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## ARBORIST REPORT \& TREE PROTECTION PLAN 496 CHARTWELL ROAD, (WARD 3) OAKVILLE, ON L6J 4A5

Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. has been retained by Homegate Corporation to prepare this Arborist Report \& Tree Protection Plan for the property at 496 Chartwell Road in Oakville, Ontario, Ward 3. The tree assessment was completed on the $28^{\text {th }}$ of September 2023 according to the requirements set forth by the Town of Oakville Urban Forestry.

The purpose of this report is to inventory and assess trees $\geq 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ dia. on the subject property, within 6 m of the proposed construction, and any trees in the Town road allowance adjacent to the property. None of my client's property is within the jurisdiction of Halton Conservation Regulation.

My client is proposing the removal of the existing dwelling and the construction of a new dwelling, with a new pool and other landscape elements. Due to the proposed construction activities, my client would like permission to remove nine (9) privately owned trees located on the subject property. Additionally, due to the proposed demolition and construction activities, my client would like permission to remove three (3) jointly owned trees located partially on the subject property as well as well as on town property. Lastly, my client would like permission to injure two (2) privately owned boundary trees as well. Please see body of the report for further details. An application to remove and injure these trees will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

As a result of these proposed non-hazardous private tree removals, my client is required to plant tree(s) on private property as compensation. The number of compensation trees, the species and planting location of the compensation trees is to be determined in conjunction with the Oakville Urban Forestry department. My client may wish to exercise their option of paying Oakville Urban Forestry cash-in-lieu for any of the compensation trees not planted on their property.

Furthermore, in order to facilitate the proposed construction, my client may wish to exercise their option of removing other smaller trees and vegetation located on the subject property. These trees are all under 15 cm in Diameter, therefore no permits or compensation plantings are required for their removal and these trees are not subject to protection during the proposed works.

Tree protection hoarding/fencing should be installed prior to any demolition or construction activities as outlined on sheets T1-T3.

## CLIENT'S TREES TO BE REMOVED

Trees \#04-\#12 \& \#13 - Permits Required


TREES \#08 - \#11



Tree \#04, a 38cm dia. Norway Spruce (Picea abies) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the front of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#04 is slightly overhanging the existing dwelling. Overall the canopy of this tree is considered to be asymmetrical as it is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new driveway, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#05, a 32cm dia. Norway Spruce (Picea abies) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the front of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Overall the canopy of this tree is considered to be sparse as it is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new driveway, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#06, a 32cm dia. Nonway Spruce ( Picea abies) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growins at the front of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#06 is leaning. Overall the canopy of this tree is considered to be sparse as it is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new driveway, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#07, a 27cm dia. Norway Spruce (Picea abies) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the front of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#07 is leanins. Overall the canopy of this tree is considered to be asymmetrical as it is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new driveway,
my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#08, a 32cm dia. Cedar (Thuja occidentalis) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the side of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#08 is codominant at its base, with leaning leaders. Overall this tree is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new dwelling, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#09, a 28cm dia. Cedar (Thuja occidentalis) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the side of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#09 is codominant and is considered to be multi stemmed, with leaning leaders. Overall this tree is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new dwelling, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#10, a 37cm dia. Cedar (Thuja occidentalis) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the side of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Overall this tree has an asymmetrical canopy as it is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new dwelling, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#11, a 28cm dia. Cedar (Thuja occidentalis) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the side of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#11 has an asymmetrical canopy. Overall this tree is being suppressed by the adjacent vegetation. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new dwelling, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#12, a 32cm dia. White Spruce (Picea glauca) is a privately-owned evergreen tree growing at the back of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#12 has unhealed pruning cuts and a sparse canopy, with dieback present. Overall the canopy of this tree is considered to be sparse due to the presence of needle cast. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed new dwelling, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry. The condition of this tree should be taken into account when determining the compensation required for its proposed removal.

As a result of the non-hazardous private tree removals, my client is required to plant tree(s) on private property as compensation. The number of compensation trees, the species and planting location of the compensation trees is to be determined in conjunction with the Oakville Urban Forestry department. My client may wish to exercise their option of paying Oakville Urban Forestry the sum of $\$ 300.00$ as cash-in-lieu for any of the compensation trees not planted on their property. Tree protection hoarding/fencing should be installed prior to any demolition or construction activities as outlined on sheets T1- T3.

