

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



January 2, 2024

The Town of Newmarket

395 Mulock Drive, P.O. Box 328, STN Main
Newmarket ON L3Y 4X7
c/o Aida Hosseinzadeh – Intermediate Planner, Development

Re: 281 Main Street North – Site Plan Application (6th Submission) – Arborist Peer Review

Ms. Hosseinzadeh,

As you have requested, Urban Forest Innovations (UFI) has reviewed the arborist report and related application information submitted in support of a proposed Site Plan Application for development of 19 three-storey townhouse units at 281 Main Street North, Newmarket, Ontario.

Document Review

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

- Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan, prepared by Maple Hill Tree Services Ltd., dated October 11, 2018, revised October 30, 2023
- Site Plan A001, prepared by Micacchi Architecture Inc., dated November 7, 2023
- Site Grading Plan and Site Servicing Plan, prepared by Aplin & Martin Consultants Ltd., dated May 2018, revised November 10, 2023

Additional documents not listed above but also provided in the submission package were briefly reviewed for context, but did not form a substantive part of this peer review. It should be noted that our review focused on the tree and shrub (i.e., arboriculture/urban forestry)-related aspects of the submission.

Background

A site visit was undertaken on July 19, 2022, to assess the site and verify the tree inventory details.

Updated Comments – July 2022

- 1) There are several dead/dying trees on site at this time. The arborist report is dated September 19, 2013 and does not reflect the site conditions. The next submission of the

arborist report must be updated to reflect the current site conditions and be reflective of the updated grading/servicing/site plans in its content and recommendations.

December 2018 Update: This has been addressed. No further comments.

- 2) The revised arborist report must consider any berms or barriers proposed along the rail line.

December 2018 Update: This has been addressed. No further comments.

- 3) The construction management plan is showing temporary parking in the area of the tree protection, east of building A. The next revision of the construction management plan must not have parking within the minimum tree protection distances as set out in the arborist report.

September 2019 Update: This has been addressed. No further comments.

- 4) The tree valuation methodology used to calculate final tree valuation results must be outlined in the revised arborist report.

September 2019 Update: The tree valuations provided in the recently revised arborist report have been derived using incorrect methodology and are undervaluing the appraised value of trees identified for preservation. The revised arborist report must amend the calculated values in accordance with the Trunk Formula Method, as set forth in the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers (CTLA) Guide to Plant Appraisal, 9th edition, where the appraised value is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Appraised Value} = [\text{Installed Tree Cost} + (\text{Unit Tree Cost} \times \text{Appraised Tree Trunk Increase})] \times \text{Species Rating} \times \text{Condition Rating} \times \text{Location Rating}$$

December 2020 Update: Comment remains unaddressed. Note that no updated arborist report was provided as part of the most recent (4th) submission package.

April 2021 Update: Comment remains unaddressed. Valuation methodology and results remain unchanged.

July 2022 Update: This has been addressed. No further comments.

- 5) The landscape plan must account for the appropriate number of replacement plantings required as set out in the arborist report. If any required replacement trees cannot be planted on-site, cash in lieu must be provided to the Town for unplanted trees at \$400.00 per tree.

September 2019 Update: No further comments.

- 6) The tree protection barriers presented in the arborist report are difficult to interpret due to the use of similar colours and linetypes. The revised arborist report must present tree protection barriers in clear and unambiguous lines to allow for improved legibility.

September 2019 Update: No further comments.

- 7) Any proposed removal or injury of trees located on the property boundary of the subject lands (e.g. shared trees #TR87, TR92, TR93) must have the consent of the owner(s) of the adjoining land(s). This will likely ensure compliance with the requirements of the provincial *Forestry Act, R.S.O. 1990*, which regulates the injury and destruction of shared trees. Several additional inventoried trees appear to be growing on adjacent property boundaries but are not listed as shared in the arborist report, e.g. trees #TR57, TR58, TR62, TR65, TR67, TR69, TR70, TR72, TR74, TR75, etc. These and any other trees located on property boundaries must have the removal consent of adjacent property owners.

September 2019 Update: This has been addressed. No further comments.

New Comments – January 2024

- 8) Trees #4, 32, 33, 56, 106, 108 are equal to or greater than 20cm diameter at breast height (DBH) and are recommended for removal. However, there is no compensation provided in the 'Replacements aggregate cm' column of the recently revised arborist report (page 13-14). A compensation amount calculated using the Depreciated Aggregate cm Method (DAM) (as outlined in the Policy) must be provided for all trees proposed for removal that are equal to or greater than 20cm diameter at breast height (DBH) and are located on or within 4.5 metres of the subject lands. Compensation calculations must be submitted for trees #4, 32, 33, 56, 106 and 108 in the revised arborist report.

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,



Shane Jobber, B.Sc.F.

ISA Certified Arborist ON-1746AM
shane@urbanforestinnovations.com

Urban Forest Innovations Inc.

1331 Northaven Drive
Mississauga, ON L5G 4E8
T: (905) 274-1022
F: (905) 274-2170
W: urbanforestinnovations.com



Philip van Wassenauer, B.Sc., MFC

ISA Certified Arborist ON-0361A
ASCA RCA #678
pwassenauer1022@rogers.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.