

I firstly want to start with addressing the comment Mark Roberts made on page 3 of his report.

His comment was – that some concerns held by the applicant are in part by the Greentree's tree report.

This flippant comment belittles and trivialises how we feel as a family residing under T666. It dismisses our 10-year-olds fear and anxiety with this tree when the wind is gusting through our property.

We firstly engaged a planner from Paterson Group who validated our concerns and advised us to contact Greentree's to conduct a report on the tree. Our feelings were and still are the same regarding T666 with or without Greentree's report.

You cannot whole heartedly say there is no risk to our home or our neighbour's home from limb failure, or worse risk to our family, Elsie our neighbour or pedestrians walking past our home. You only need to google pin oak tree falls NZ to read oak trees are prone to limb fall & tree fall, even when reported as being healthy. You will see the article that I requested to be added to my brief of evidence. An 80 year old pin oak deemed to be healthy by an arborist fell on a lady resulting in her death in May 2022.

I beg of you to execute your common sense; we reside too close to this extra-large tree, it does pose a risk to people & property making it a health and safety risk. This is our family home; our daughter should not feel unsafe in her own home and nor should the rest of our family. There is no financial gain to us to remove this tree, our section cannot be subdivided.

I presume you have all had a site visit and viewed T666 with no foliage. Dressed in an abundance of leaves this tree has a depressing presence. While I will admit it is an attractive tree, it is not in the right location. Since 2020 the tree has had significant growth, the canopy is now lifted above our house height. This leaves us with no Sun to enjoy our front yard, shaded dark living areas and dark children's bedrooms. We endure constant twig breakage on our lawn, which our dog gets lodged in the roof of her mouth, she requires our help to remove these, they leave her mouth bloodied from her trying to claw them out. They also land on the roof of ours and our neighbour's homes. We endure 12 weeks of leaf fall, filling 2 full fadge sacks of leaves weekly. Our neighbour and us have spent a substantial amount of money having drain coil installed to prevent blocked spouting's from this tree.

I want to stress we don't dislike this tree, but I do want to stress it is not in an appropriate location for its size, it does pose a risk to dwelling, amenities and people and I'm sure you don't want this sitting on your conscience when it does happen.

Greentree's STEM report clearly shows me this tree does not meet the required 145 points which poses an ethical question, should it even be on the significant tree list?

I have enclosed images taken from all points around Mosgiel and to me this tree is not visible from many varied distances. I will agree, you could possibly see T666 from a vantage point, but then you could possibly see me standing outside my house from a vantage point too. Standing on a vantage point to see the tree and zooming in so far the houses are hard to recognise because they are blurred is not transparent visibility evidence. Mosgiel is predominantly on the flat and King Street sits right in the middle of central flat Mosgiel. I believe Greentree's score around Visibility is true and fair in their STEM report provided and, on this basis, I request the tree be removed from the significant tree list.

I will say it absolutely stuns me that Roberts Consulting's report is the absolute opposite of Greentree's report, there is clearly conflict here and leaves me feeling a little concerned. I understand that removing this tree from the significant tree list is not councils desired outcome, but arguing against every point from my independent accredited arborists report, is underhanded and appears bias to appease stake holders.

In Roberts Consulting's report, Mark states he conducted a site visit on the 27 May 2024, where he assessed the tree from ground level. Our property is monitored by 2 security cameras, and on this day I can confirm he was not detected on our property. To get the full impact this tree has on us, it must be accessed from inside our property, not from the street front.

I will close off with this statement.

T666 does not meet the required stem points to be listed as a significant tree.