

## Official Recommendations for City of London Tree Protection By-law

1. Standardized form as part of the application package for both the “Arborist Report” and “Arborist Opinion”

REASONING: Make the application process more streamlined and accessible for applicants and city staff reviewing application package material.

2. Include a minimum canopy target of irreversible die back within the by-law

REASONING: Give arborists an acceptable and standardized target for reports and opinions.

3. Review the definition of “Pest” to include an infestation causing detrimental and irreversible damage to the direct health of a tree

REASONING: Many trees can become “infested” with aphids and other “pests” that do not impact the overall long term health of the tree, and just cause physical appearance to change.

4. Review “Replacement Tree” definition to clarify “native” is required, and “shade or large growing tree” are synonymous.
  - a. \*\*\* Should the distinctive tree size recommendation go forward (25cm), the replacement definition should be altered to

REASONING: As the by-law currently reads, native appears independent from shade or large growing tree, and doesn’t give the impression it is mandatory.

5. Golf courses be added to the exemption list

REASONING: Golf courses currently manage trees on a “required removal for safety” rational, and many do not have the resources to include replacement programs, nor do they want to increase forest density. Overall, the forest cover across the City on golf course land is not significant to raise concern about overall large scale canopy loss.

6. Reduce distinctive tree size to 25cm for a permit (=14% of trees protected in London compared to the current 4% with 50cm diameter)

REASONING: At current 50cm diameter standards, 4% of trees in the City of London are protected under this bylaw. Changing protection to 25cm diameter increases the protection of trees to 14%, and encompasses a greater species diversity.

7. Adding Species at Risk Act (Ontario 2004) to section 8.3 (including other wildlife in the tree), or consider removing other specific provincial legislation and speak generally to halting work when wildlife are present.

REASONING: Select provincial legislation is included (Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994), but does not encompass all potential wildlife issues that are addressed at the provincial level.