Ruhland & Associates Ltd

200-1750 Courtwood Crescent, Ottawa, Ontario K2C 2B5 P (613) 224-4744 x 222 F (613) 224-1131 info@rala.ca www.rala.ca

TREE CONSERVATION REPORT

18 Louisa Street, Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared for: Ironwood Fund Limited Partnership Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared by: Ruhland & Associates Limited 1750 Courtwood Crescent, Suite 200 Ottawa, ON K2C 2B5 (613) 224-4744

May 26, 2021







TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Project information |
|--|
| 1.0 Introduction |
| 2.0 Existing features32.1 Surface water42.2 Deep slopes42.3 Wildlife42.4 Significant vegetation/species42.5 Distinctive trees42.6 Hazardous trees5 |
| 3.0 Vegetation inventory4 |
| 4.0 Vegetation conservation |
| 5.0 Potential impacts and mitigation measures. 6 5.1 Potential impacts. 6 5.2 Protection measures. 6 5.3 Specific protection measures. 6 |

6.0 Planting recommendations......7

AERIAL IMAGE

MAP #1 - CURRENT VEGETATION AND CHART

MAP #2- PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVED VEGETATION,

PRESERVATION DETAIL

PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project Name: | 18 Louisa Street |
|------------------------|---|
| Owner: | Jennings Real Estate Attn: Mr. Ken Jennings |
| Applicant: | Fotenn Planning + Design Brian Casagrande |
| Prepared By: | Ruhland & Associates Limited, 1750 Courtwood Crescent, Suite 200, Ottawa, ON K2C 2B5 613-224-4744 Attn: Marietta Ruhland |
| Contractor: | Unknown at this time. |
| Municipal Address: | 18 Louisa Street, Lots 7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14, Registered Plan 49, City of Ottawa |
| Official Plan & Zoning | Designations: Site Zoning as per Ottawa Zoning By-law 2008-250 Site Designation I1A |
| Purpose for Report: | In support for an application for site plan control |
| Schedule of Proposed | Works: 2022. |

Other Applications Affecting Subject Lands: None

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The subject site is located 18 Louisa Street in the city of Ottawa. The site is described legally as Lots 7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14, Registered Plan 49, City of Ottawa.

The subject lands are approximately $3,200 \text{ m}^2$ (0.32 hectares, 0.79 acres) in size. It is bounded on the west side by an existing residential dwelling and a surface parking lot for the Saint Hyacinth Roman Catholic Polish Church, on the east side by Bell Street North and on the south side by Arlington Avenue. The lands consist of a commercial building and surface parking delineated by a chain link fence.

Approximately 51% (1,635m²) of the site is paved. Including the rooftop of the existing commercial building, approximately 89% (2,872m²) of the site is currently impervious.

The subject lands were visited by Ruhland & Associates Ltd. on March 4th. 2021 to review species and basic conditions of trees growing on site. The locations of trees are from survey information, from field observations and aerial photographs. Status of existing vegetation was taken from field observations. Review of the three Ash trees on Arlington Avenue was conducted on May 26th, 2021.

The goal of this report is to highlight the condition of existing trees on site, the impact of the proposed development and measures recommended to preserve and minimize impact.

2.0 EXISTING FEATURES

This section will list the natural features of the site and its surrounding context.

2.1 Surface Water Features

No water features.

2.2 Steep Slopes

No significant changes in elevation across the site.

2.3 Wildlife

No evidence of larger mammals was found on the site during any site reviews. It is expected that the normal urban wildlife is present.

2.4 Significant natural elements

Significant natural elements include valued woodlots designated as Urban Natural Features or Natural Environment Areas; significant woodlands; high quality, specimen trees; riparian woodlots, rare communities or other unique ecological features and species at risk.

No significant natural elements have been found on site during site visits, and the site is not in proximity to any designated significant natural element.

2.5 Distinctive Trees

Distinctive trees (as described in the City of Ottawa Tree Protection Bylaw No. 2020-340 as 'trees measuring 30 cm or more in diameter at breast height within the inner urban area'.)

The majority of trees on site (12) are distinctive. The largest distinctive specimen is Tree # 7 with a DBH of 0.85m. Tree A on adjacent property is also distinctive.

