

Urban Forest Innovations Inc.
1331 Northaven Drive
Mississauga ON L5G 4E8



February 21, 2024

The Town of Newmarket

395 Mulock Drive, P.O. Box 328, STN Main
Newmarket ON L3Y 4X7
c/o Umar Mahmood – Planner COA & Cultural Heritage

Re: 7 Harry Walker Parkway – Committee of Adjustment – Arborist Peer Review

Mr. Mahmood,

As you have requested, Urban Forest Innovations, Inc. (UFI) has reviewed the arborist report and related application information submitted in support of a proposed lot severance for the construction of a retail plaza at 7 Harry Walker Parkway, Newmarket, ON.

This letter report outlines our review methodology and presents our comments.

Methodology

Document review

The following documents, provided by the Town of Newmarket, were reviewed:

- Tree Inventory, Preservation, and Replacement Plan, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Ltd., dated December 22, 2016
- Existing Conditions, Proposed Site Plan, Tree Inventory & Preservation Plan, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Ltd., dated December 22, 2016

Additional documents provided in the submission package were reviewed briefly for context, but did not form a substantive part of this peer review.

With the exception of documents submitted prior to April, 2018, all reviewed documents are evaluated against the latest revised version of the Town of Newmarket *Tree Preservation*,

Protection, Replacement and Enhancement Policy (April 2018 or latest version), hereinafter referred to as the *Policy*.

Site visit

A site visit was undertaken on July 4, 2023, to assess the site and verify the tree inventory details.

Comments

Based upon our review of the above-referenced documents, we offer the following comment(s):

Tree inventory

1. The tree inventory presented in the arborist report must be corrected to accurately reflect the species, size, and condition of all significant trees located on or within 4.5 metres of the subject lands. Several deficiencies in the tree inventory were noted during site observations:
 - Multiple incorrect species identifications, e.g. trees #108, 109 and 110 are listed as Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*), whereas site observations show them to be hedge maple (*Acer campestre*). Trees #111, 112, 113 and 114 are listed as pear species (*Pyrus* sp.), whereas site observations show them to be apple species (*Malus* sp.).
 - Minor inaccuracies in tree measurements, e.g., trees #108, 109 and 110 are listed as 15cm, 21cm and 18cm diameter at breast height (DBH) respectively, whereas site observations show them to be 22cm, 30cm, and 26cm DBH respectively.

Prior to any demolition or construction activity on the subject lands, the Town must be notified in order to conduct an inspection of the installed tree protection fencing and other tree protection measures.

Additional comments on trees affected by this application will be provided when the requested additional information is available for further review.

We trust that this letter will suffice for your current needs. Should you have any questions or require further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted by,



Philip van Wassenauer, B.Sc., MFC
ISA Certified Arborist ON-0361A
Member – ASCA, SMA, SAG Baumstatik
E: pwassenauer1022@rogers.com



Shane Jobber, B.Sc.F.
ISA Certified Arborist ON-1746AM
E: shane@urbanforestinnovations.com

Urban Forest Innovations, Inc.
1331 Northaven Drive
Mississauga ON L5G 4E8
T: (905) 274-1022 F: (905) 274-2170
www.urbanforestinnovations.com

Limitations of Assessment

It is our policy to attach the following clause regarding limitations. We do this to ensure that the client is aware of what is technically and professionally realistic in assessing and retaining trees.

The assessment(s) of the tree(s) presented in this report has been made using accepted arboricultural techniques. These may include, among other factors, a visual examination of: the above-ground parts of the tree(s) for visible structural defects, scars, external indications of decay such as fungal fruiting bodies, evidence of pests or pathogens, discoloured foliage, the condition of any visible root structures, the degree and direction of lean (if any), the general condition of the tree(s) and the surrounding site, and the proximity of property and people. Except where specifically noted, the tree(s) was not cored, probed, climbed or assessed using any advanced methods, and there was no detailed inspection of the root crown(s) involving excavation.

Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions made in this report, it must be recognized that trees are living organisms, and their health and vigour constantly change over time. They are not immune to changes in site or weather conditions, or general seasonal variations. Weather events such as wind or ice storms may result in the partial or complete failure of any tree, regardless of assessment results.

While reasonable efforts have been made to accurately assess the overall condition of the subject tree(s), no guarantee or warranty is offered, expressed or implied, that the tree(s) or any of its parts will remain standing or in stable condition. It is both professionally and practically impossible to predict with absolute certainty the behaviour of any single tree or its component parts, regardless of the assessment methodology implemented. Inevitably, a standing tree will always pose some level of risk. Most trees have the potential for failure under adverse weather conditions, and the risk can only be eliminated if the tree is removed.

Although every effort has been made to ensure that this assessment is reasonably accurate, the tree(s) should be re-assessed periodically. The assessment presented in this report is only valid at the time of inspection.