# Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report
# 517 Plains Road East
# Burlington, Ontario

prepared for

**BryDec Development Inc.**
**3324 Guelph Line**
**Burlington, Ontario L7P 0S7**

prepared by

KUNTZ
FORESTRY
CONSULTING Inc.

PO Box 1267 Lakeshore W PO
146 Lakeshore Road West
Oakville ON L6K 0B3
289.837.1871
www.kuntzforestry.ca
consult@kuntzforestry.ca

27 January 2026

KUNTZ FORESTRY CONSULTING INC. Project P4913

## Introduction

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. (KFCI) was retained by BryDec Development Inc. to complete a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report as part of a development application for the subject property located at 517 Plains Road East in the City of Burlington, Ontario. The subject properties are located on the north side of Plains Road East, west of Joan Drive.

The work plan for this tree preservation study included the following:

- Prepare an inventory of the tree resources measuring 10cm diameter at breast height (DBH) and greater on and within six metres of the subject property and trees of all sizes within the road right-of-way;
- Evaluate potential tree saving opportunities based on proposed development plans, and;
- Document the findings in a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report.

The results of the evaluation are provided below.

## Policy Framework

The City of Burlington By-law 68-2013 (Public Tree By-law) applies to trees of all sizes located on public property, including within the road right-of-way.

The City of Burlington By-law 40-2022 (Private Tree By-law) applies to trees located within the Urban Planning Boundary that are 20cm DBH and greater.

## Methodology

Trees greater than 10cm DBH on and within six metres of the subject property and all trees of all sizes within the road right-of-way were included in the tree inventory. Trees were located using a topographic survey provided for the subject property, aerial imagery, and estimations made from known points in the field. Trees included in the inventory were identified as 1-6.

Individual tree resources were visually assessed for condition utilizing the following parameters:

**Tree #** – Number assigned to trees that corresponds to Figure 1.
**Species** – Common and botanical names provided in the inventory table.
**DBH** – Diameter (cm) at breast height, measured at 1.4m above the ground.
**Condition** – Condition of tree considering trunk integrity (TI), crown structure (CS) and crown vigor (CV). Condition ratings include poor (P), fair (F), and good (G).
**Crown Dieback** – Percentage of dead branches within the crown.
**Dripline** – Crown radius (m).
**Comments** – Any other relevant tree condition information.

## Existing Site Conditions

The subject property is currently occupied by two motel buildings, asphalt parking pad, and associated amenity areas. Tree resources exist in the form of landscape trees and self-seeded volunteers. Refer to Figure 1 for the existing site conditions.

## Individual Tree Resources

The tree inventory was conducted on 8 January 2026. The inventory documented six trees on and adjacent to the subject property and within the road right-of-way. Refer to Table 1 for the results of the tree inventory and Figure 1 for the locations of the trees included in the tree inventory. Refer to Appendix A for photographs of the trees.

Tree resources were comprised of Norway Maple (*Acer platanoides*), Silver Maple (*Acer saccharinum*), Crabapple (*Malus spp*.), and Siberian Elm (*Ulmus pumila*).

## Proposed Development

The proposed development includes the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of a 11-storey mixed use building with underground parking. Refer to Figure 1 for the proposed site plan.

## Discussion

The following sections provide a discussion and analysis of tree impacts and tree preservation relative to the proposed development and existing conditions.

*Development Impacts / Tree Removal*

The removal of Tree 2, a 58.8cm Norway Maple, will be required to accommodate the proposed development. Shoring for the underground parking will occur at 1.5m from the base of Tree 2 and its preservation is not possible. Tree 2 is located within the city road right-of-way and a permit from the City of Burlington is required prior to its removal. Refer to Figure 1 for the location of required tree removals.

*Tree Preservation*

The preservation of the remaining five trees, including Trees 1 and 3-6, will be possible with the use of appropriate tree protection measures as indicated on Figure 1.