## BOUNDARY TREES TO BE REMOVED

Trees \#15, \#16 \& \#8N - Permits Required


CODOMINANCE / BARK
INCLUSION / WETWOOD / SEEPAGE


Tree \#15, a 135cm Dia. Silver Maple (Acer saccharinum), is a jointly-owned deciduous tree growing at the back of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#15 is growing along my client's Northern property line and is considered to be partially on town property. This tree is codominant at its base, and is considered to be multi stemmed. These leaders are leaning, with bark inclusion present at this union. This is considered to be a potential water trap. Due to the TPZ of this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed pool and rear yard landscape elements, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Tree \#16, an 83cm Dia. Silver Maple (Acer saccharinum), is a jointly-owned deciduous tree growing at the back of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#16 is growing along my client's Northern property line and is considered to be partially on town property. This tree is codominant, with bark inclusion noted. This is considered to be a potentially weak union. Due to this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed dwelling and the excavation required to construct it, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

It is important to note that Silver Maples (also known as Soft Maples) as a species pose problems as they mature. According to woody plant specialist Michael A. Dirr, Silver Maples, due to their fast growing weak wooded nature become "...a liability with ase" (Dirr; 1998, 52). According to Gary Hightshoe Silver Maples have a "frequent" rating with regards to susceptibility to wind/ice damase due to their "very weak, brittle branches." They are also considered a short-lived tree species "reaching maturity at 50-75 years, rarely beyond 125 years" (1988, 126). Silver Maple trees do not compartmentalize wounds well and future pruning wounds will be vectors for Anthracnose, Verticillium wilt, and Nectria canker. Silver Maple are susceptible to all three.

Tree \#8N, an 18,12cm Dia. White Mullberry (Morus a/ba), is a jointly-owned deciduous tree growing near the side of the property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#8N is growing along my client's Northern property line and is considered to be partially on my client's private property. This tree is codominant, with bark inclusion, seepage and wetwood noted at this union. Therefore this is considered to be a weak union and a structurally compromised point in the tree. In addition, due to the TPZ of this tree being located within the footprint of the excavation required to construct the proposed dwelling and in order to facilitate the proposed works, my client is looking to remove this tree at this time. Therefore an application to remove this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

An application to remove these trees will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry. As a result of these non-hazardous private tree removals, my client is required to plant trees on private and public property as compensation. The number of compensation trees, the species and planting location of the compensation trees is to be determined in conjunction with the Oakville Urban Forestry department. My client may wish to exercise their option of paying Oakville Urban Forestry cash-in-lieu for any of the compensation trees not planted on their property.

Tree protection hoarding/fencing should be installed prior to any demolition or construction activities as outlined on sheets T1- T3.

## BOUNDARY TREES TO BE INJURED

Trees \#4N \& \#6N - Norway Spruces (64 \& 58cm Dia.) - Permits Required


Lakeshore Tree Services Inc.
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Tree \#4N, a 64cm dia. Norway Spruce (Picea abies) is a jointly-owned evergreen tree growing at the front of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#4N is growing along my client's Northern property line and is considered to be partially on town and private property. Therefore this is considered to be a boundary tree. This tree is considered to have an asymmetrical canopy as it is being suppressed by Tree \#6N.

The proposed construction and demolition activities will infringe upon the 4.2m Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of Tree \#4N. Due to the TPZ of this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed front yard landscape elements, my client is looking to injure this tree at this time. Therefore an application to injure this tree will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Specifically, a section of the proposed front yard elements will occur within the TPZ, with the intrusion proposed at a distance of 3.9 m . The encroachment is along the Southwestern section of the TPZ of this tree, consisting of the construction of the proposed water feature. It is important to note that the proposed dwelling and the excavation required to construct it will not occur within the footprint of the TPZ in this area.

Root protection is proposed within the TPZ, in order to limit compaction in this immediate section as this area will provide access to the rear of the property. Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. recommends root and canopy pruning prior to construction along the edge of the disturbance required to facilitate the dwelling and proposed landscape elements.

Tree \#6N, a 58cm dia. Norway Spruce (Picea abies) is a jointly-owned evergreen tree growing at the front of the subject property at 496 Chartwell Road. Tree \#6N is growing along my client's Northem property line and is considered to be partially on town and private property. Therefore this is considered to be a boundary tree. This tree is considered to have an asymmetrical canopy as it is being suppressed by the nearby dwelling.

The proposed construction and demolition activities will infringe upon the 3.6m Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of Tree \#6N. Due to the TPZ of this tree being located within the footprint of the proposed dwelling and front yard landscape elements, my client is looking to injure this tree at this time. Therefore an application to injure Tree \#6N will be submitted to Oakville Urban Forestry.

