



January 10, 2022

Gino J. Aiello  
GJA Inc.  
110 Didsbury Road Unit #9  
Ottawa, ON  
K2T 0C2

**RE: TREE CONSERVATION REPORT FOR 1635 LYCÉE PLACE (LYCÉE CLAUDEL)**

Dear Gino,

This report details a pre-construction tree conservation report (TCR) for the above-noted property in Ottawa. The need for this TCR is related to the proposed redevelopment of the subject property, which includes the re-alignment of the front entranceway/student drop off area, expansion of the parking lot to the south of the school building, a sports field to the north and amphitheater and open space to the east. Trees on properties slated for development are protected through the City of Ottawa's Tree Protection By-law (By-law No. 2020-340).

Under the by-law tree conservation reports are required for all properties subject to site plan control applications on which trees of 10 centimetres in diameter or greater are present. The approval of this TCR by the City of Ottawa and the issuing of a permit by them authorize the removal of approved trees. **Importantly, although this report may be used to support the application for a City tree removal permit, it does not by itself constitute permission to remove trees or begin site clearing activities. No such work should occur before a tree removal permit is issued by the City of Ottawa.**

The inventory in this report details the assessment of all individual trees on the subject property. No trees appear to be on nearby private or City of Ottawa lands. The proposed changes will require the removal of the majority of trees on the subject property. Field work for this report was completed in September 2021.

**TREE SPECIES, CONDITION, SIZE AND STATUS**

Tables 1 and 2 detail the species, condition, size (diameter), ownership and preservation status of the individual trees on the subject property. Each of these trees is referenced by the numbers plotted on the tree conservation plan included on page 6 of this report. Pictures 1 through 5 on pages 8, 9 and 10 show selected trees on the property. Importantly, due to access limitations trees in and around the fenced playground to the rear of the school building were assessed from a distance. As a result, species, sizes and condition assessments are only approximate.



Table 1. Species, condition, size (diameter) and status of trees in front area of 1635 Lycée Place

| Tree No. | Tree species   | Condition (VP→E) | DBH <sup>1</sup> (cm) | Owner -ship | Age class, tree condition notes & <b>preservation status</b> (to be removed or preserved and protected)  |
|----------|--|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| 1        | Willow ( <i>Salix spp.</i> )                               | Poor             | +/40                  | Private     | Mature; heavy vine growth throughout crown; extensive crown dieback – tree is in decline; <b>to be preserved and protected</b> (though recommended for removal)  |
| 2        | Silver maple ( <i>Acer saccharinum</i> )                   | Good             | +/-30 avg.            | Private     | Mature; multi-stemmed from grade; native species; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |
| 3        | Cottonwood ( <i>Populus deltoides</i> )                    | Good             | +/-20 avg.            | Private     | Maturing; double stemmed from grade; native species; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>  |
| 4        | Amur maple ( <i>Acer tataricum</i> subsp. <i>ginnala</i> ) | Good             | 13.9                  | Private     | Mature; ‘standard’ variety – central stem to 2m from grade with multiple competing stems above – no clear leader; introduced invasive species; good species selection under Hydro lines; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>  |
| 5        | Amur maple   | Good             | 11.9                  | Private     | Mature; ‘standard’ variety; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |
| 6        | Amur maple   | Poor             | 12.8                  | Private     | Mature; ‘standard’ variety; holding only 50% foliage; heavy wounding to main stem - barkless; stem and basal sprouts recently removed; tree is in decline; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>  |
| 7        | Freeman maple ( <i>Acer x. freemanii</i> )                 | Good             | 9.7                   | Private     | Maturing; central dominant stem to 3.5m with divergent leaders; poor species selection under Hydro lines; cultivar; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |
| 8        | Amur maple   | Good             | 9.1                   | Private     | Mature; ‘standard’ variety; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |
| 9        | Little-leaf linden ( <i>Tilia cordata</i> )                | Poor             | 53.0                  | Private     | Mature; stunted form due to continual heavy pruning from overhead Hydro lines; crown asymmetric towards northwest due to strongly divergent laterals arising at 2m; poor species selection under Hydro lines; introduced species; <b>to be preserved and protected</b> |
| 10       | Amur maple   | Good             | 13.8                  | Private     | Mature; ‘standard’ variety; crown asymmetric towards south; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |
| 11       | Amur maple   | Poor             | 14.7                  | Private     | Mature; ‘standard’ variety; holding only 50% foliage; heavy wounding to main stem; stem and basal sprouts recently removed; tree is in decline; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |



Table 1. Con't

| Tree No. | Tree species                         | Condition (VP→E) | DBH <sup>1</sup> (cm) | Owner -ship | Age class, tree condition notes & <b>preservation status</b> (to be removed or preserved and protected)  |
|----------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| 12       | Amur maple                           | Fair             | 13.6                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; basal sprouts recently removed; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |
| 13       | Amur maple                           | Poor             | 15.0                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>   |
| 14       | Little-leaf linden                   | Poor             | 37.0 & 40.7           | Private     | Mature; double-stemmed from grade; heavily pruned (topped) due to overhead Hydro lines; poor species selection for location; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>  |
| 15       | English oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> ) | Good             | 4.0                   | Private     | Juvenile; commemorative 'Vimy' oak; introduced species; tree provenance of nationally historic importance; <b>to be transplanted elsewhere on property</b>   |
| 16       | Amur maple                           | Good             | 21.7                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)   |
| 17       | Amur maple                           | Good             | 16.0                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; seam on north side of main stem 0.1-1.75m has healed; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)   |
| 18       | Amur maple                           | Good             | 16.2                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)   |
| 19       | Amur maple                           | Fair             | 12.7                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; seam on south side of main stem 0.2-1.5m is open with <i>Coriolus</i> spp. in wound; planted too high; growth stunted due to very limited rooting area; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction) |
| 20       | Amur maple                           | Fair             | 11.1                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; growth stunted due to very limited rooting area; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 21       | Amur maple                           | Fair             | 16.7                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; basal sprouting; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 22       | Amur maple                           | Fair             | 18.2                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; basal sprouting; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 23       | Amur maple                           | Fair             | 16.9                  | Private     | Mature; 'standard' variety; basal sprouting; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |

Table 2. Species, condition, size (diameter) and status of trees in the rear playground of 1635 Lycée Place

| Tree No. | Tree species                                      | Condition (VP→E) | DBH <sup>1</sup> (cm) | Owner -ship | Age class, tree condition notes & <b>preservation status</b> (to be removed or preserved and protected) |
|----------|---|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|---|
| 24       | Honey-locust<br>( <i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> )  | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; introduced species to Eastern Ontario; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)     |
| 25       | Little-leaf linden                                | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 26       | Little-leaf linden                                | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 27       | Freeman maple                                     | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 28       | Honey-locust                                      | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 29       | Japanese tree lilac ( <i>Syringa reticulata</i> ) | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; cultivar; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)                                  |
| 30       | Japanese tree lilac                               | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 31       | Freeman maple                                     | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 32       | Freeman maple                                     | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 33       | Little-leaf linden                                | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 34       | Little-leaf linden                                | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 35       | Honey-locust                                      | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 36       | Japanese tree lilac                               | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 37       | Hackberry<br>( <i>Celtis occidentalis</i> )       | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; native species; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)                            |
| 38       | Freeman maple                                     | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |

Table 2. Species, condition, size (diameter) and status of trees in the rear playground of 1635 Lycée Place

| Tree No. | Tree species                                | Condition (VP→E) | DBH <sup>1</sup> (cm) | Owner -ship | Age class, tree condition notes & <b>preservation status</b> (to be removed or preserved and protected) |
|----------|---|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|---|
| 39       | Poplar<br>( <i>Populus</i> spp.)            | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; native species; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)                            |
| 40       | Freeman maple                               | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 41       | Black walnut<br>( <i>Juglans nigra</i> )    | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; native species; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>  |
| 42       | Freeman maple                               | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 43       | Freeman maple                               | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |
| 44       | Norway maple<br>( <i>Acer platanoides</i> ) | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; introduced invasive species; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)               |
| 45       | Larch<br>( <i>Larix</i> spp.)               | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; native species; <b>to be preserved and protected</b>  |
| 46       | Freeman maple                               | Good             | >10                   | Private     | Maturing; <b>to be removed</b> (conflicts with construction)  |

<sup>1</sup> diameter at breast height, or 1.4m from grade (unless otherwise indicated); average diameters indicate multi-stemmed trees



## PROVINCIAL REGULATIONS

Provincial regulations are applicable to trees on private property. In particular, the Endangered Species Act (2007) mandates that tree species on the Species at Risk in Ontario (SARO) list be identified. Butternut (*Juglans cinerea*) is present in Eastern Ontario and is listed as threatened on the SARO. Because of this it is protected from harm. No trees of this species were identified on the subject property or nearby on adjacent properties.

## TREE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION MEASURES

Preservation and protection measures intended to mitigate damage during construction will be applied for the trees to be retained adjacent to the subject property. The following measures are the minimum required by the City of Ottawa to ensure tree survival during and following construction:

1. As per the City of Ottawa's tree protection barrier specification, erect a fence as close as possible to the CRZ of the tree(s);
2. Do not place any material or equipment within the CRZ of the tree(s);
3. Do not attach any signs, notices or posters to any tree;
4. Do not raise or lower the existing grade within the CRZ without approval;
5. Tunnel or bore instead of trenching within the CRZ of any tree;
6. Do not damage the root system, trunk or branches of any tree;
7. Ensure that exhaust fumes from all equipment are NOT directed towards any tree's canopy.

<sup>1</sup> critical root zone (CRZ) is established as being 10 centimetres from the trunk of a tree for every centimetre of DBH. The CRZ is calculated as DBH x 10 cm.

This report is subject to the attached Limitations of Tree Assessments and Liability to which the reader's attention is directed.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned with any questions concerning this report.

Yours,



Andrew K. Boyd, B.Sc.F, R.P.F. (#1828)  
Certified Arborist #ON-0496A and TRAQualified  
Consulting Urban Forester





Picture 1. Trees #1-3 (left to right) located at the rear of 1635 Lycée Place



Picture 2. Trees #6-9 (left to right) located in front of 1635 Lycée Place





Picture 3. Trees #10-14 (left to right) located in front of 1635 Lycée Place



Picture 4. Trees #19-16 (right to left) located in front of 1635 Lycée Place





Picture 5. Tree #15, historic Vimy oak located in front of 1635 Lycée Place

# LIMITATIONS OF TREE ASSESSMENTS & LIABILITY

## GENERAL

It is the policy of *IFS Associates Inc.* to attach the following clause regarding limitations. We do this to ensure that our clients are clearly aware of what is technically and professionally realistic in assessing trees for retention.

This report was carried out by *IFS Associates Inc.* at the request of the client. The information, interpretation and analysis expressed in this report are for the sole benefit and exclusive use of the client. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the client to whom it is addressed. Unless otherwise required by law, neither all or any part of the contents of this report, nor copy thereof, shall be conveyed by anyone, including the client, to the public through public relations, news or other media, without the prior expressly written consent of the author, and especially as to value conclusions, identity of the author, or any reference to any professional society or institute or to any initialed designation conferred upon the author as stated in his qualifications.

This report and any values expressed herein represent the opinion of the author; his fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified value, a stipulated result, nor upon any finding to be reported. Details obtained from photographs, sketches, *etc.*, are intended as visual aids and are not to scale. They should not be construed as engineering reports or surveys. Although every effort has been made to ensure that this assessment is reasonably accurate, the tree(s) should be reassessed at least annually. The assessment presented in this report is valid at the time of the inspection only. The loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.

