



AGENDA

FOR TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE MEETING TO BE HELD ON

12 JULY 2021 AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE CEO REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

~~IN7477645584~~

ROOMS, SALISBURY
COMMUNITY HUB, 34 CHURCH STREET, SALISBURY

MEMBERS

Cr S Reardon (Chairman)
Mayor G Aldridge (ex officio)
Cr C Buchanan
Cr P Jensen (Deputy Chairman)
Cr S Ouk

REQUIRED STAFF

Chief Executive Officer, Mr J Harry
General Manager City Infrastructure, Mr J Devine
Team Leader Natural Assets, Mr C Johansen
Manager Governance, Mr R Deco

APOLOGIES

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES

Presentation of the Minutes of the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee Meeting held on 15 June 2021.

REPORTS

TMASC1	Future Reports for the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee	5
TMASC2	Tree Removal Requests - Monthly Update	7
TMASC3	Review of Tree Removal Request - Various Locations	13

OTHER BUSINESS

CLOSE



**MINUTES OF TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
IN THE LITTLE PARA CONFERENCE ROOMS, SALISBURY COMMUNITY HUB,
34 CHURCH STREET, SALISBURY ON**

15 JUNE 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT Cr S Reardon (Chairman)
Mayor G Aldridge (ex officio)
Deputy Mayor, Cr C Buchanan
Cr P Jensen (Deputy Chairman)
Cr S Ouk

STAFF Chief Executive Officer, Mr J Harry
General Manager City Infrastructure, Mr J Devine
Manager Infrastructure Management, Mr D Roy
A/Manager Governance, Ms J Crook
Governance Support Officer, Ms K Boyd

The meeting commenced at 7.40 pm.

The Chairman welcomed the members, staff and the gallery to the meeting.

APOLOGIES

Nil

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES

Moved Cr P Jensen
Seconded Mayor G Aldridge

The Minutes of the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee Meeting held on 10 May 2021, be taken as read and confirmed.

CARRIED

REPORTS

TMASC1 Future Reports for the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee

Moved Mayor G Aldridge
Seconded Cr P Jensen

1. The information is received.

CARRIED

TMASC2 Tree Removal Requests - Monthly Update

Cr S Ouk left the meeting at 7:45 pm.
Cr S Ouk returned to the meeting at 7:47 pm.

Moved Cr P Jensen
Seconded Cr S Ouk

1. The information is received.

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

Nil

CLOSE

The meeting closed at 7.47 pm.

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

ITEM	TMASC1
	TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE
DATE	12 July 2021
HEADING	Future Reports for the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee
AUTHOR	Michelle Woods, Projects Officer Governance, CEO and Governance
CITY PLAN LINKS	4.2 We deliver quality outcomes that meet the needs of our community
SUMMARY	This item details reports to be presented to the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee as a result of a previous Council resolution. If reports have been deferred to a subsequent meeting, this will be indicated, along with a reason for the deferral.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The information is received.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 A list of resolutions requiring a future report to the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee is presented for noting at each meeting.

2. CONSULTATION / COMMUNICATION

- 2.1 Internal
 - 2.1.1 Report authors and General Managers.
- 2.2 External
 - 2.2.1 Nil.

3. REPORT

- 3.1 At the time of preparing this report, there are currently no resolutions of Council requiring a further report to be presented to the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee.

4. CONCLUSION / PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Future reports for the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee have been reviewed and there are none that require a report to be presented at this point in time.

CO-ORDINATION

Officer:	EXEC	GMCI
Date:	05/07/2021	01/07/2021

INFORMATION ONLY ITEM

TMASC2

TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE

DATE

12 July 2021

HEADING

Tree Removal Requests - Monthly Update

AUTHOR

Jamie Hosking, Team Leader Urban Built Assets, City Infrastructure

CITY PLAN LINKS

- 1.1 Our City is attractive and well maintained
- 4.1 Members of our community receive an exceptional experience when interacting with Council

SUMMARY

This monthly report provides Members with updates on tree removal requests received from residents.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. The information is received.

ATTACHMENTS

This document should be read in conjunction with the following attachments:

- 1. May 2020 Tree Requests

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 At its meeting held on Tuesday, 27 April 2021 Council resolved that:

“That a standing report be established for every meeting of the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee to inform Council of every application received for tree removal and the outcome of that request.”

Resolution Number 0916/2021

- 1.2 Staff currently uploads a monthly tree removal request information table to the Elected Members Portal. This document has been adapted to provide further information and will now be reported to each meeting of the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee.