Specifically, a section of the proposed dwelling and walkway will occur within the TPZ, with the intrusion proposed at a distance of 3.6 m . The encroachment is along the Southwestern section of the TPZ of this tree.

Root protection is proposed within the TPZ, in order to limit compaction in this immediate section as this area will provide access to the rear of the property. Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. recommends root and canopy prunins prior to construction along the edge of the disturbance required to facilitate the dwelling and proposed landscape elements

It is important to note that the root system of Tree \#6N is able to return to the overdig areas, post construction and that the root systems of the trees proposed for removal are dominant in the areas where the greatest impact is proposed to occur.

Overall, to limit the impact that this proposed work will have on Trees \#4N \& \#6N, Lakeshore Tree Senvices Inc. recommends that the proposed work be conducted utilizing hand tools, and under arborist supenvision whenever possible.

Furthermore, Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. recommends "deep root feeding" fertilization in as large an area as possible within the TPZ of Trees \#4N \& \#6N. The fertilizer should be low in nitrogen and high in phosphorous in order to promote new root growth to compensate for any root loss during construction.

Overall, to limit the impact that this proposed work will have on these trees, Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. recommends that hoarding be installed as outlined on sheet T1, and that the driveway removal work in this section be conducted last, once materials, personnel and waste due to the construction of the proposed dwelling is concluded. This work should be conducted utilizing hand tools, and under arborist supervision.

Tree protection hoarding/fencing should be installed prior to demolition or construction activities, as outlined on sheets T1- T3.

## GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are given to maximize the health and protection of all trees near construction:

1. No groundbreaking activities or demolition of existing dwelling should occur until all tree preservation requirements have been met. Of primary concern is the erection of proper hoarding to establish the tree protection zones (TPZ).
2. An Arborist should be consulted for all site work that impacts the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ).
3. Roots should be cut cleanly by a Certified Arborist.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TREES PROPOSED TO BE INJURED

The following recommendations are given for the trees that are proposed to be injured in the interest of maximizing their health and longevity.

1. Fertilize via "deep root feeding" as large an area as possible within the TPZ of these trees. The fertilizer should be low in nitrogen and high in phosphorous in order to promote new root growth to compensate for any root loss during construction. Ideally this work would occur prior to injury, however it can be done post-injury.
2. Following construction mulch the base of these trees with 75 mm of composted wood chips (free of disease and dyes) as large an area as possible within the TPZ of these trees.

## LIMITATIONS OF ASSESSMENTS

It is the policy of Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. to attach the following clause in regards to limitations. This is to ensure that the client is fully aware of what is technically and professionally realistic in the preservation and assessment of trees in the urban environment.

The assessment of the trees in this report has been done in conjunction with and according to accepted arboriculture methods and techniques. These include an examination of the above ground parts of the tree for structural defects, scars, cracks, the overall condition of the root structures, the severity and direction of lean (if any), the general condition of the trees and the surrounding environment, external indications of decay such as fungal fruiting bodies, evidence of attack by insects, symptoms of infestation and pathogens, discoloured foliage, and the proximity of potential targets should a tree fail. Except where specifically noted, the trees were not cored, probed or climbed and there was no detailed inspection of the root crowns involving excavations, or samples taken to be scientifically tested.

Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions presented in this report, it must be acknowledged that trees are living organisms. They are not immune to changes in site conditions, dramatic weather events or seasonal variations in climate. Therefore it should always be recognized that trees are ever evolving and their health and vigour constantly vary over time. While all reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the subject trees are healthy, no suarantees are offered or implied that these trees or part(s) of any trees will remain intact.

It is professionally and practically impossible to predict with absolute certainty the behaviour of any tree or its component parts under all circumstances and variables. Most trees have the potential for failure under adverse weather conditions and the risk can only be completely eliminated if the tree is removed. Inherently, a standing tree will always pose some level of risk. Although every effort has been made to ensure that this assessment is reasonably accurate, trees should be re-assessed periodically. The assessment presented in this report is valid at the time of inspection.

This report is property of Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. and/or its agents and may not be used until payment is made in full unless written permission is granted. Lakeshore Tree Services Inc. reserves the right to withdraw this report and its recommendations, if any requirements are not met. All details and graphics are copyright of Lakeshore Tree Services Inc.

