

From: [Penelope Jaggar](#)
To: [Phil Petersen](#)
Subject: Re: LUC-2023-253, Removal of significant tree at 17 Sandringham Street - request for further information
Date: Friday, 28 July 2023 12:10:44 p.m.
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[0.png](#)
[Tree junction_2.jpeg](#)
[Tree junction.jpeg](#)
[T990_pg1.jpeg](#)
[T990_pg2.jpeg](#)
[T990.pdf](#)

Good morning Phil

Please find attached the Arborist's report on the tree as requested and photos showing the junction he has spoken of. The branch that was there, fell quite a long time ago and left 2 or 3 10cm high jagged edges which we just cut off to avoid injuries.

As per the attached request for information form, I think the tree meets the criteria for removal based on clauses c & e of Policy [7.2.1.2](#).

Clause c. - as discussed in the report there is risk to our house should the tree split at the junction as shown. It would definitely fall on both our power and phone lines and then the house. This may not be going to happen 'tomorrow' so to speak, however, the risk does seem to be present & I'd prefer we didn't wait for that to happen.

Clause e. - I think this is totally true... we have put off doing any landscaping of our property at the front, due in part to the tree roots and the damage they have done in the past (blocked main drain to house, cracked the driveway and reduced and stunted growth of current plantings) and problems it will cause in the future, to new landscaping eg. driveway, path, fence, plantings etc. We believe the updated landscaping will have significant positive effects in respect of the efficient use of land. As it is, the only item to be seen is our very large cabbage tree, with its very ugly scarring & potential risk etc. When walking past, people don't even see the tree, all they see is a trunk which does not have much in the way of aesthetic value. If this is removed we can utilise our whole section, beatify it and keep it flood free also as we're planning to put a lot of extra soil, grass etc to help with drainage.

We also have direct neighbours who have a smaller cabbage tree that they are keen to see mature. Would this not fill the 'aesthetic' gap that our tree is seen to have filled in the street & neighbourhood? Our tree is clearly very old and some new life in the form of a younger tree seems to be a very good thing.

Apart from an Arborist report, I was unsure what/who you meant in b) of your point 1. regarding Requested information. If there is someone or something else you can suggest, please let me know so I can do this asap.

Kind regards
Penelope

Tree junction.jpeg



Tree junction_2.jpeg



Tree junction.jpeg



Tree junction_2.jpeg

On Tue, Jul 18, 2023 at 11:26 AM Phil Petersen <Phil.Petersen@dcc.govt.nz> wrote:

Hi Penelope,

Please see the attached request for further information - and do get in touch if you have any questions.

Your application is now on-hold until you respond to this request.

Kind regards,

Phil



If this message is not intended for you please delete it and notify us immediately; you are warned that any further use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this material by you is prohibited..

From: Phil Petersen
Sent: Monday, 17 July 2023 4:08 p.m.
To: Penelope Jaggar <penelope.jaggar@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: LUC-2023-253, Removal of significant tree at 17 Sandringham Street

Hi Penelope,

I am still waiting for comments from the consultant council arborist but will be able to request further information from you as soon as I have his comments. I have enquired with the arborist today as I expected to receive comments last week.

Please be aware that is a non-complying activity with quite a high bar to reach in terms of whether the district plan allows granting - so a successful application is not certain.

Also, the district plan requires that this is publicly notified via Proposed 2GP Rule 7.4. (1). This means that after the further information aspects have been addressed, that council would look to notify the application next.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

Phil

From: Penelope Jaggar <penelope.jaggar@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 5 July 2023 5:17 p.m.
To: Phil Petersen <Phil.Petersen@dcc.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: LUC-2023-253, Removal of significant tree at 17 Sandringham Street

Good afternoon Phil

Thank you for your email last Friday, that's fabulous that we're underway. I don't have any specific questions but am keen to assist where/if I can.

I would really appreciate your updates as you go as I have a landscaper, concreter, fencer and tiler waiting to hear so we can coordinate them all to complete our landscaping plans. We appreciate these plans may have to be altered depending on the outcome of our tree submission.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Penelope

027 527 0770

On Fri, Jun 30, 2023 at 3:54 PM Phil Petersen <Phil.Petersen@dcc.govt.nz> wrote:

Kia ora Penelope,

I have been allocated your application for processing. I will be in touch early next week about this application, and as I make progress.