2. CONSULTATION / COMMUNICATION

- 2.1 Internal
 - 2.1.1 City Infrastructure Staff
- 2.2 External
 - 2.2.1 Various Residents

3. REPORT

- 3.1 The attached table is a summary of requests for tree removals received and actioned by staff during the past month and has been provided on the Elected Member Portal for March 2021.
- 3.2 98 tree removal requests were received in May, of these requests 64 were approved for removal, this included 8 significant or regulated trees approved through development applications. 34 applications were refused, of the 34 refused, 17 are significant or regulated under the Planning Development Infrastructure Act.
- 3.3 The nature of tree removal requests often results in an ongoing dialogue between the owner of the property and Council related to tree removal and subsequent discussions around the species type and location of the new street tree.
- 3.4 It is important to note that through various annual programs Council plants over 2,000 trees each year. These programs include Street Tree Renewal Program, In-fill Planting Program, Tree Screen Renewal Program, Reserve Upgrade Program, Feature Landscape Renewal Program, Greening Program, School Tree Planting Program, Major Projects and ad-hoc planting requests. Our Street Tree Renewal Program planted 996 trees in 2019/20 and it is expected that 1,392 will be planted in 2020/21.

4. CONCLUSION / PROPOSAL

- 4.1 It is proposed that the information contained in the attachment be noted.

CO-ORDINATION

Officer:	GMCI	EXEC
Date:	02/07/2021	05/07/2021

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: May 2021

Assessed by Parks and Open Space Assets team on site and removed based on Councils Tree Removal Criteria adopted by Council April 2016

ADDRESS	DATE	REFERENCE	APP/REF
Brahma Lodge 49 Caruso Crescent - New Dwelling - DA 361/580/2021/1A	3/05/21	DW 6653319	Approved @ Cost
Brahma Lodge 9 Benalla Street - tree nearest drive	31/05/21	CRM 370049	Approved x 1
Burton 14 Gallina Grove	12/05/21	CRM 369963	Approved
Burton 41 Hopner Avenue - Regulated	19/05/21	CRM 370703	Refused - Regulated Tree
Direk 32-38 & 40-42 Mirage Road - DA 21008727 - var to 361/1259/2019/18	13/05/21	DW 6686385	Approved @ Cost x 5 trees
Direk 31 Cherry Avenue	19/05/21	CRM 371076	Refused
Gulfview Heights 3 Seville Avenue - Lot 53 - New Dwelling - DA 21001577	25/05/21	DW 6701188	Approved @ Cost x 1
Gulfview Heights 11 Seville Avenue - failed tree	28/05/21	CRM 371959	Approved - Failed Tree
Ingle Farm 2 Broilga Avenue - Dwelling 2 Baloo Street - 221 Application - DW 6640491	12/05/21	CRM 370003	Approved @ Cost x 1
Ingle Farm 2 Mandy Court - Regulated	3/05/21	CRM 368943	Refused - Regulated Tree
Ingle Farm 14b Sheringa Avenue	3/05/21	CRM 368441	Refused
Ingle Farm 44 Beovich Road - tree nearest letterbox	12/05/21	CRM 369334	Approved x 1
Ingle Farm 62 Foster Row - 1 tree at front	12/05/21	CRM 369487	Approved - dead
Ingle Farm 62 Foster Row - 1 tree at side - Gilbert Street	12/05/21	CRM 369487	Approved - dead
Ingle Farm 15B Warubi Avenue - Regulated	6/05/21	CRM 364779	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Ingle Farm 14 Debney Avenue	14/05/21	CRM 368352	Refused
Para Hills 5A Margaret Street	3/05/21	CRM 369233	Approved
Para Hills side 6 Maves Road - Loral Street - 1 tree, 1 dead shrub and extra stump	12/05/21	CRM 369908	Approved
Para Hills Wilkins Reserve - side 7 Hartley Crescent - 2 Trees	12/05/21	CRM 369739	Approved x 2
Para Hills Wilkins Reserve - side 7 Hartley Crescent - 3 Regulated Trees	12/05/21	CRM 369739	Refused - x 3 Regulated Trees
Para Hills opp 154 Maxwell Road - dead tree	12/05/21	CRM 369207	Approved - dead tree
Para Hills 3 Linton Road - 2 trees	14/05/21	CRM 370604	Approved x 2
Para Hills side 26 Gwender Terrace - Mitchell Drive - Significant tree nearest corner	11/05/21	ETF 282239	D/A Approved - Significant tree
Para Hills 22 Maves Road - tree north of drive, towards corner	19/05/21	CRM 370607	Approved x 1
Para Hills West opp 502 Bridge Road	25/05/21	CRM 370962	Approved x 1
Para Vista 17 Kalina Avenue - Lot 741 - 2 x New Dwellings - DA 21007064	3/05/21	DW 6654210	Approved @ Cost x 1
Para Vista 4 Heather Court - Dwelling 1 - DA 361/D214/20	13/05/21	DW 6680619 / DW 6687116	Approved @ Cost x 1
Parafield Gardens 88 Bradbury Street - T2 - New Dwelling - DA 21005809	3/05/21	DW 6668101	Approved @ Cost
Parafield Gardens 14 Shorney Road - Regulated	3/05/21	CRM 362498	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens 20 Howell Road - 221 - DW 6523619	14/05/21	CRM 365716	Approved @ Cost

**FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT COUNCIL'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACE ASSETS
OFFICER - 8406 8403**

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: May 2021

Assessed by Parks and Open Space Assets team on site and removed based on Councils Tree Removal Criteria adopted by Council April 2016

ADDRESS	DATE	REFERENCE	APP/REF
Parafield Gardens Unit 7 / 6 Grevilla Drive	7/05/21	CRM 370548	Refused
Parafield Gardens Unit 9 / 6 Grevilla Drive	7/05/21	CRM 370548	Refused
Parafield Gardens 6 Colton Court	12/05/21	CRM 370000	Approved
Parafield Gardens 15 Hawthorn Terrace	12/05/21	CRM 369870	Approved
Parafield Gardens 9 Townsend Avenue - Regulated - tree nearest driveway of no. 7	12/05/21	CRM 369740	Refused - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens 3 Primrose Court - Regulated	12/05/21	CRM 367294	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens 57B Rosalie Terrace - Regulated - DA 21006666 - New Dwelling	25/05/21	DW 6700885	Refused - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens 9 Townsend Avenue - 2 trees (tree nearest no. 7 is Regulated)	26/05/21	CRM 371316	Refused x 2
Parafield Gardens 28 Chesser Street	26/05/21	CRM 371840	Approved
Parafield Gardens AGH Cox Reserve - tree opposite drive of 5 Homestead Place	26/05/21	CRM 371119	Approved x 1
Parafield Gardens 5 Blueberry Road - 2 trees	26/05/21	CRM 371251	Refused x 2
Parafield Gardens 1 Erica Court	26/05/21	CRM 371018	Approved
Paralowie 15 Caloundra Drive	7/05/21	CRM 370379	Refused
Paralowie 22 Piar Street	5/05/21	CRM 369163	Refused
Paralowie rear 19 McQueen Court - Regulated	7/05/21	CRM 370393	Refused - Regulated Tree
Paralowie rear 27 McQueen Court - Regulated	7/05/21	CRM 370393	Refused - Regulated Tree
Paralowie side 34 Jessie Road - Winston Avenue - 2 trees	6/05/21	CRM 361093	Approved x 2
Paralowie 21 Brando Court - tree nearest drive	7/05/21	CRM 370482	Approved
Paralowie 21 Brando Court - Significant	7/05/21	CRM 370482	Refused
Paralowie 7 Brando Court	7/05/21	CRM 370482	Refused
Paralowie 6 Mendez Street - 2 trees	5/05/21	CRM 368516	Refused x 2
Paralowie 22 Boyara Crescent - tree furthest from drive	12/05/21	CRM 370199	Approved
Paralowie 22 Boyara Crescent - Regulated	12/05/21	CRM 370199	Refused - Regulated Tree
Paralowie 30 Metala Road - Regulated	12/05/21	CRM 369948	Refused - Regulated Tree
Paralowie 10 Lombard Avenue - Regulated	14/05/21	CRM 370300	Refused - Regulated Tree
Paralowie 2 Manuella Court - Regulated - tree nearest drive	12/05/21	CRM 364785	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Paralowie 25 Santander Drive	19/05/21	CRM 370868	Approved
Paralowie 3 Caulfield Crescent	19/05/21	CRM 370740	Approved
Paralowie 51 Vindana Road - dead tree	27/05/21	CRM 368876	Approved - dead tree
Paralowie 5 Linda Close - Significant	26/05/21	CRM 363330	Refused - Significant Tree
Pooraka 28 Lincoln Crescent - Regulated	6/05/21	CRM 364003	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Pooraka 19 Duffield Drive - nearest drive	14/05/21	CRM 370830	Approved x 1

FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT COUNCIL'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACE ASSETS OFFICER - 8406 8403

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: May 2021

Assessed by Parks and Open Space Assets team on site and removed based on Councils Tree Removal Criteria adopted by Council April 2016

