Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report
1056 and 1060 Brant Street
Burlington, Ontario

prepared for

Samuel Mandelbaum
1056 and 1060 Brant Street
Burlington, Ontario L7R 2J9

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

12 May 2025, revised 22 October 2025

KUNTZ FORESTRY CONSULTING INC. Project P4638

Introduction

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. (KFCI) was retained by Samuel Mandelbaum to complete a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report as part of a development application for the subject properties located at 1056 and 1060 Brant Street in the City of Burlington, Ontario. The subject properties are located on the north side of Brant Street, south of Queen Elizabeth Way.

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 properties 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 properties 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 Trees 1-9.

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 properties are currently vacant properties. All structures above ground were demolished. 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 5 May 2025. The inventory documented nine trees on and adjacent to the subject properties 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 Freeman Maple (*Acer x freemanii*), Green Ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), Eastern Cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), Willow Species (*Salix spp*.), and Siberian Elm (*Ulmus pumila*).

Trees 5 and 9 are snags cut at 4m from the ground and only coppice growth alive.

Proposed Development

The proposed development includes the construction of a 11-storey residential building with underground parking. Shoring for the proposed underground parking is required at the property boundary. 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 Trees 2-4 (3 trees) will be required to accommodate the proposed development. As they are located along the property boundary and their preservation is not possible due to the proposed shoring for the underground parking. Refer to Figure 1 for the locations of the required tree removals.

Tree Preservation

The preservation of the remaining six trees, including Trees 1 and 5-9 will be possible with the use of appropriate tree protection measures as indicated on Figure 1.

Tree 1

The existing asphalt driveway within the mTPZ of Tree 1 will be removed. Tree preservation fence for Tree 1 must be installed along the edge of the existing asphalt. After the demolition of the asphalt, the area can be amended using high-quality topsoil.

Trees 5 and 9

Trees 5 and 9 are snag with 3-4m tall with coppice growth. Given that more than 75% of wood and crown are lost, it is not realistic to provide the full-sized minimum Tree Protection Zone (mTPZ). Instead, dripline is used as a tree protection area. The existing fence along the property boundary will suffice as tree preservation fence for Trees 5 and 9. If the removal of the fence is required, the installation of tree preservation fencing will be required at the same location. Refer

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

Trees 6-8

Trees 6-8 are located at 1.8m west of the property line, on adjacent property. Shoring for the proposed development is required at the property boundary. Given that 1.8m protection will be sufficient for Trees 6-8, all are 12-17cm DBH, the existing fence along the property line will suffice as tree preservation fence. If the removal of the fence is required, the installation of tree preservation fencing will be required at the same location. 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 Samuel Mandelbarum to complete a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report as part of a development application for the subject properties located at 1056 and 1060 Brant Street 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 nine trees on and adjacent to the subject properties. The removal of three trees will be required to accommodate the proposed development. The remaining six 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
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: 1056 and 1060 Brant Street, Burlington Date: 5 May 2025 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	Siberian Elm	*Ulmus pumila*	16, 11, 10	F-G	G	F-G	F-G		1.5	2.4	12	4.0	18	Union at base and 0.6m with included bark (M)	City	Preserve
2	Green Ash	*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*	10.5	P	P	P	P	75	1.0	2.4	50	4.0	50	Grape vine competition (M)	Private/ Neighbour	Remove
3	Eastern Cottonwood	*Populus deltoides*	19	G	G	G	G		1.0	2.4	50	4.0	50	Sweep (L), grape vine competition (L)	Private/ Neighbour	Remove
4	Green Ash	*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*	13	P	P	P	P	90	1.0	2.4	50	4.0	50	Dead except a few lower branches	Private/ Neighbour	Remove
5	Willow species	*Salix spp.*	~90	P	P	P-F	P	80	2.5	-	-	-	-	Main stem cut at 4m, coppice growth (H)	Neighbour	Preserve
6	Freeman Maple	*Acer x freemanii*	~17	G	G	G	G		1.5	2.4	10	4.0	25		Neighbour	Preserve
7	Freeman Maple	*Acer x freemanii*	~12	G	G	G	G		1.5	2.4	10	4.0	25		Neighbour	Preserve
8	Freeman Maple	*Acer x freemanii*	~14	G	G	G	G		1.5	2.4	10	4.0	25		Neighbour	Preserve
9	Willow species	*Salix spp.*	~60	P	P	P-F	P	75	3.0	-	-	-	-	Main stem cut at 4m, coppice growth (H), broken branches (H)	Neighbour	Preserve

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)
CDB	Crown Dieback	(%)
S/H Rating	Structural / Health Rating	(%)
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. View from southeast corner



Image 2. Tree 1



Image 3. Trees 2 (right) and 3



Image 4. Tree 4



Image 5. Tree 5



Image 6. Trees along western perimeters



Image 7. Tree 6



Image 8. Tree 7



Image 9. Tree 8



Image 10. Tree 9



Image 11. Trees along western perimeter