*Tree 1*

Encroachment into the minimum Tree Protection Zone (mTPZ) of Tree 1, a 35cm Crabapple, is required to accommodate the proposed development. Shoring for the underground parking will be required at 2m from the base of Tree 1 (at the property line). The following mitigation measures must be implemented to ensure the trees respond well to the impacts of the proposed development.

- Prior to the proposed development, tree preservation fence must be installed as indicated on Figure 1. On the south side of Tree 1, tree preservation fence must be installed along the existing concrete sidewalk.
- Excavation on the top 60m from the surface within the mTPZ of Tree 1 should be completed using a low-pressure hydro vac or air spade excavation methods.
- Exposed roots should be pruned by a Certified Arborist in accordance with Good Arboricultural Standards.

- Excavation below 60m from the surface can be completed using shoring machines.

*Tree 3*

Tree 3 is located at the northeastern corner of the subject property. As the existing building occupies up to the property boundary, the tree should have minimal roots growing into the subject property. Given that the extent of the proposed underground parking will be smaller than the extent of the existing building, the development should have minimal impacts on the tree. Its crown is already pruned back to the property line due to overhead utility wires. The following mitigation measures must be implemented to ensure the trees respond well to the impacts of the proposed development.

- Prior to the proposed development, tree preservation fence must be installed along the property line as indicated on Figure 1.
- The existing building should be carefully pulled away from the tree.
- Excavation for the new underground parking should not past the foundation of the existing building.
- No crown pruning will be required to accommodate the proposed development.

Refer to Figure 1 for the location of required tree preservation fencing, general Tree Protection Plan Notes, and tree preservation fence details.

## Summary and Recommendations

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. was retained by BryDec Development Inc. to complete a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report as part of a development application for the subject property located at 517 Plains Road East in the City of Burlington, Ontario. A tree inventory was conducted and reviewed in the context of the proposed site plan.

The findings of the study indicate a total of six trees on and adjacent to the subject property. The removal of one tree will be required to accommodate the proposed development. The remaining five trees can be saved with the use of appropriate tree protection measures, as outlined in Figure 1.

The following recommendations are suggested to minimize impacts to trees identified for preservation. Refer to Figure 1 for tree preservation fencing locations, general Tree Protection Plan Notes, and tree preservation fence details.

- Tree protection barriers and fencing should be erected at locations as prescribed on Figure 1. All tree protection measures should follow the guidelines as set out in the tree preservation plan notes and the tree preservation fencing detail.

- No construction activity including surface treatments, excavations of any kind, storage of materials or vehicles, unless specifically outlined above, is permitted within the area identified on Figure 1 as a tree protection zone (TPZ) at any time during or after construction.

- Branches and roots that extend beyond prescribed tree protection zones that require pruning must be pruned by a qualified Arborist or other tree professional. All pruning of tree roots and branches must be in accordance with Good Arboricultural Standards.

- Site visits pre, during, and post construction are recommended by either a certified consulting arborist (I.S.A.) or registered professional forester (R.P.F.) to ensure proper utilization of tree protection barriers. Trees should also be inspected for damage incurred during construction to ensure appropriate pruning or other measures are implemented.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc.

Kaho Hayashi

Kaho Hayashi, B.Sc., M.Sc.F.
Senior Forest Ecologist, Consulting Arborist
ISA Certified Arborist #ON-2153A
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
Tree Appraisal Certified
Tel: 289-837-1871 ext. 103
Cell: 647-278-8857
Email: kaho.hayashi@kuntzforestry.ca

*Limitations of Assessment*

*Only the tree(s) identified in this report were included in the inventory. The assessment of the trees presented in this report has been made using accepted arboricultural techniques. These may include a visual examination taken from the ground of all the above-ground parts of the tree for structural defects, scars, external indications of decay such as fungal fruiting bodies, evidence of attack by insects, discoloured foliage, the condition of any visible root structures, the degree of lean (if any), the general condition of the trees and the identification of potentially hazardous trees or recommendations for removal (if applicable). Where trees could not be directly accessed (ie. due to obstructions, and/or on neighbouring properties), trees were assessed as accurately as possible from nearby vantage points.*

