

# **Trees and Forests Advisory Committee**

## **Report**

7th Meeting of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee  
July 25, 2018  
Committee Room #3

Attendance                   PRESENT: G. Mitchell (Acting Chair); T. Khan, A. Meilutis, A. Morrison, N. St. Amour, M. Szabo, S. Teichert and R. Walker and J. Bunn (Acting Secretary)

ABSENT: C. Haindl, J. Koelheide, C. Linton and R. Mannella

ALSO PRESENT: A. Beaton, J. Ramsay, S. Rowland and J. Spence

The meeting was called to order at 12:15 PM.

### **1. Call to Order**

#### 1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

### **2. Scheduled Items**

#### 2.1 Boulevard Tree Protection By-law Update

That it BE NOTED that a verbal update from J. Spence, Manager, Urban Forestry, with respect to the Boulevard Tree Protection By-law, was received.

### **3. Consent**

#### 3.1 6th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee

That it BE NOTED that the 6th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on June 27, 2018, was received.

#### 3.2 Highbury Avenue/Hamilton Road Intersection Improvements - Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Completion, from B. Huston, Dillon Consulting Limited and M. Elmadhoon, City of London, with respect to the Highbury Avenue/Hamilton Road Intersection Improvements Environmental Assessment Study, was received.

### **4. Sub-Committees and Working Groups**

#### 4.1 (ADDED) Parks and Recreation Master Plan Working Group

That the Civic Administration BE ADVISED of the following comments from the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee with respect to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan:

- it should be ensured that trees continue to populate the City of London as it is “The Forest City” and more trees should be planted in shared recreation spaces;
- it is recommended that a shade policy be created as a task item and implemented under the Parks and Recreation Master Plan;

- selective tree species should be planted in parks and recreation areas to assist with safer shaded areas;
- older trees should be kept and maintained as much as possible and all trees should be properly maintained (watering, trimming, etc.);
- citizens of the City of London should be engaged with respect to what is being done to protect and encourage trees and forests in their area;
- tree-related communities (i.e., ReForest London) should be allowed to use parks and recreation facilities to hold events;
- the Parks and Recreation Master Plan should explicitly recognize the importance of park spaces play in the local environment and that park spaces should be designed in such a way as to enhance the environmental benefits they offer; and,
- it is recommended that a Naturalization Policy be included as a task item under the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

#### 4.2 (ADDED) Tree Protection By-law Working Group

That the Civic Administration BE ADVISED of the following comments of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee with respect to the City of London Tree Protection By-law:

- there should be a standardized form as part of the application package for both the “Arborist Report” and the “Arborist Opinion”;
- the by-law should include a minimum canopy target of 51% of irreversible die back;
- the definition of “Pest” should be revised to include an infestation causing detrimental and irreversible damage to the direct health of a tree;
- the distinctive tree size should be reduced to 25 cm for a permit;
- the definition of “Replacement Tree” should be revised to clarify that “native” is required and that “shade” and “large growing tree” are synonymous;
- golf courses should be added to the exemption list in Section 5 of the by-law; and,
- wildlife values and interests within a tree should be considered more carefully with respect to provincial and federal Acts and Regulations and tied back to the by-law process to ensure a consistent approach;

it being noted that the attached communication from the Tree Protection By-law Working Group, with respect to this matter, was received.

#### 5. **Items for Discussion**

None.

#### 6. **Deferred Matters/Additional Business**

None.

#### 7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:56 PM.

## 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.