2.6 Hazardous trees

There are no trees deemed as hazardous on site.

3.0 VEGETATION INVENTORY

The vegetation inventory consisted in the visual inspection of trees of 10 centimetres in diameter or greater. Tree condition was assessed based on visual defects only.

The trees were numbered in sequence, as shown MAP#1. Note: there are two trees (Tree # A, Tree # B) located on adjacent property that were included in this inventory. This is because the critical root zones of these trees were thought to overlap into the site and could have been impacted by the proposed development.

For detailed information on condition of trees collected during inventory, please refer to Existing Vegetation Inventory Data.

There are only two species on site: *Acer negundo* (Manitoba Maple) and *Fraxinus* ssp. (Ash ssp.) and in general they are in fair to poor condition. Seven trees have significant suckering occurring at the base of the trunk. Four of the trees have grown into/swallowed steel poles or chain-link fences on site.

4.0 VEGETATION CONSERVATION

Please refer to MAP#2 for proposed development and conserved vegetation.

4.1 Vegetation to be Retained

Recommended for retention are:

Trees #12, 13 14

Trees #12, 13, 14 will not be impacted by the proposed development. These are Ash trees and do not appear to have received inoculation against Emerald Ash Borer. As the initial inventory was conducted in the winter, overall canopy condition was impossible to determine. However, as Figure 1 shows, all the Ash trees appear to be in overall good condition as of May 26th, 2021. The roots on all three trees are slightly girdled, but canopies appear to be full and lush.



Figure 1 Picture of Ash trees on May 26, 2021.

Trees #A, B don't appear to be impacted by development. Even though these trees are located on adjacent property, they should be protected according to measures in section 5.2 below.

4.2 Vegetation to be Removed

Recommended for removal are:

| Trees #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 | 7, |
|----------------------------|----|
| 8, 9, 10, 11. | |

Trees # 1-11 are in direct conflict with the proposed development. According to the proposed site plan, the parking garage extends to the property line on all sides. Therefore, all trees are scheduled to be removed. The majority of these trees were in fair to poor condition, as shown in Figure 2 below.



Figure 2 Manitoba Maple grown into chain link fence, Manitoba Maple absorbed steel pole in trunk.

All removals to be done and will require a permit, in accordance with the City of Ottawa tree bylaw 2020-340 and this Tree Conservation Report.

5.0 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

5.1 Potential Impacts

Existing vegetation may be impacted by the development on site. Impact on existing vegetation can be due to construction, asphalt drive aisles or parking areas, grade change, changes to drainage patterns, and effects of impervious surfaces.

5.2 Protection Measures

In accordance with the Tree Protection By-law No. 2020-340, a protection fence is to be erected at vegetation that is to be preserved. The protection fence shall be erected as per City of Ottawa Tree Protection Detail on Map#2. The protection fence shall be maintained throughout all phases of the development. No work is to be done within the tree protection fence.

Within the CRZ, as demarcated by the tree protection fence, there should be:

- No storage of equipment or materials of any kind;
- No movement of vehicles, equipment or pedestrians;
- No construction activities of any kind;
- No disposal of contaminants or liquids.

5.3 Specific Protection Measures

All protection measures shall follow Tree Protection By-law No. 2020-340. The following *protected trees* cannot be injured or removed without a tree permit from the City:

- All City-owned trees throughout the urban and rural area
- All trees 10 cm or more in diameter at breast height on private properties within the urban area that are subject to a Planning Act application for Site Plan, Plan of Subdivision, or Plan of Condominium
- All trees 10 cm or more in diameter at breast height on private properties within the urban area that are over 1 hectare in size
- All distinctive trees on private properties 1 hectare or less in size.

6.0 PLANTING RECOMMENDATIONS

Only two genera of plants are found on site: *Acer* (6) and *Fraxinus* (10).To increase the profile of biodiversity on site, new trees to be planted should be from a genus that is not currently on site.

Proposed vegetation should correspond to the following:

- Native, non-invasive tree species to preserve the local natural heritage on site.
- Plant species that are resistant to de-icing salt
- Plant species that are resistant to drought and compaction
- Plants that are suitable smaller soil volumes, as they will be planted on slab.

