)**	**Critical Root Zone (m)**	**Estimated Age (year)**	**Ownership**	**Condition**	**Action**
1	Siberian Elm (*Ulmus pumila*)	Non-native	18	1.8	10	Off-site	Poor	Remove
2	Freeman's Maple (*Acer x freemanii*)	Native	30	3.0	20	Off-site	Good	Retain
3	White Spruce (*Picea glauca*)	Native	25	2.5	20	Off-site	Fair	Retain
4	White Spruce (*Picea glauca*)	Native	25	2.5	20	Off-site	Fair	Retain

[1]refer to Figure 1 for an overview of tree locations

The health status of the inventoried trees varied slightly, with Fair (2), Good (1), and Poor (1) ratings accounting for the inventoried trees. No dead trees were observed within the study area during the inventory and assessment. The study area is highly developed in nature, with few trees or natural vegetation found throughout the area.

LEGEND

- Approximate Site Boundary
- Tree Location
  - **1** - Siberian Elm
  - **2** - Freeman's Maple
  - **3** - White Spruce
  - **4** - White Spruce
- Critical Root Zone (1.8m) -Siberian Elm
- Critical Root Zone (2.5m) -White Spruce
- Critical Root Zone (3m) - Freeman's Maple

10 5 0 10

Scale 1:400 Metres

REFERENCE

GIS data provided by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, 2021.

CLIENT: MB AND ASSOCIATES

PROJECT: TREE CONSERVATION REPORT
630 MONTREAL ROAD, OTTAWA, ON

TITLE: CURRENT VEGETATION

McINTOSH PERRY
115 Walgreen Road, RR3, Carp, ON K0A1L0
Tel: 613-836-2184 Fax: 613-836-3742
www.mcintoshperry.com

PROJECT NO:CCO-21-4432	
Date	Aug., 09, 2021
GIS	EU
Checked By	KB

FIGURE: 1

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVED VEGETATION

The proposed development will align closely to the original footprint of the subject property, resulting in a low impact to trees within the study area. There are no trees within the subject property; however, a single Siberian Elm, located off-site, directly adjacent to the subject property will be required to be removed (**Figure 2**). Siberian Elm is a non-native, invasive species. As this individual has grown, a portion of the tree has become intertwined with the boundary fence and the tree is in poor condition (see **Appendix A**).

The remaining trees (i.e. trees 2, 3, and 4) should be monitored over time. Care should be taken when removing the asphalt and existing fence and buildings on-site to avoid impacting these individual's critical root zones.

LEGEND

- Approximate Site Boundary
- Fencing
- Tree Location
  - **2** - Freeman's Maple
  - **3** - White Spruce
  - **4** - White Spruce
- Critical Root Zone (2.5m) -White Spruce
- Critical Root Zone (3m) - Freeman's Maple

10 5 0 10

Scale 1:400 Metres

REFERENCE

GIS data provided by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, 2021.

CLIENT: MB AND ASSOCIATES

PROJECT: TREE CONSERVATION REPORT
630 MONTREAL ROAD, OTTAWA, ON

TITLE: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
AND CONSERVED VEGETATION

McINTOSH PERRY
115 Walgreen Road, RR3, Carp, ON K0A1L0
Tel: 613-836-2184 Fax: 613-836-3742
www.mcintoshperry.com

PROJECT NO:CCO-21-4432	
Date	Aug., 09, 2021
GIS	EU
Checked By	KB

FIGURE: 2

5.0 TREE PROTECTION MEASURES

Tree protection measures described in this section are provided not only to ensure tree survival during the construction period, but also to ensure that trees will continue to grow and remain healthy. The tree protection strategy is to create a safe environment during the construction period while also preserving the trees and ensuring that they do not become a hazard in the long-term. Trees can by damaged in a number of ways during construction. It is recommended that the contractor take every precaution necessary to prevent damage to the trees to be retained/conserved.

5.1 Temporary Tree Protection Fencing

The most common injury to a tree is to the crown or trunk. These injuries are visible and permanent and in some cases can be fatal to the tree. The roots are susceptible to physical injury resulting from cutting of the roots, soil compaction and/or smothering of the roots.

To ensure protection of the root system of trees to be retained, temporary tree protection fencing should be erected at the critical root zone of trees located inside or adjacent to the construction area. Temporary fencing is proposed surrounding the perimeter of the subject property (**Figure 2**) and will sufficiently protect the retained trees that are adjacent to the subject property.

5.2 Tree Pruning

Prior to construction, any trees that have branches in the way of the proposed development should be pruned by a Certified Arborist. Pruning should not occur until after the leaves have come out in the spring. At this time, dead wood and hazardous limbs should also be removed, however, pruning of live branches should be avoided unless necessary.

Similarly, any roots that are/or partially exposed, due to earthworks, should be pruned by hand if possible, following standard arboricultural practices. Roots that are exposed due to earthworks should be covered with native topsoil immediately to ensure that the roots do not dry out or have further damage occur to them. Root pruning should be completed by a Certified Arborist.

5.3 Tree Monitoring

Trees located adjacent to construction works will experience a change in their immediate environment. As a result, tree health should be monitored. Trees that have died or have been damaged beyond repair by the Contractor within two (2) years of construction shall be removed and replaced by the Contractor at their own expense according to City of Ottawa compensation requirements, or as directed by City staff.

5.4 Wildlife Protection

Clearing and vegetation removal is prohibited during the nesting period of most migratory birds, under the Migratory Birds Convention Act. This period extends from April 1st to August 31st of each calendar year. Should tree removal during the bird nesting season be unavoidable, the Contractor is required to conduct a nesting

survey by a registered professional avian biologist to identify and ensure that there are no nesting birds within the site that may be negatively impacted. Clearance surveys during this period are valid for a period of 48 hours following the completion of the nest search.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

A single Siberian Elm (tree No. 1) is proposed for removal and is <30cm DBH; as such no compensation plantings or cash-in-lieu is proposed or required as per the City of Ottawa's Tree By-law (2020-340).

This individual tree is located off-site, directly adjacent to the subject property. In accordance with the City of Ottawa's Tree By-law (2020-340) written permission will be required from the landowner prior to approval for removal.

7.0 LIMITING TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The assessment of the trees presented within this report have been made using a visual examination of the above-ground parts of each tree for structural defects, external indications of decay, evidence of insect presence, and discoloured foliage. None of the trees examined were dissected, cored, probed, or climbed, and detailed root crown examinations involving excavation were not undertaken.

Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions made in this report, it must be realized that trees are living organisms and their health and vigour is constantly changing. They are not immune to changes in site conditions or seasonal variations in the weather.

While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure the trees recommended for retention are healthy, no guarantees are offered or implied, that these trees or any part of them will remain standing. It is both professionally and practically impossible to predict with absolute certainty the behaviours of single tree or group of trees in all circumstances. Every effort has been made to ensure that this assessment is reasonably accurate, however trees should be re-assessed periodically.

Appendix A – Photo Log

Photo 1: View of the subject property from the northwest corner facing south. May 7, 2021.

Photo 2: View of the subject property from the northwest corner facing southeast. May 7, 2021.

Photo 3: View of the subject property from the northeast corner facing south. May 7, 2021.

Photo 4: View of the Siberian Elm proposed for removal. May 7, 2021.