ADDRESS		DATE	REFERENCE	APP/REF
Salisbury	53 Margaret Avenue - Regulated	3/05/21	CRM 360963	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Salisbury	Salisbury War Memorial - Grange Avenue - 2 Casuarina's for Orion prop to be installed	14/05/21	ETF 288469	Approved x 2
Salisbury	152 Salisbury Highway - Significant	7/05/21	ETF 283093	D/A Approved - Significant tree
Salisbury	34 Cynthia Road - Lot 1 - New Dwelling - DA 21010554	24/05/21	DW 6699097	Approved @ Cost x 1
Salisbury Downs	12 Dublin Avenue	5/05/21	CRM 369005	Approved
Salisbury Downs	34 Jolsen Street - Regulated	5/05/21	CRM 368558	Refused - Regulated Tree
Salisbury Downs	64 Thompson Avenue x 3 Trees (1 x Regulated)	12/05/21	CRM 369288	Refused x 3 (incl 1 Regulated)
Salisbury East	98 Barbara Street - Tree 2 - DA 21007389 - New Dwelling	5/05/21	DW 6669131	Approved @ Cost
Salisbury East	98 Barbara Street - Tree 3 - DA 21007389 - New Dwelling	5/05/21	DW 6669131	Approved @ Cost
Salisbury East	rear Unit 85 / 20 Smith Road - Fern Grove Blvd	3/05/21	CRM 367788	Approved
Salisbury East	rear Salisbury East Neighbourhood Centre	12/05/21	ETF 287347	Approved
Salisbury East	side 2 Strathpine Street - 3 trees - Fern Grove Blvd	26/05/21	CRM 371137	Refused x 3
Salisbury Heights	5 Francis Crescent - Tree 1 - Lot 59 - House B - New Dwelling - DA 21008917	44329	DW 6687591	Approved at Cost
Salisbury Heights	5 Francis Crescent - Tree 2 - Lot 59 - House B - New Dwelling - DA 21008917	44329	DW 6687591	Approved at Cost
Salisbury Heights	side 1 Veart Court - Pacific Cct - 2 trees	44330	CRM 367724	Approved x 2
Salisbury Heights	2 Chichester Court - Regulated	44328	CRM 364264	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Salisbury Heights	side 117 Target Hill Road - Dan Court	44335	CRM 370544	Approved x 1
Salisbury North	33 Chamberlain Street	44319	CRM 369903	Approved
Salisbury North	15 Uranbo Street - Regulated	44319	CRM 368413	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Salisbury North	40 Holstein Drive	44330	CRM 370387	Refused
Salisbury North	Lake Windemere	44335	ETF 281389	D/A Approved - Significant tree
Salisbury North	Lake Windemere - Significant Tree	44334	ETF 281389	Approval Supported - Significant Tree
Salisbury North	25 Garrin Street	44344	CRM 371234	Approved x 1
Salisbury North	4 Yuwindi Avenue - 2 trees	44335	ETF 287685	Approved x 2
Salisbury North	16 Yuwindi Avenue	44335	ETF 287685	Approved
Salisbury North	10 Yuwindi Avenue - Regulated	44335	ETF 287685	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Salisbury North	40 Guernsey Crescent - Regulated	44335	CRM 367792	Refused - Regulated Tree

FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT COUNCIL'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACE ASSETS OFFICER - 8406 8403

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: May 2021

Assessed by Parks and Open Space Assets team on site and removed based on Councils Tree Removal Criteria adopted by Council April 2016

	ADDRESS	DATE	REFERENCE	APP/REF
Salisbury Park	27a Johnswood Drive	44334	CRM 370816	Refused
Salisbury Park	1 Smedley Place - 3 trees - trees 2, 4 and 6th tree (nearest corner)	44330	CRM 368676	Approved x 3
Salisbury Park	1 Smedley Place - 4 trees	44330	CRM 368676	Refused x 4
Salisbury Park	6 Sandy Crescent - 2 x Regulated Trees	44342	CRM 370039	Refused x 2 Regulated Trees
Salisbury Plain	6 Bridle Court - x 2 Regulated Trees	44328	CRM 369638	Refused x 2 Regulated Trees
Valley View	54 Eyre Crescent - Regulated	44342	CRM 366327	Refused - Regulated Tree
Valley View	10 Florence Avenue - 221 - DW 6667745 - 2nd Driveway	44347	CRM 367485	Approved @ Cost
Walkley Heights	8 Waldin Court	44319	CRM 368448	Refused
Walkley Heights	1 The Circuit	44328	CRM 368836	Approved

FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT COUNCIL'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACE ASSETS OFFICER - 8406 8403