The application was lodged on 27 June 2023 and will take up to 20 working days to process, unless I require further information and need to place the application on hold.

Please feel free to ask any questions.

Kind regards,

Phil

[Phil Petersen](#)

PLANNER/KAIMAHERE

RESOURCE CONSENTS/ TOHU WHAKAMAHI RAWA

P 03 477 4000 **DD** 03 474 3492 | phil.petersen@dcc.govt.nz

Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin

PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054

New Zealand

www.dunedin.govt.nz

[DCC Main Page](#)



If this message is not intended for you please delete it and notify us immediately; you are warned that any further use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this material by you is prohibited..



Basic Tree Risk Assessment Form

Client Penelope Jagger Date 23/07/23 Time _____
 Address/Tree location 17 Sandringham St, 8th floor, Dunedin Tree no. T990 Sheet 1 of 2
 Tree species 7i Kauri - Cordyline australis Height 8m Crown spread dia. 5m
 Assessor(s) Dylan King Tools used _____ Time frame 1 year

Target Assessment

Target number	Target description	Target protection	Target zone			Occupancy rate 1 - rare 2 - occasional 3 - frequent 4 - constant	Practical to move target?	Restriction practical?
			Target within drip line	Target within 1x Ht.	Target within 1.5x Ht.			
1	<u>HOUSE</u>	<u>NA</u>		<u>Y</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>
2	<u>Phone line</u>	<u>NA</u>		<u>Y</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>
3	<u>Foot path</u>	<u>NA</u>		<u>Y</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>
4								

Site Factors

History of failures _____ Topography Flat ☒ Slope ☐ _____ % Aspect _____
 Site changes None ☒ Grade change ☐ Site clearing ☐ Changed soil hydrology ☐ Root cuts ☐ Describe _____
 Soil conditions Limited volume ☐ Saturated ☐ Shallow ☐ Compacted ☐ Pavement over roots ☐ _____ % Describe _____
 Prevailing wind direction _____ Common weather Strong winds ☐ Ice ☐ Snow ☐ Heavy rain ☐ Describe _____

Tree Health and Species Profile

Vigor Low ☒ Normal ☐ High ☐ Foliage None (seasonal) ☐ None (dead) ☐ Normal _____ % Chlorotic _____ % Necrotic _____ %
 Pests/Biotic insect damage around scars Abiotic Multiple wounds around bark to trunk
 Species failure profile Branches ☒ Trunk ☒ Roots ☐ Describe _____

Load Factors

Wind exposure Protected ☐ Partial ☐ Full ☒ Wind funneling ☐ _____ Relative crown size Small ☐ Medium ☐ Large ☒
 Crown density Sparse ☐ Normal ☒ Dense ☐ Interior branches Few ☐ Normal ☒ Dense ☐ Vines/Mistletoe/Moss ☐ _____
 Recent or expected change in load factors _____

Tree Defects and Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Failure

— Crown and Branches —

Unbalanced crown ☐ LCR _____ %
 Dead twigs/branches ☒ _____ % overall Max. dia. 25cm
 Broken/Hangers Number _____ Max. dia. _____
 Over-extended branches ☐
Pruning history
 Crown cleaned ☐ Thinned ☐ Raised ☐
 Reduced ☐ Topped ☐ Lion-tailed ☐
 Flush cuts ☐ Other _____

Cracks ☐ _____ Lightning damage ☐
 Codominant ☒ _____ Included bark ☐
 Weak attachments ☐ _____ Cavity/Nest hole _____ % circ.
 Previous branch failures ☒ _____ Similar branches present ☐
 Dead/Missing bark ☒ Cankers/Galls/Burls ☐ Sapwood damage/decay ☐
 Conks ☐ Heartwood decay ☐ _____
 Response growth _____

1/3 roughly of canopy removed previously at main union resulting in rot
 Condition(s) of concern _____

