

Caleb Park

From: David Glenn
Sent: Wednesday, 15 March 2023 03:34 p.m.
To: Caleb Park
Cc: Aidan Battrick
Subject: RE: LUC-2023-61 - 100 Cannington Road

Hi Caleb , Further to our conversation I can confirm that I have no concerns as to regard of health and safety with this tree and the surrounding people and property. There are no signs that the tree has any risk factors that would make it susceptible to whole or partial tree failure.

I also believe there is no risk to the foundations of the house from the tree roots as in the main tree roots are responsible for shrinking clay soils by extracting moisture however Totara and not noted for removing moisture from the clay.

The paving is definitely affect by the tree roots however the paving is uneven also in places where there are no tree roots affecting it lending creditability to the suggestion that the paving was poorly laid .

There will be a nuisance value to the needles but I would suggest this is merely routine maintenance.

The shading would be minimal in my opinion.

As an aside and not asked for I also note its 2GP stem value at 157 and I think this may be an inflated figure in my estimation realistically the stem value is more likely to be in the region of 114 to 120.

D

David Glenn

Urban Forest and Open Space Adviser

COUNCIL PARKS and CEMETERIES

P 03 477 4000 | cell 021 240 6492 | E david.glenn@dcc.govt.nz

Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin

PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054

New Zealand

www.dunedin.govt.nz

Tree Risk Assessor TRaQ-QTRA-VALID

From: Caleb Park <Caleb.Park@dcc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 March 2023 11:04 a.m.
To: David Glenn <David.Glenn@dcc.govt.nz>
Cc: Aidan Battrick <Aidan.Battrick@dcc.govt.nz>
Subject: LUC-2023-61 - 100 Cannington Road
Importance: High

Hi David

I understand you would be able to help provide some comments for resource consent applications related to scheduled trees?

I have attached my memo and the application for your reference.

Let me know if you would like to discuss anything but it would much appreciated if you were able to provide comments by 17 March 2023.

Regards

Caleb Park

ASSOCIATE SENIOR PLANNER

CITY PLANNING

P 03 477 4000 | **DD** 03 474 3581 | **E** caleb.park@dcc.govt.nz

Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin

PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054

New Zealand

www.dunedin.govt.nz

Caleb Park

From: David Glenn
Sent: Sunday, 2 April 2023 11:41 a.m.
To: Caleb Park
Cc: Luke McKinlay
Subject: RE: LUC-2023-61 - 100 Cannington Road
Attachments: totara cannington.xlsx

Hi Caleb , My STEM assessment is attached .

As you will see the total value I can attribute is 96 which of course was not enough to make it reach the threshold of the schedule tree list in the first place.

There a few reasons why the scores differ mostly these are to do with attributes that are subjective and require determinations based on Ron Flocks thoughts on trees and also the changes to the method he introduced when the RNZIH no longer supported the method they were using.

It requires delving into the questions that are asked and decided on before scoring . I have worked with this for more that 30 years and often a person doing the scooring is guided by the score sheet rather than the criteria as set in the guide.

I have put the original scores alongside my scores for comparison.

Totara is a well-known and common species in the South Island it meets no criteria for infrequent.

Its function (usefulness) is neither greater or less than most single trees however it does not provide a greater score for the physical or Conservation criteria and further there are negative factors.

From my experience in judging tree ages I would put this 80 plus this could be proven one way or the other by an old photograph however its not a big nor old Totara .I have not looked for an old photo as yet.

Although the tree is a single tree its not a solitary tree while standing at the tree you can count 10 plus.

I grade its role as a 3 as I can not see any defence of 15 it is a small tree in a small garden surrounded by many trees.

I grade its climate effect as a 3 as an individual tree in most cases has a minimal effect on the climate , many studies have shown that 5k or more trees (a shelter belt) can have a climate influence and as such the Totara is part of the fabric of the tree landscape of the area however its an individual tree.

I spoke with the owners and they owned the property when the scheduled list was introduced in 2001 but they have no memory of a visit from the council to inspect it .

D

[David Glenn](#)

Urban Forest and Open Space Adviser

COUNCIL PARKS and CEMETERIES

P 03 477 4000 | **cell** 021 240 6492 | **E** david.glenn@dcc.govt.nz

Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin

PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054

New Zealand

www.dunedin.govt.nz

Tree Risk Assessor TRaQ-QTRA-VALID

TO:	Caleb Park, Planner
FROM:	Luke McKinlay, Landscape Architect
DATE:	11-April-2023
SUBJECT	Land Use Consent – Removal of Scheduled Tree T285 LUC-2023-61 – 100 Cannington Road, Dunedin. LA Comment

Hi Caleb,

The following is in response to your request for comment on the above application for the removal of the Schedule Tree T285 (Totara) at 110 Cannington Road. As you note, the applicant's request to remove the tree does not appear to relate to the health of the tree. Rather, it relates to the tree having a perceived risk to personal/public safety and a risk to the dwelling. As requested, I have prepared a STEM re-assessment (amenity only) for this tree.

Site photographs are attached in Appendix 1.

Planning Matters

The most recent STEM assessment on record, which was made in 2001, resulted in an overall score of 156, which is above the required 147 "pass" total for inclusion on the schedule. The amenity evaluation section scored a sub-total of 69. The condition evaluation received a subtotal score of 87 points. The highest score was attributed to its proximity as a solitary specimen (27 points).