ITEM	TMASC3
	TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE
DATE	12 July 2021
HEADING	Review of Tree Removal Request - Various Locations
AUTHOR	Jamie Hosking, Team Leader Urban Built Assets, City Infrastructure
CITY PLAN LINKS	1.1 Our City is attractive and well maintained 1.2 The health and wellbeing of our community is a priority 2.1 Salisbury has a balance of green spaces and natural environments that support biodiversity
SUMMARY	In line with the approved tree removal procedure several decisions relating to the retention of trees have been appealed.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The report is received and noted
2. Council endorses the following:
 - a. Removal of 2 Angophora costata in front of 13 and 15 Arrow Crescent, Paralowie
 - b. Retention of 1 significant Angophora costata in front of 13 Arrow Crescent, Paralowie
 - c. Removal of 1 Eucalyptus sideroxylon in front of 15 Caloundra Drive, Paralowie and the 3 Eucalypts species adjacent.
 - d. Removal of 1 Eucalyptus sideroxylon in front of 7 Brando Court, Paralowie and 1 Eucalypts species adjacent.
 - e. Retention of 1 significant Eucalyptus sideroxylon opposite 7 Brando Court, Paralowie
 - f. Retention of 1 significant Eucalyptus sideroxylon in front of 33 Boyara Crescent, Paralowie
3. That in line with the procedure the residents are notified of the outcome of the appeals, removal works programmed and new trees are planted.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In line with the approved tree removal procedure residents are able to appeal decisions relating to the retention of trees, this appeal process involves;
 - On-site meeting with residents and ward members
 - Report to TMAS
 - Notification of outcome to residents
- 1.2 Several appeals have been lodged for trees that have been assessed over the last few months.

2. CONSULTATION / COMMUNICATION

2.1 Internal

2.1.1 Staff

2.2 External

2.2.1 Elected Members and residents

3. REPORT

3.1 The following appeals have been lodged under the tree removal policy; the residents are seeking the removal of the trees.

Location	Suburb	Description	On-site Meeting date
13 Arrow Crescent	Paralowie	Review of retention of two <i>Angophora costata</i> in front of the property	13 June 2021
15 Caloundra Drive	Paralowie	Review for removal of one <i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i>	13 June 2021
7 Brando Court	Paralowie	Review for removal of one regulated <i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i> and one <i>Eucalyptus leucoxylon</i>	13 June 2021
33 Boyara Crescent	Paralowie	Review for removal of two <i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i>	13 June 2021

4. 13 ARROW CRESCENT

ASSESSMENT

4.1 Request for assessment of 3 trees in front of 13 Arrow was received 10 May 2021.

4.2 Assessment was undertaken on 15 May 2021, and identified;

- 4 mature *Angophora costata* present within the verge in front of properties 13 and 15.
- Two trees in front of the property were assessed;
- Tree 1 (nearest driveway) – regulated tree, health-fair with good density and foliage colour, structure-fair with no structural flaws, remedial pruning and canopy reduction works recommended.
- Tree 2 – health-fair with good density and foliage colour, structure-fair with no structural flaws.

4.3 Sewer inspection was undertaken to identify resident concerns in relation to root invasion, inspection identified;

- Old earthenware non-sealed system
- Minor root infiltration through the pipe couplings is visible; this is very common for an earthenware drain of this age. There are multiple roots masses along the drainage system which aren't causing blockages at this time. The roots entering the system are taking advantage of the age of the drain as it is common for roots to enter from the joins.

4.4 When assessed against Council's tree removal criteria;

1	The tree is in an unsuitable location and is unreasonably obstructing approved infrastructure	No
2	The tree is inconsistent with the landscape style or character of the local area and/or does not contribute substantially to the landscape or streetscape	No
3	The spacing of trees planted on a standard width verge is inconsistent with the "Street Tree Planting Guide" for that species of tree, in accordance with the Streetscape Renewal Policy	No
4	The tree is diseased and has a short life expectancy or is dead and has no significant landscape or habitat value	No
5	The tree is structurally poor and/or poses an unacceptable risk to public or private safety and/or has a history of major limb failure	No
6	The trees roots are shown to be causing or threatening to cause damage exceeding two thousand dollars to adjacent infrastructure	No, while the roots have entered the sewer system this is due to the age and type of pipe work, this has not caused damage.
7	The trees roots have resulted in damage to Council's kerb or footpath that has required replacement or substantial repair works on more than one occasion within a 5-year period	No
8	The tree is in the location of a first single driveway of a property	No
9	The tree is in the location of an approved Council development	No
10	The tree has been assessed for removal as part of the "Streetscape or Landscape Redevelopment Programme"	No
11	The tree, according to a medical specialist or GP, has been determined to be the cause of a detrimental effect on the health of a nearby resident. Such advice must be in writing	No
12	Genuine hardship a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or; b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or; c. The person/resident is aged or frail and has moderate, severe or profound disabilities which prevent them from relieving the nuisance caused by the tree; or d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.	No.