## On behalf of Lakeshore Tree Services Inc.



Sebastian Bravo, Certified Arborist ISA ON-1852A


| Tree \# | Common Name | Botanical Name | Dia. (cm) | R.z. | т.. | c.s. | c.v. | Categor | TPZ (m) | Comments | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | cedar | Thuid occidentalis | 20,20 | F | F | F | F | 1 | 2.4 | Client's tree, codominant at base, deformed trunk, unhealed pruning cuts, epicormic shoots, growing close to property line | preserve |
| 02 | White Spruce | Picea sluca | ${ }^{24}$ | F | G | F | F | 1 | 2.4 | Client's tree, growing close to property line, asymmetrical canopy, leaning, suppressed by adjacent vegetation | preserve |
| 03 | White Spuce | Picea slauca | 29 | F | G | F | F | 1 | 2.4 | Asymentrical canopy, leaning, suppressed by adjacent vegetation | preserve |
| 04 | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | ${ }^{38}$ | F | G | F | F | 1 | 3.0 | Assmmetrical canopy, suppressed by adiacent vegetation | Remove (P) |
| 05 | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | 32 | F | ${ }^{6}$ | F | F | 1 | 3.0 | Sparse canopy, suppressed by adjacent vegetation | REMOVE (P) |
| ${ }_{0} 0$ | Norway Spruce | Picea ables | 32 | F | F | F | F | 1 | 3.0 | Sparse canopy, leaning, suppressed by adiacent vegetation | Remove (P) |
| 07 | Norway Spruce | Picea ables | 27 | F | G | F | F | 1 | 2.4 | Assmmetrical canopy, suppressed by adjacent vegetation | Remove (P) |
| ${ }^{08}$ | cedar | Thui occidentals | 19,19 | F | F | F | F | 1 | 2.4 | Codominant at base, leaning leaders, usppressed by adjacent vegetation | Remove (P) |
| 09 | cedar | Thuia occidentalis | ${ }^{28}$ | F | F | F | F | 1 | 3.0 | Codominant, mutt stemmed, leaning leaders, suppressed [18,16,14] | Remove (P) |
| 10 | cedar | Thuid occidentals | ${ }^{37}$ | F | F | F | F | 1 | 3.0 | Assmmetrical canopy, suppressed by adiacent vegetation | Remove (P) |
| 11 | cedar | Thuid occidental/s | ${ }^{28}$ | F | F | F | F | 1 | 2.4 | Assmmetrical canopy, suppressed by adjacent vegetation | REMOVE (P) |
| 12 | White Spruce | Picea sluca | 32 | F | G | F | F | 1 | 3.0 | Sparse canopy, dieback, needle cast, unhealed pruning cuts | Remove (P) |
| 13 | White Spruce | Picea slauca | ${ }^{20}$ | F | G | P | P | 1 | 2.4 | Neeclie cast, sparse canopy, in decine | preserve |
| 14 | White Spruce | Picea slauca | ${ }^{27}$ | F | G | P | P | 1 | 2.4 | Neeclie cast, sparse canopy, in decine | preserve |
| 15 | Silver Maple | Acersacchasinum | 135 | F | F | F | F | 185 | 13.5 | Multi stemmed, codominant at base, leaning leaders, bark inclusion, water trap, weak union, candidate for cabling, dieback | Remove (P) |
| 16 | Siver Maple | Acerssacchasinum | ${ }^{83}$ | F | F | F | F | 125 | 5.4 | Codominant, bark inclusion, potentilly weak union | REMOVE (P) |
| ${ }^{1 \times}$ | White Ash | fraxinus americana | 36 | F | G | F | F | 5 | 3.0 | Town tree, treated for EAB affiction | preserve |
| ${ }^{2 N}$ | White Mulleeny | Morus alba | 16 | F | F | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Codominant, mutis stemmed, leaning leaders, suppressed [18,16,14] | preseve |
| 3 N | White Spruce | Picea sluca | ${ }^{24}$ | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree, srowing close to property line | preseve |
| 4 N | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | 64 | F | G | F | F | 145 | 4.2 | Boundary tree, suppressed, asymmetrical canopy | INURY (P) |
| ${ }_{5 N}$ | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | 51 | F | G | F | F | 5 | 3.6 | Town tree, planted on a slope | preserve |
| ${ }^{6 N}$ | Norway Spruce | Picea ables | ${ }^{58}$ | F | G | F | F | 125 | 3.6 | Boundary tree, overhanging existing dwelling | INUXY (P) |
| N | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | 32 | F | G | F | G | 5 | 3.0 | Town tree, planted on a slope | preserve |
| ${ }^{8 N}$ | White Mullberry | Morus alba | 18,12 | F | P | G | G | 185 | 2.4 | Boundary tree, invasive species, codominance, seepage, weak union | REmove (P) |
| ${ }^{\text {N }}$ | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | 32 | F | G | G | G | 5 | 3.0 | Town tree, planted on a slope | preserve |
| 10 N | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | 32 | F | G | G | G | 5 | 3.0 | Town tree, planted on a slope | preserve |
| 11N | Norway Spruce | Picea abies | ${ }^{28}$ | F | G | G | G | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree, planted on a slope | preserve |
| 1 E | White Spruce | Picea sluca | 21 | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree, suppressed by adicent vegetation | preserve |
| ${ }^{2 E}$ | White Spruce | Picea sluca | ${ }^{22}$ | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree, suppressed by adjicent vegetation | preseve |
| 3 E | White Spruce | Piceas sluca | 32 | F | G | F | F | 5 | 3.0 | Town tree | preserve |
| 4 E | White Spruce | Piceas sluca | ${ }^{33}$ | F | G | F | F | 5 | 3.0 | Boundary tree, asymetrical canopy | preserve |
| 15 | White Spruce | Picea Sluyca | ${ }^{20}$ | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree | preserve |
| 25 | White Spruce | Piceas sluca | 16 | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree | preserve |
| 35 | White Spruce | Picea sluuca | 15 | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree | preserve |
| 45 | White Spruce | Piceas sluca | 22 | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree | preserve |
| 55 | White Spruce | Piceas sluca | 12 | F | G | F | F | 1\%2 | 2.4 | Boundary tree | preserve |
| 65 | White Spruce | Picea sluca | 17 | F | G | F | F | 182 | 2.4 | Boundary tree | preseve |
| 75 | White Spruce | Picea sluca | ${ }^{22}$ | F | G | F | F | 1\&2 | 2.4 | Boundary tree | preserve |
| ${ }_{5}$ | White Spruce | Picea sluca | 18 | F | G | F | F | 122 | 2.4 | Boundar tree | preserve |
| 95 | White Spruce | Picea sluuca | ${ }^{23}$ | F | G | F | F | 1\%2 | 2.4 | Boundary tree | preserve |
| 105 | White Spruce | Picea slauca | 20 | F | G | F | F | 1\%2 | 2.4 | Boundar tree | preseve |
| 115 | Siver Maple | Acer sacchasinum | 65 | F | F | F | F | 2 | 4.2 | Neighbour's tree | preserve |
| ${ }^{1 w}$ | Austrian Pine | Pinus nigra | ${ }^{47}$ | F | F | F | F | 5 | 3.0 | Town tree, planted on a slope, codominance | preserve |
| ${ }^{2 w}$ | Black Walut | Justans nigra | ${ }^{24}$ | F | G | F | F | 5 | 2.4 | Town tree, growing on a slope | preserve |
| ${ }^{3 \%}$ | Black Locust | Robinia pseudoacacia | 31 | F | F | F | F | 5 | 3.0 | Town tree, growing on a slope, mutt stemmed | preserve |

