



"CARING FOR LONDON & AREA SINCE 1988"

To whom this may concern,

We've been retained by the residents of Lambeth Ave and Highway Ave to provide a 3rd party opinion on the city owned trees of both streets. Our clients have concerns about the number of trees being removed or scheduled to be removed, and the reasoning behind the removals.

I regularly do pre-construction consulting for several engineering firms in London and have an extensive background in tree removals and trimming for infrastructure projects.

Our clients were able to provide some documentation for me to work with, however a site visit is required with the engineer in charge of the project, their consulting arborist, and a forestry department manager to explore options of trees that could be retained based on my findings.

I inspected every tree that is left on Highway Ave, as Davey tree has already removed the majority of trees on this street. I also inspected all trees on Lambeth Ave that are going to be impacted by the construction project. A full comprehensive report has not been provided in order to keep my billing's minimal for the residents. I have provided my findings at the end of this letter.

As a certified arborist I found the provided report to be contradictory in certain locations where trees that are to be retained show the same defects and abnormalities as trees that are to be removed and vice versa.

When I am consulting for pre-construction I have the ability to work directly with the engineer designing the project to bounce ideas back and forth. In this case our services are being utilized in a reactive situation, and this makes it difficult to reach out for any information from the engineer in charge.

All opinions in this report are from an unbiased standpoint and are strictly my professional opinions as an ISA certified arborist.

We would like to have a one hour meeting onsite to discuss my findings, and explore some options that may save some of the trees on these streets. After the site meeting it will be easier for me to explain to the residents why any given tree must be removed even if it doesn't show any defects or abnormalities and doesn't present any immediate liability.

We are hoping that by working together we can come to a logical resolution to retain some of the trees that are listed for removal, and put the local resident's minds at ease during this sensitive project.

Regards,
Calvin McCallum, Co-Owner
ISA certified arborist ON1295-A

7024 KERR RD, LONDON ON N6N 1C5 ~ 519-685-0257 ~ INFO@CLCTREESERVICES.COM



"CARING FOR LONDON & AREA SINCE 1988"

LIST OF FINDINGS

Highway Ave

19 Highway

Crack in trunk and 1/2 canopy loss from soil born pathogen that was ramped last year in Norway Maples.

Why wasn't it removed

27

Twisting trunk crack from ground to approximately 4m ending at branch union.

Likely girdled roots and heavy soil compaction.

Why wasn't it removed

49

Girdling roots with some die back.

No liabilities present and less structural defects than previously mentioned trees that are being retained.

Active bird nest in small cavity over driveway.

If ecological sewer or bit survey was completed, which is legally required from April 1st to august 31st due to migratory bird act which is a federal law.

If we were contracted to do the tree removals we would have provided this before commencing any tree work.

61

Norway maple

Sub surface girdling roots on east side of trunk.

Main trunk union has included bark and weak attachment point.

Easy limb is likely to fail.

Weight reduction on east portion of tree will limit the amount of stress on the union and tree could likely be retained, but based on

trees that are to be removed due to liability, I'm not sure why this wasn't mentioned.



"CARING FOR LONDON & AREA SINCE 1988"

Highway Ave, continued

243 Edward St

Norway maple at garage.

Major girdling roots and exposed root plate.

Tree is heavily weighted over road way due to hydro trimming.

Branches over road way will need major trimming to allow access for excavators and there will be minimal canopy retained.

Not sure why the tree is being retained.

56

Obvious removal due to fruiting fungal bodies at main branch unions.

Pheasant back mushroom.

Lambeth Ave

16 retainable

What is the construction conflict exactly and is there any other options.

Site meeting required

19

Basswood sp.

Large trunk crack leading to main union with included bark and structural defects.

Poses liability to public.

Was this noted or any remediation options given? Otherwise should be removed if not willing to cable and brace.

21 retainable

What is the conflict? Site meeting required

Tree has defects but shows no immediate liability.



"CARING FOR LONDON & AREA SINCE 1988"

Lambeth Ave. continued

24 retainable?

Upon further inspection, deep cavity present at first branch union. Could pose liability.
Removal required

27 retainable

What is the conflict? Site meeting required

We remediation or other options given in attempt to save the tree?

28

basal defects and abnormalities present liability. Removal required.

38

Tip die back

Obvious trunk and root flare defects.

Thick layer of grass at base of tree indicating internal rot that ants and other insects are tunneling through.

Not sure why it is to be retained? Poses liability and will cost more to the city to move PDC's etc.

42

What is the conflict? Site meeting required

Limited defects, and healthy canopy.

Are there any options to retain?

45

What is the conflict? Site meeting required.

Yes it is perched high, but not posing risk of failure.

Regular arboricultural maintenance will limit sail effect in canopy.

Are there options to retain

48

Major defect at trunk flare.

Large girdling roots

Multiple main branches from same trunk location.

Poses limited liability but likely won't live a long full life.



"CARING FOR LONDON & AREA SINCE 1988"

Lambeth Ave. continued

50

What is the conflict?

Yes there is major root issues but the tree poses limited liability and has a healthy canopy.

Trimming for equipment clearance and balancing on house side will reduce stress on main trunk.

51

What is the conflict?

Canopy is healthy.

Limited liability

*homeowner was present at time of inspection and noted that the roots from the tree are in his sewer line.

Likely a removal due to sewer issues

55

Sub surface girdling roots on south and east side of trunk. Air spade to expose and cut.

Soil compaction issues should be address

56

Major included bark.

Minor tip die back

Root plate rot on south side of root flare

Likely not retainable

58 retainable

What is the conflict? Site meeting required

Healthy canopy

Limited liability present.

We're other options offered or explored?

261 Edward

Basal rot present on north west side of trunk.

Presents liability.

Removal required

257 Edward

Major cavity at root flare on north side

Presents liability. Removal required