- 4.5 The regulated tree when considered against the provisions within the Planning Development Infrastructure Act would be unlikely to meet criteria for removal and a Development Application would not be supported.

PO1.1	Performance Outcome. Regulated Trees are retained where they	Satisfied	Comments
a)	make an important visual contribution to local character and amenity	Yes	
b)	are indigenous to the local area and listed under the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972</i> as a rare or endangered native species	No	
c)	provide an important habitat for native fauna	Yes	

PO 1.3	Performance Outcome.	Satisfied	Comments
(a)	Tree damaging activity is only undertaken to:		
(i)	remove a diseased tree where its life expectancy is short	No	Tree is in good health
(ii)	mitigate an unacceptable risk to public or private safety due to limb drop or the like	No	Tree has no sign of structural issues
(iii)	rectify or prevent extensive damage to a building of value as comprising any of the following A. Local Heritage Place B. State Heritage Place C. Substantial building of value and there is no reasonable alternative to rectify or prevent such damage other than to undertake a tree damaging activity	No	Reasonable alternative to prevent against damage would include the replacement of the sewer system with a closed pipe that prevents root ingress.
(iv)	reduce an unacceptable hazard associated with a tree within 20 metres of an existing residential, tourist accommodation or other habitable building from bushfire	No	Tree has no sign of structural issues
(v)	treat disease or otherwise in the general interests of the health of the tree	No	
(vi)	Maintain the aesthetic appearance and structural integrity of the tree	No	

- 4.6 Based on the above the trees were identified for retention and the resident notified of the decision.

APPEAL

- 4.7 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the resident and ward members, Cr Chad Buchanan and Cr Donna Proleta. This occurred on the 23 June 2021.

- 4.8 Discussion reinforced the outcome for the tree assessment and justification for retention.
- 4.9 It was noted that the significant tree would be retained and it was agreed on site to put forward the removal of the two middle trees of the grouping of 4 to address the residents concern and alleviate the nuisance of roots in the sewer. It was noted that the removal of the two trees would not prevent the root intrusion; this would only be rectified by the replacement of the sewer system with a closed pipe.



5. 15 CALOUNDRA DRIVE PARALOWIE

ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 Request for assessment of 3 trees in front of 15 Caloundra Drive Paralowie was received 4 May 2021.
- 5.2 Assessment was undertaken on 5 May 2021, and identified;
- 1 mature Eucalyptus sideroxylon within the verge in front of property
 - Tree is in health-fair with good density and foliage colour, structure-fair with no structural flaws, remedial pruning and canopy reduction works recommended.
 - Some footpath disturbance was noted.

5.3 When assessed against Council's tree removal criteria;

1	The tree is in an unsuitable location and is unreasonably obstructing approved infrastructure	No
2	The tree is inconsistent with the landscape style or character of the local area and/or does not contribute substantially to the landscape or streetscape	No
3	The spacing of trees planted on a standard width verge is inconsistent with the "Street Tree Planting Guide" for that species of tree, in accordance with the Streetscape Renewal Policy	No
4	The tree is diseased and has a short life expectancy or is dead and has no significant landscape or habitat value	No
5	The tree is structurally poor and/or poses an unacceptable risk to public or private safety and/or has a history of major limb failure	No
6	The trees roots are shown to be causing or threatening to cause damage exceeding two thousand dollars to adjacent infrastructure	No
7	The trees roots have resulted in damage to Council's kerb or footpath that has required replacement or substantial repair works on more than one occasion within a 5-year period	Yes, some disturbance of lifting footpath pavers, which could be rectified.
8	The tree is in the location of a first single driveway of a property	No
9	The tree is in the location of an approved Council development	No
10	The tree has been assessed for removal as part of the "Streetscape or Landscape Redevelopment Programme"	No
11	The tree, according to a medical specialist or GP, has been determined to be the cause of a detrimental effect on the health of a nearby resident. Such advice must be in writing	No
12	Genuine hardship a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or; b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or; c. The person/resident is aged or frail and has moderate, severe or profound disabilities which prevent them from relieving the nuisance caused by the tree; or d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.	No.