## preserve - tree proposed to be preserved, not being injured or removed

NUURY (P) - tree proposed to be injured - permit requil
remove - tree to be removed - no permit reauired
REMOVE (P) - tree proposed to be removed - permit reauired
Tree $\#$. tris number refers to the number on the tree assessment and plat. - Only the last three numbers on the tree tag are efeferenced
species
the commen
Secies - ne common name and botanical name for each tree are provided
Diameter - refers to diameter (in centimeters) measured at 1.4 m above finished
and




4. Trees of al diameters stivated within lands sdesignated under citiv of Oavkivieref Ravine Protection.


## SCHEDULE 1 <br> TREE PROTECTION BARRIER

## OAKVILLE



## Tree Protection Barriers

PLWOOD
(1) Tree protection barriers must be 1.2 m (4ft) high, waferboard hoarding or an equivalent approved by Urban Forestry Services.
(2) Tree protection barriers for trees situated on the Town road allowance where visibility must be maintained can be 1.2 m ( 4 ft .) high and consist of plastic web snow fencing on a wood frame made of 2 "x 4 "s .
(3) Where some excavate or fill has to be temporarily located near a tree protection barrier, plywood must be used to ensure no material enters the Tree Protection Zone.
(4) All supports and bracing should be outside the Tree Protection Zone. All such supports should minimize damaging roots outside the Tree Protection Barrier.
(5) No construction activity, grade changes, surface treatment or excavations of any kind is permitted within the Tree Protection Zone.

## Lakeshore Tree Services Inc

1011 Upper Middle Road E. Suite 1550
Oakville ON L6H 5 Z9 905-407-5253
lakeshoretreeservices@gmail.com
Doxtatec
496 CHARTWELL RD.
OAKVILLE, ON
L6J 4A5
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| :---: | :---: |
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