*Locations of trees provided in the report are determined as accurately as possible based on the best information available. If official survey information is not provided, tree location in the report may not be exact. In this case, if trees occur on or near property boundaries, an official site survey may be required to determine ownership utilizing specialized survey protocol to gain precise location.*

*Furthermore, recommendations made in this report are based on the site plans that have been provided at the time of reporting. These recommendations may no longer be applicable should changes be made to the site plan and/or grading, servicing, or landscaping plans following report submission.*

*Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions made in this report, it must be recognized that trees are living organisms, and their health and vigor constantly change over time. They are not immune to changes in site conditions or seasonal variations in the weather conditions. Any tree will fail if the forces applied to the tree exceed the strength of the tree or its parts.*

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

## Table 1. Tree Inventory

Location: 517 Plains Road East, Burlington Date: 8 January 2026 Surveyor: KH

| Tree # | Common Name | Scientific Name | DBH | TI | CS | CV | S/H Rating | CDB | DL | mTPZ | Encr. mTPZ (%) | CRZ | Encr. mTPZ (%) | Comments | Owner | Action |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Crabapple | *Malus spp.* | 35 | F/G | G | F/G | F/G | | 3.5 | 2.4 | 23 | 4.0 | 32 | Co-dominance at 2.5m, pruning wounds (L), bow (L) to south, epicormic branches (M) | City | Injure |
| 2 | Norway Maple | *Acer platanoides* | 58.5 | F/G | G | F | F | | 5.0 | 3.6 | 8 | 6.0 | 26 | Union at 2.5m with 5 stems, pruning wounds (L) with rot | City | Remove |
| 3 | Siberian Elm | *Ulmus pumila* | ~65, 40, 35 | P/F | F | F | P/F | 20 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 25 | 9.0 | 28 | Union at base and 2m with 3 stems but 1stem cut, 1stem topped at 4m, pruning wounds (M) with rot due to overhead utility wires, broken branches (M), dead branches (L) | Neighbour | Injure |
| 4 | Norway Maple | *Acer platanoides* | ~28 | F | F | F | F | | 3.0 | 2.4 | 0 | 4.0 | 6 | Pruning wounds (M) due to overhead utility wires | Neighbour | Preserve |
| 5 | Norway Maple | *Acer platanoides* | ~35 | F | P/F | F | P/F | | 3.0 | 2.4 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 | Fence inclusion (H) at base, union at 16mm, lean (L), pruning wounds (M) due to overhead utility wires | Neighbour | Preserve |
| 6 | Silver Maple | *Acer saccharinum* | ~80 | F/G | G | F/G | F/G | | 7.0 | 4.8 | 2 | 8.0 | 13 | Bow (L) to east, multi-stems, one stem has lean (M) over subject property then cut at property line | Neighbour | Injure |

| Codes | | |
|---|---|---|
| DBH | Diameter at Breast Height | (cm) |
| TI | Trunk Integrity | (G, F, P) |
| CS | Crown Structure | (G, F, P) |
| CV | Crown Vigor | (G, F, P) |
| S/H Rating | Structural / Health Rating | (G, F, P) |
| CDB | Crown Dieback | (%) |
| mTPZ | Minimum Tree Protection Zone, as measured from edge of tree | (m) |
| Encr. mTPZ | Amount of Encroachment into the Minimum Tree Protection Zone | (%) |
| CRZ | Critical Root Zone | (m) |
| Encr. CRZ | Amount of Encroachment into the Critical Root Zone | (%) |
| Owner | Ownership of Tree | City, Subject Property, Neighbouring Property |
| P = poor, F = fair, G = good, ~ = estimate, (VL) = very light, (L) = light, (M) = moderate, (H) = heavy | | |

## Appendix A: Site Photographs



Image 1. Tree 1


Image 2. Tree 2



Image 3. Tree 3



Image 4. Trees 4 (right)) and 5



Image 5. Tree 5 (view from east)




Image 6. Tree 5 – view from north