5.1 Based on the above the tree was identified for retention and the resident notified of the decision.

APPEAL

- 5.2 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the resident and ward members, Cr Chad Buchanan and Cr Donna Proleta. This occurred on the 23 June 2021.
- 5.3 Discussion reinforced the outcome for the tree assessment and justification for retention.
- 5.4 It was noted on site that the verge width was narrow and the tree would eventually cause further damage to the footpath and kerb, which would contribute to the lifting of the footpath.
- 5.5 It was agreed on site to put forward the removal of the tree to limit further damage to council infrastructure.
- 5.6 It was also agreed on site that the 3 trees adjacent would be put forward for removal, with 1 having poor form, 1 being close to existing side entry pit and having poor form, 1 being dead and all 3 being overshadowed by the significant tree in the neighboring property.



**6. 7 BRANDO COURT PARALOWIE
ASSESSMENT**

- 6.1 Request for assessment of 1 tree in front of 7 Brando Court Paralowie and 2 two trees opposite was received 5 May 2021.
- 6.2 Assessment was undertaken on 6 May 2021, and identified;
- Tree 1 – mature Eucalyptus leucoxyylon within the verge in front of the property in health-fair with good density and foliage colour, structure-fair with no structural flaws, remedial pruning and canopy reduction works recommended.

- Tree 2 – mature Eucalyptus sideroxylon in the verge opposite the property, in health-fair with good density and foliage colour, structure-fair with no structural flaws. Noted to be within 1.2m of existing side entry pit, recommended for removal.
- Tree 3 – regulated Eucalyptus sideroxylon in the verge opposite the property, in health-fair with good density and foliage colour, structure-fair with no structural flaws, recommended for retention.

6.3 When assessed against Council's tree removal criteria;

1	The tree is in an unsuitable location and is unreasonably obstructing approved infrastructure	Tree 1 – No Tree 2 – Yes Tree 3 – No
2	The tree is inconsistent with the landscape style or character of the local area and/or does not contribute substantially to the landscape or streetscape	No
3	The spacing of trees planted on a standard width verge is inconsistent with the "Street Tree Planting Guide" for that species of tree, in accordance with the Streetscape Renewal Policy	No
4	The tree is diseased and has a short life expectancy or is dead and has no significant landscape or habitat value	No
5	The tree is structurally poor and/or poses an unacceptable risk to public or private safety and/or has a history of major limb failure	No
6	The trees roots are shown to be causing or threatening to cause damage exceeding two thousand dollars to adjacent infrastructure	No
7	The trees roots have resulted in damage to Council's kerb or footpath that has required replacement or substantial repair works on more than one occasion within a 5-year period	No
8	The tree is in the location of a first single driveway of a property	No
9	The tree is in the location of an approved Council development	No
10	The tree has been assessed for removal as part of the "Streetscape or Landscape Redevelopment Programme"	No
11	The tree, according to a medical specialist or GP, has been determined to be the cause of a detrimental effect on the health of a nearby resident. Such advice must be in writing	No
12	Genuine hardship a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or; b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or; c. The person/resident is aged or frail and has moderate, severe or profound disabilities which prevent them from relieving the nuisance caused by the tree; or d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.	Not at the time of assessment.

6.4 The regulated tree when considered against the provisions within the Planning Development Infrastructure Act would be unlikely to meet criteria for removal and a Development Application would not be supported.

PO1.1	Performance Outcome. Regulated Trees are retained where they	Satisfied	Comments
a)	make an important visual contribution to local character and amenity	Yes	
b)	are indigenous to the local area and listed under the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972</i> as a rare or endangered native species	No	
c)	provide an important habitat for native fauna	Yes	

PO 1.3 (a)	Performance Outcome. Tree damaging activity is only undertaken to:	Satisfied	Comments
(i)	remove a diseased tree where its life expectancy is short	No	Tree is in good health
(ii)	mitigate an unacceptable risk to public or private safety due to limb drop or the like	No	Tree has no sign of structural issues
(iii)	rectify or prevent extensive damage to a building of value as comprising any of the following A. Local Heritage Place B. State Heritage Place C. Substantial building of value and there is no reasonable alternative to rectify or prevent such damage other than to undertake a tree damaging activity	No	
(iv)	reduce an unacceptable hazard associated with a tree within 20 metres of an existing residential, tourist accommodation or other habitable building from bushfire	No	Tree has no sign of structural issues
(v)	treat disease or otherwise in the general interests of the health of the tree	No	
(vi)	Maintain the aesthetic appearance and structural integrity of the tree	No	

6.5 Based on the above the trees 1 and 3 were identified for retention, tree 2 was identified for removal and the resident notified of the decision.

APPEAL

6.6 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the resident and ward members, Cr Chad Buchanan and Cr Donna Proleta. This occurred on the 23 June 2021.

