

APPENDIX 5:

**Memorandum from Mark Roberts, Roberts Consulting Ltd,
Responding to Valley Arboricultural Ltd Report (December
2025)**

Memorandum

TO: Karen Bain – Associate Senior Planner
FROM: Mark Roberts – Arborist, Roberts Consulting Ltd
DATE: December 12, 2025
SUBJECT: LUC-2025-420, 27 King Street, Mosgiel

Dear Karen,

As per your December 9 email request, please find my arboricultural comments for application LUC-2025-420. The application is for Urgent Removal, due to the tree's decline, and relates to the scheduled Pin Oak T666 at 27 King Street, Mosgiel.

Summary of the application

Application LUC-2025-420 is a request to remove the Pin Oak T666 at 27 King Street, Mosgiel. The application was lodged on September 11, 2025.

- This application is a new application for removal and has been considered separately from LUC-2024-171, which was also an application to remove the scheduled Pin Oak T666 at 27 King Street, Mosgiel.
- At the request of Council, I contacted the applicant and arranged a site visit on the morning of Monday, September 22, 2025. The site visit took place.
- I reported back to Council (Jeremy Grey, Senior Planner) in a Memorandum-formatted response on September 22, 2025
- I was asked to answer four (4) specific questions relating to 'newly' identified concerns raised by the applicant's arborist (Mr Waymouth of Green Trees Ltd) in his August 6, and September 6, 2025, reports.
- My recommendation at the time was, *'Based on the current condition of the tree, I believe that there is time to further investigate the 'newly' identified concerns, and that the tree does not need to be removed under urgency through Emergency Works'*
- On December 9, you contacted me and asked me to provide comment on a new arborist's report commissioned by the applicant. This report was undertaken by William Hagendorn of Valley Arboriculture Ltd.
- Mr Hagendorn assessed the tree on November 28, 2025. He noted that the tree was in excellent health and had no signs of disease or insect damage, and that whole tree failure did not appear imminent.
- Mr Hagendorn then went on to say that he had concerns around a torsional crack in the trunk and the multiple included bark stems that had the potential to create a whole tree failure.

General comments on the Valley Arboriculture report

Mr Hagendorn has identified areas of response growth on the tree and interpreted them as locations of potential concern. He does not say that they indicate whole tree failure is imminent.

Response growth, as the name would suggest, is growth that occurs in response to something, typically a load (i.e. gravity) or repetitive movement (i.e. movement caused by wind). The new wood is set down in localised areas of the tree, and can be seen on trunks and branches as bumps, ridges, and/or changes in texture. The process is completely natural.

When I teach this, I ask my students to think of response growth like reinforcing; *the tree is responding by growing reinforcing to the area*. For a tree to be able to produce response growth the tree must be healthy enough to be able to grow this new material. Mr Hagendorn also notes that the tree is in excellent health.

Mr Hagendorn propose a maintenance plan to reduce the load on these locations of potential concern. He suggests that the tree could be reduced in size through successive crown reduction pruning events (*the independent arborist appointed through mediation, Mr Glenn, also proposed that the tree be reduced in size*).

Mr Hagendorn also recommended that the tree be removed to address the applicant's fear.

- Mr Waymouth, Mr Hagendorn, Mr Glenn, and I, through mediation, have all recommended that the risk of tree failure can be mitigated through pruning
- It is possible that tree maintenance could reduce the levels of fear, and pruning could take place to alleviate some of these concerns.

Comments on the application

Application LUC-2025-420 is a request for urgent removal of the scheduled Pin Oak T666. It was lodged on September 11, 2025,

- October 2025 brought two record-breaking severe wind events to Dunedin (October 19 and October 23). Whole tree failure did not occur
- The applicant's second arborist assessed the tree after these severe wind events and said that whole tree failure did not appear imminent.
- The applicant's second arborist identified and interpreted areas of potential concern and recommended that the tree be pruned over the course of six to eight years. Six to eight years does not represent an imminent or urgent time frame

Recommendations

1. Based on the information provided at the time of the application, I do not recommend that the consent be granted for the tree to be removed under urgency.

2. Based on the additional information provided as an addendum to the application, I do not recommend that consent be granted for the tree to be removed under urgency.
3. Having read and understood both sets of new information and having considered them independently of the material provided for LUC-2024-171, I do not recommend that consent be granted for this tree to be removed.
4. If the application was amended from a request to remove to a request for maintenance, then I would recommend support for crown reduction work to be undertaken on the oak tree T666 at 27 King Street, Mosgiel.

Yours sincerely,



Mark Roberts

Arborist
Roberts Consulting Ltd