Under the Proposed District Plan (2GP), the proposal is a non-complying activity pursuant of Rule 7.3.2(3), which seeks to avoid the removal of scheduled trees unless:

- I. There is a significant risk to personal/public safety or a risk to personal safety that is required to be managed under health and safety legislation
- II. The tree poses a substantial risk to a scheduled heritage building or structure
- III. There is moderate to significant risk to buildings
- IV. The removal of the tree is necessary to avoid significant adverse effects on existing infrastructure and network utilities, or
- V. The removal of the tree will result in significant positive effects in respect of the efficient use of land (Policy 7.2.1.2)

Comments

STEM Assessment

There are two broad assessment categories to a STEM report – condition (health) and amenity (community benefit). My role in the assessment of applications to remove a scheduled tree, is to consider the amenity section of the STEM assessment.

The 2001 council STEM assessment of T285, resulted in a total amenity 'score' of 69 consisting of the following:

- Stature: 9-14 (9 points)
- Visibility: 0.5km (3 points)

- Proximity: Solitary (27 points)
- Role: Important (15 points)
- Climate: Important (15 points)

Total amenity score: **69 points**

It is considered that the 2001 STEM scores for stature, visibility and proximity are reasonable. The measurements for stature and visibility appear accurate. With regards to proximity, the assessment of this criterion is largely determined by the extent to which the surrounding context is considered. At the site level, this is a solitary tree. If considered in the context of the neighbouring properties, there is generally some separation to other nearby trees. The closest neighbouring trees are also smaller/visually subservient to T285. It is not part of an obvious cluster/block of trees (refer figs 1-3, Appendix 1).

With regards to role, this criterion assesses a tree's value in its setting or as part of a visual composition. The STEM assessment guide recommends considering this criterion, by asking the question "how would a particular vista/place look without the tree?". A positive role can relate to a harmonious relationship between the tree and its surrounds (i.e. it does not necessarily need to be the most visually dominant tree in the neighbourhood to have a valued role). Broadly, "role" relates to the visual and amenity contribution made by a tree in a particular location.

In this setting, it is considered that the Totara tree, which is healthy and has good form, contributes positively to the neighbourhood character, which features trees in several different settings. In this well-established neighbourhood, several large native trees, including scheduled beech trees (*Nothofagus fusca*), occupy relatively prominent locations at 124, 102 and 84 Cannington Road. Oriental Plane and European Ash street trees line the northern side of Cannington Road. Trees also frame the boundaries of the nearby John McGlashan College sports fields. More broadly, the Ross Creek Reservoir Reserve contains Kanuka-broadleaved forest on the hill slopes north of the site.

In terms of streetscape amenity, it is considered that this Totara forms a moderately prominent native tree, albeit setback from the street edge. It forms a notable part of the fabric of the "tree scape" within this neighbourhood, without being a primary focal feature. It integrates harmoniously with the surrounding neighbourhood. On balance, it is considered that it has a **moderate** role, as a long-standing tree in this neighbourhood.

According to the STEM methodology guide, the climate criterion specifically refers to the microclimatic influence of a tree in terms of shade, shelter and temperature control. On this basis, it is considered that the 2001 STEM assessment has somewhat overestimated the climatic influence of T285. Because this tree is set back from the street edge, its climatic influence on nearby public spaces is limited. It is, however, an evergreen native species with a relatively broad canopy, so will have some, albeit moderate influence in terms of shade and shelter. It is considered that it will have no more than a **moderate** influence on climate.

Reassessment of the amenity component of the STEM.

- Stature: 9-14 (9 points)
- Visibility: 0.5km (3 points)
- Proximity: Solitary (27 points)
- Role: moderate (9 points)
- Climate: moderate (9 points)

Total amenity score: **57 points**

Concluding Comments

It is considered that the 2001 STEM amenity assessment of T285 is slightly overestimated, but this tree continues to make a positive contribution to the amenity of the surrounding area. It is noted that the applicant does not contest the significance and contribution of the tree. My reassessment of the amenity component of the STEM scores this tree at 57 points.

Regards,

Luke McKinlay
Landscape Architect

CITY PLANNING

Appendix 1: Site Photographs



Figure 1: View of T285 near entrance to 102 Cannington Road



Figure 2: View towards T285 from near corner of Pilkington St and Cannington Rd.



Figure 3: View towards T285 from the southeast on Cannington Road.

STANDARD TREE EVALUATION FORM

Date	13-6-01	
Tree	Totara	
Address	100 Cammington rd	
372		
Height (m)	Radius (m)	Circumference (m) @ 1.2m

CONDITION EVALUATION						
Points	3	9	15	21	27	Score
• Form	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good	Specimen	15
• Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	15
• Vigour & Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very Good	Excellent	15
• Function	Minor	Useful	Important	Significant	Major	15
• Age (Yr)	10 Yrs+	20 Yrs +	40 Yrs +	80 Yrs +	100 Yrs+	27
Subtotal Points						87

AMENITY EVALUATION						
Points	3	9	15	21	27	Score
• Stature (m)	3-8	9-14	15-20	21-26	27+	9
• Visibility (km)	0.5	1.0	2.0	4.0	8.0	3
• Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	27
• Role	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	15
• Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	15
Subtotal Points						69

NOTABLE EVALUATION						
Recognition Points	Local 3	District 9	Regional 15	National 21	International 27	Score
Stature						
• Feature						
• Form						
Historic						
• Age 100+						
• Association						
• Commemoration						
• Remnant						
• Relict						
Scientific						
• Source						
• Rarity						
• Endangered						

Subtotal Points

Total Points

156

B. Smith Arborist
Peter Hammonds