Native species and cultivars of native species will be prioritized in plant selection. Noninvasive, non-indigenous species will be considered where conditions are not amenable to indigenous trees.

Tree species suitable for this site include: Juniper, small Maples, Gleditsia, Hackberry, Ironwood, Kentucky Coffee Tree, Ginkgo, Crabapple species.

Prepared by: Jessica Karafilov & Marietta Ruhland Reviewed by: Marietta Ruhland, OALA

Ruhland & Associates Limited March 11, 2019

AERIAL IMAGE





| drawing MAP # 1 - C | N | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--|
| scale 1:300 | date April, 2021 | project no. 20-1629 | dwg. no. MAP #1 | |
| drawn by M.Malkov | checked by M.Ruhland | revision no. | | |

Existing Vegetation Inventory Data

18 Louisa Street

| PLANT ID # | SIZE DBH* / ht. (m) | Private (P), City (C), Adjacent (A) | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | DISTINCTIVE TREE** | CONDITION | ACTION | COMMENTS |
|---------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 0.37 | С | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | \checkmark | Good | REMOVE | Minor decay and suckering occuring at base of trunk. |
| 2 | 0.36 | С | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | \checkmark | Fair | REMOVE | Minor decay and suckering occuring at base of trunk. Significiant deadwood in upper canopy. |
| 3 | 0.33 | С | Acer negundo | Manitoba Maple | \checkmark | Fair | REMOVE | Suckering occuring at base of trunk. |
| 4 | 0.37 | С | Acer negundo | Manitoba Maple | \checkmark | Poor | REMOVE | Suckering occuring at base of trunk. Steel sign pole and chainlink fence ingrown into trunk at base. Significant deadwood in upper canopy. Suboptimal branch structure with 2 codominant stems at 3m. |
| 5 | 0.39 | С | Acer negundo | Manitoba Maple | \checkmark | Poor | REMOVE | Suckering occuring at base of trunk. Steel sign pole and chainlink fence ingrown into trunk at base. Significant deadwood in upper canopy. Decay across half of trunk diameter. Existing conflict with overhead power lines. Suboptimal branch structure with 2 codominant stems at 1m. |
| 6 | 0.5 | С | Acer negundo | Manitoba Maple | \checkmark | Fair | REMOVE | Suboptimal branch structure with 6 codominant stems at 0.5m. |
| 7 | 0.85 | с | Acer negundo | Manitoba Maple | \checkmark | Poor | REMOVE | Suckering occuring at base of trunk. Steel sign pole and chainlink fence ingrown into trunk at base. Existing conflict with overhead power lines. Suboptimal branch structure with 5 codominant stems at 0.5m. |
| 8 | 0.25 | С | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | | Good | REMOVE | Wounds in branches of upper canopy. |
| 9 | 0.35 | С | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | \checkmark | Good | REMOVE | Wounds in branches of upper canopy. Suboptimal branch structure with 2 codominant stems at 2m. |
| 10 | 4 x 0.3 | С | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | \checkmark | Fair | REMOVE | Chainlink fence ingrown at trunk base. Multistem (4) at base. |
| 11 | 0.48 | С | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | \checkmark | Fair | REMOVE | Large wounds in one of codominant stems. Suboptimal branch structure with 2 codominant stems at 2m. |
| 12 | 0.25 | С | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | | Good | REMAIN | Suboptimal branch structure with 2 codominant stems at 2m. |
| 13 | 0.3 | с | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | \checkmark | Good | REMAIN | Minor wounds due to pruning. Slightly unbalanced crown. |
| 14 | 0.3 | с | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | ~ | Good | REMAIN | Unbalanced crown towards sidewalk wide due to heavy pruning. |
| A | 0.35 | Α | Fraxinus ssp | Ash ssp. | \checkmark | Fair | REMAIN | Suckering occuring at base. Potential conflict with overhead power lines. Unbalanced crown towards sidewalk side due to heavy pruning. |
| В | 0.2 | A | Acer negundo | Manitoba Maple | | Fair | REMAIN | Existing conflict with chainlink fence and pole. Potential conflict with overhead wires in <5 years. Otherwise good form with strong leader. |

**Distinctive Tree (By-Law 2020-340) * Diameter at Breast Height