Part Size _____ Fall Distance 8m

Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Significant ☐

Likelihood of failure Improbable ☐ Possible ☐ Probable ☐ Imminent ☐

Part Size _____ Fall Distance _____

Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☒ Significant ☐

Likelihood of failure Improbable ☐ Possible ☐ Probable ☐ Imminent ☐

— Trunk —

Dead/Missing bark ☒ Abnormal bark texture/color ☐
 Codominant stems ☒ Included bark ☒ Cracks ☒
 Sapwood damage/decay ☒ Cankers/Galls/Burls ☐ Sap ooze ☐
 Lightning damage ☐ Heartwood decay ☒ Conks/Mushrooms ☐
 Cavity/Nest hole _____ % circ. Depth _____ Poor taper ☐
 Lean _____ ° Corrected? _____
 Response growth _____
 Condition(s) of concern main union rot spreading
 Part Size _____ Fall Distance _____

Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☒ Significant ☐

Likelihood of failure Improbable ☐ Possible ☐ Probable ☐ Imminent ☐

— Roots and Root Collar —

Collar buried/Not visible ☐ Depth _____ Stem girdling ☐
 Dead ☐ Decay ☐ Conks/Mushrooms ☐
 Ooze ☐ Cavity ☐ _____ % circ.
 Cracks ☐ Cut/Damaged roots ☐ Distance from trunk _____
 Root plate lifting ☐ Soil weakness ☐
 Response growth _____
 Condition(s) of concern none visible
 Part Size _____ Fall Distance _____

Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Significant ☐

Likelihood of failure Improbable ☐ Possible ☐ Probable ☐ Imminent ☐

Risk Categorization

Target (Target number or description)	Tree part	Condition(s) of concern	Likelihood												Consequences				Risk rating (from Matrix 2)
			Failure				Impact				Failure & Impact (from Matrix 1)								
			Improbable	Possible	Probable	Imminent	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Unlikely	Somewhat	Likely	Very likely	Negligible	Minor	Significant	Severe	
House	Crown/ Canopy	Split in union from rot.		/				/	/			/				/			High
Phone line on street	Crown	Split in union		/				/			/				/				Low
Footpath	Crown & trunk.	Split in union		/				/			/			/					Low

Matrix 1. Likelihood matrix.

Likelihood of Failure	Likelihood of Impact			
	Very low	Low	Medium	High
Imminent	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely
Probable	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Likely
Possible	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat likely
Improbable	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely

Matrix 2. Risk rating matrix.

Likelihood of Failure & Impact	Consequences of Failure			
	Negligible	Minor	Significant	Severe
Very likely	Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
Likely	Low	Moderate	High	High
Somewhat likely	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Unlikely	Low	Low	Low	Low

Notes, explanations, descriptions

area of concern is spreading rot through the centre of two dominant leaders - heavily weighted canopy could split through the centre

Mitigation options

1. Heavily reduce canopy - Rot in union still remains - Residual risk low -
2. Residual risk
3. Residual risk
4. Residual risk

Overall tree risk rating Low ☐ Moderate ☒ High ☐ Extreme ☐

Overall residual risk None ☐ Low ☒ Moderate ☐ High ☐ Extreme ☐ Recommended inspection interval

Data ☐ Final ☒ Preliminary Advanced assessment needed ☐ No ☐ Yes-Type/Reason

Inspection limitations ☒ None ☐ Visibility ☐ Access ☐ Vines ☐ Root collar buried Describe

Kia Ora,

To whom it may concern

Attached is the ISA tree risk/health assessment form for the Cordyline australis at 17 Sandringham St Dunedin. Tree no T990 .Not all of this form can correlate to a cordyline in the same way as an actual tree but I have attempted.

The Overall health of the Cordyline in my professional opinion is in slow decline. It is sporting multiple wounds around the base of the trunk right up to chest height where there has been a large limb removed previously. This wound has rot actively spreading through the trunk with two large heavily weighted stems on either side. If there was a failure with that main union essentially half the tree would fall, either on the house or the phone line and footpath.

The tree is definitely not in it great shape, I wouldn't say it is an immediate high risk but there is no easy way to remedy its fault. A heavy prune of the canopy would possibly reduce the risk of its impact upon failure but the damaged union would still remain and continue to hinder the trees health not really accomplishing much. I believe the tree has Past its best days.

Kā mihi,

Dylan King

Qualified Arborist

For The Love Of Trees

