



October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024

**Memo to:** Samantha Yeung, Planner II – Development  
**From:** Taylor Posey, Planner II – Parks  
**File Number(s):** ZBLA-24-0007 & SUB-24-0001  
**Location:** 19, 25 Schomberg Road, 41, 43 Maple Grove Avenue  
**Applicant:** Simmy Suu

---

**Materials reviewed:**

- Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., dated July 30, 2024
- Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., dated July 30, 2024
- Grading Plan, prepared by Aplin Martin, dated July 31, 2024
- General Servicing Plan, prepared by Aplin Martin, dated July 31, 2024
- Landscape Concept Plan, prepared by byPATH, dated July 30, 2024
- Conceptual Site Plan, prepared by John G. Williams Limited, dated August 9, 2024
- Sustainability Metrics, dated May 13, 2024

**Comments:**

1. The Grading Plan must be revised to show all existing trees, including their size, tree protection zones (TPZ) and tree # per the Arborist Report. This includes trees proposed for removal.
2. Further to the above comment, site grading and works should be coordinated with the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TIPP) to ensure trees proposed from retention are not being injured. The applicant should ensure that the proposed swales do not encroach into the TPZ's of trees C, G, P2 and P4. If injury to these trees is proposed consent from the adjacent property owners will be required. The Arborist Report should also speak to the injuries the swales may cause if they are located within the TPZs. **Partially Addressed: Swales are still shown encroaching into the TPZ and tree protection fencing of trees P2 and C on the Grading Plan. P2 is being retained and protected without injury. The Arborist Report states that the fencing can be removed for the swales to be installed, however this will still cause injury. The locations of the swales should be revised so these are not encroaching into the tree protection fencing and TPZs. Please note that this information must be updated on all plans that show this information including, but not limited to, the TIPP and Grading Plan.**
3. **Both stages of tree protection fencing for tree C should be shown on the Grading Plan.**
4. **Subject to the above comment being addressed. The applicant is proposed injury or removal to trees E, D, P1 and P2 which are located wholly or partially on adjacent properties. The applicant is required to provide written consent letters from the adjacent property owners for these injuries/removals.**
5. The City's Urban Forest Management Plan and City's Official Plan recognize the important role of trees in improving air quality and reducing the urban heat island effect and provide policy direction for tree and woodland protection. They also establish a canopy cover target of 30%. As such, the City requires the preservation of the City-owned large mature Sugar Maples in good-fair condition (Tree A and C) which provide numerous environmental benefits to the community. Minor injury may be permitted to Tree A And C provided that the following revisions are made to the proposed development:
  - a. move the dwelling on Lot 1 further back from the street to enable the proposed porch and walkways to be located outside the TPZ of Tree A
  - b. reduce the driveway widths on Lot 1 from the proposed 3.2m to a maximum width of 3m for both driveways to reduce impacts to Tree A as well as City-owned Tree C



- c. propose a permeable driveway surface (i.e. not asphalt as is currently proposed), to reduce impacts to Tree A as well as City-owned Tree C
  - d. restore the area where the existing driveway is proposed to be removed with sod and match the existing grades to reduce impacts to Tree A
6. The applicant will be required to pay a valuation for the removal of Tree B and injuries of Trees A and C. This will be provided by Urban Forestry and forwarded to the applicant.
  7. Further to the above, as Tree A is to be preserved no tree should be planted in its location as this will overcrowd the space. Please revise the Landscape Plan and all relevant materials accordingly.
  8. Please ensure all plans show consistent information. The Grading Plan and TIPP should show the decks at the rear of the proposed dwellings and the proposed infiltration galleries in the rear yards. The infiltration galleries should be located to facilitate the preservation of existing trees. The TIPP Report should also speak to the injuries the works may cause if they are located within the existing trees TPZs. **Partially Addressed: The decks must be shown on the Grading Plan and TIPP.**
  9. The TIPP Report notes that a total of 32 native and non-native trees/tree polygons are located on and within 6 metres of the subject property. It also notes that 23 trees/tree polygons will require removal as a result of the proposed development. The City will seek to restore the tree canopy within the development by securing tree plantings and/or compensation for the loss of these trees through the development process. Any trees not planted on the property must be accounted for via cash-in-lieu.
  10. Due to the presence of Oat Wilt in Ontario, Richmond Hill is recommending spacing Oak tree plantings at larger distances to avoid the potential for root grafting and spread of Oak wilt in the future if the trees are infected. Staff recommend switching the planting locations of one of the Bur Oak plantings with one of the Hackberry plantings to provide a greater distance in between Oak trees.
  11. Show the specific pH, organic matter and depth requirements on the Landscape Plan to fulfill Sustainability Metric NE-2.
  12. Update the Master Plant List on the Landscape Plan to include proposed shrub plantings. The update should also include a break down of which of the proposed species support pollinators.

Sincerely,

**Taylor Posey**  
Planner II – Parks  
Park and Natural Heritage Planning