- 6.7 Discussion reinforced the outcome for the tree assessment and justification for retention.
- 6.8 The resident identified that they were experience hardship due to extended serious illness and could not undertake maintenance of the tree to remove nuisance.
- 6.9 It was noted on site that the verge width was narrow and the *E. leucoxylon* would eventually cause damage to the footpath, kerb and front fence as well as being with 1.5m of an existing side entry pit, which would contribute to the lifting of the footpath.
- 6.10 It was agreed on site that the *E. leucoxylon* would be removed as well as a small *Eucalyptus* with poor form adjacent.
- 6.11 It was noted that the remaining *E. sideroxylon* opposite the property being significant would be retained.



7. 33 BOYARA CRESENT PARALOWIE

ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 Request for assessment of 1 tree in front of 33 Boyara Crescent Paralowie was received 23 May 2021.
- 7.2 Assessment was undertaken on 24 May 2021, and identified;
- 1 regulated *Eucalyptus sideroxylon* in the verge opposite the property, in health-fair with good density and foliage colour, structure-fair with no structural flaws, recommended for retention.

7.3 When assessed against Council's tree removal criteria;

1	The tree is in an unsuitable location and is unreasonably obstructing approved infrastructure	No
2	The tree is inconsistent with the landscape style or character of the local area and/or does not contribute substantially to the landscape or streetscape	No
3	The spacing of trees planted on a standard width verge is inconsistent with the "Street Tree Planting Guide" for that species of tree, in accordance with the Streetscape Renewal Policy	No
4	The tree is diseased and has a short life expectancy or is dead and has no significant landscape or habitat value	No
5	The tree is structurally poor and/or poses an unacceptable risk to public or private safety and/or has a history of major limb failure	No
6	The trees roots are shown to be causing or threatening to cause damage exceeding two thousand dollars to adjacent infrastructure	No
7	The trees roots have resulted in damage to Council's kerb or footpath that has required replacement or substantial repair works on more than one occasion within a 5-year period	No
8	The tree is in the location of a first single driveway of a property	No
9	The tree is in the location of an approved Council development	No
10	The tree has been assessed for removal as part of the "Streetscape or Landscape Redevelopment Programme"	No
11	The tree, according to a medical specialist or GP, has been determined to be the cause of a detrimental effect on the health of a nearby resident. Such advice must be in writing	No
12	Genuine hardship a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or; b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or; c. The person/resident is aged or frail and has moderate, severe or profound disabilities which prevent them from relieving the nuisance caused by the tree; or d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.	Not at the time of assessment.

- 7.4 The regulated tree when considered against the provisions within the Planning Development Infrastructure Act would be unlikely to meet criteria for removal and a Development Application would not be supported.

PO1.1	Performance Outcome. Regulated Trees are retained where they	Satisfied	Comments
a)	make an important visual contribution to local character and amenity	Yes	
b)	are indigenous to the local area and listed under the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972</i> as a rare or endangered native species	No	
c)	provide an important habitat for native fauna	Yes	

PO1.3	Performance Outcome.	Satisfied	Comments
(a)	Tree damaging activity is only undertaken to:		
(i)	remove a diseased tree where its life expectancy is short	No	Tree is in good health
(ii)	mitigate an unacceptable risk to public or private safety due to limb drop or the like	No	Tree has no sign of structural issues
(iii)	rectify or prevent extensive damage to a building of value as comprising any of the following A. Local Heritage Place B. State Heritage Place C. Substantial building of value and there is no reasonable alternative to rectify or prevent such damage other than to undertake a tree damaging activity	No	
(iv)	reduce an unacceptable hazard associated with a tree within 20 metres of an existing residential, tourist accommodation or other habitable building from bushfire	No	Tree has no sign of structural issues
(v)	treat disease or otherwise in the general interests of the health of the tree	No	
(vi)	Maintain the aesthetic appearance and structural integrity of the tree	No	

- 7.5 Based on the above the tree was identified for retention.

APPEAL

- 7.6 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the resident and ward members, Cr Chad Buchanan and Cr Donna Proleta. This occurred on the 23 June 2021.

- 7.7 Discussion reinforced the outcome for the tree assessment and justification for retention.
- 7.8 It was noted that the significant tree would be retained and would be reviewed through the street tree planting program, which is expected to occur within the next 4 years.
- 7.9 Consideration for bringing the street forward in the program would be considered.

8. CONCLUSION / PROPOSAL

- 8.1 In line with the approved tree removal procedure several decisions relating to the retention of trees has been appealed.
- 8.2 Site meetings have been completed and recommendation made regarding retentions and removals.

CO-ORDINATION

Officer:	GMCI	EXEC
Date:	02/07/2021	05/07/2021