## LIMITATIONS

The information contained in this report covers only the tree(s) in question and no others. It reflects the condition of the assessed tree(s) at the time of inspection and was limited to a visual examination of the accessible portions only. *IFS Associates Inc.* has prepared this report in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the forestry and arboricultural professions, subject to the time limits and physical constraints applicable to this report. The assessment of the tree(s) presented in this report has been made using accepted arboricultural techniques. These include a visual examination of the above-ground portions of each tree for structural defects, scars, cracks, cavities, external indications of decay such as fungal fruiting bodies, evidence of insect infestations, 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 people and property. Except where specifically noted in the report, the tree(s) examined were not dissected, cored, probed or climbed to gain further evidence of their structural condition. Also, unless otherwise noted, no detailed root collar examinations involving excavation were undertaken.

While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the tree(s) proposed for retention are healthy, no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, are offered that these trees, or any parts of them, will remain standing. This includes other trees on or off the property not examined as part of this assignment. It is both professionally and practically impossible to predict with absolute certainty the behaviour of any single tree or groups of trees or their component parts in all circumstances, especially when within construction zones. Inevitably, a standing tree will always pose some risk. Most trees have the potential for failure in the event of root loss due to excavation and other construction-related impacts. This risk can only be eliminated through full tree removal.



Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions made in this report, it must be realized that trees are living organisms, and their health and vigour constantly change over time. They are not immune to changes in site conditions, or seasonal variations in the weather. It is a condition of this report that *IFS Associates Inc.* be notified of any changes in tree condition and be provided an opportunity to review or revise the recommendations within this report. Recognition of changes to a tree's condition requires expertise and extensive experience. It is recommended that *IFS Associates Inc.* be employed to re-inspect the tree(s) with sufficient frequency to detect if conditions have changed significantly.

#### ASSUMPTIONS

Statements made to *IFS Associates Inc.* in regards to the condition, history and location of the tree(s) are assumed to be correct. Unless indicated otherwise, all trees under investigation in this report are assumed to be on the client's property. A recent survey prepared by a Licensed Ontario Land Surveyor showing all relevant trees, both on and adjacent to the subject property, will be provided prior to the start of field work. The final version of the grading plan for the project will be provided prior to completion of the report. Any further changes to this plan invalidate the report on which it is based. *IFS Associates Inc.* must be provided the opportunity to revise the report in relation to any significant changes to the grading plan. The procurement of said survey and grading plan, and the costs associated with them both, are the responsibility of the client, not *IFS Associates Inc.*

#### LIABILITY

Without limiting the foregoing, no liability is assumed by *IFS Associates Inc.* for: 1) any legal description provided with respect to the property; 2) issues of title and/or ownership with respect to the property; 3) the accuracy of the property line locations or boundaries with respect to the property; 4) the accuracy of any other information provided by the client or third parties; 5) any consequential loss, injury or damages suffered by the client or any third parties, including but not limited to replacement costs, loss of use, earnings and business interruption; and, 6) the unauthorized distribution of the report.

#### INDEMNIFICATION

An applicant for a permit or other approval based on this report shall agree to indemnify and save harmless *IFS Associates Inc.* from any and all claims, demands, causes of action, losses, costs or damages that affected private landowners and/or the City of Ottawa may suffer, incur or be liable for resulting from the issuance of a permit or approval based on this report or from the performance or non-performance of the applicant, whether with or without negligence on the part of the applicant, or the applicant's employees, directors, contractors and agents.

Further, under no circumstances may any claims be initiated or commenced by the applicant against *IFS Associates Inc.* or any of its directors, officers, employees, contractors, agents or assessors, in contract or in tort, more than 12 months after the date of this report.

#### ONGOING SERVICES

*IFS Associates Inc.* accepts no responsibility for the implementation of any or all parts of the report, unless specifically requested to supervise the implementation or examine the results of activities recommended herein. In the event that examination or supervision is requested, that request shall be made in writing and the details, including fees, agreed to in advance.