



AGENDA

FOR TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE MEETING TO BE HELD ON

**11 OCTOBER 2021 AT CONCLUSION OF THE ASSET MANAGEMENT
SUB COMMITTEE MEETING**

**IN LITTLE PARA CONFERENCE ROOMS, SALISBURY COMMUNITY HUB,
34 CHURCH STREET, SALISBURY**

MEMBERS

Cr S Reardon (Chairman)
Mayor G Aldridge (ex officio)
Deputy Mayor, 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 13 September 2021.

REPORTS

- TMASC1 Future Reports for the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee
(please note there are no forward reports as a result of a Council resolution
to be listed at this time)
- TMASC2 Tree Removal Requests - Monthly Update 7
- TMASC3 Review of Tree Removal Request - Various Locations 15

OTHER BUSINESS

CLOSE



**MINUTES OF TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
IN WITTBER AND DR RUBY DAVY ROOMS, SALISBURY COMMUNITY HUB,
34 CHURCH STREET, SALISBURY ON**

13 SEPTEMBER 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT	Cr S Reardon (Chair) Mayor G Aldridge (ex officio) Deputy Mayor, Cr C Buchanan Cr P Jensen (Deputy Chair) Cr S Ouk
OBSERVERS	Cr L Braun Cr D Proleta Cr K Grenfell Cr G Reynolds General Manager Business Excellence, Mr C Mansueto General Manager City Development, Ms M English
STAFF	Chief Executive Officer, Mr J Harry General Manager City Infrastructure, Mr J Devine Team Leader Urban Built Assets, Mr J Hosking Manager Governance, Mr R Deco PA to General Manager City Infrastructure, Ms H Prasad

The meeting commenced at 7.17pm.

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

APOLOGIES

Nil.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES

Moved Cr P Jensen
Seconded Cr S Ouk

The Minutes of the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee Meeting held on 09 August 2021, be taken as read and confirmed.

CARRIED

REPORTS

TMASC1 Future Reports for the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee

Please note there are no forward reports as a result of a Council resolution to be listed at this time.

TMASC2 Tree Removal Requests - Monthly Update

Moved Cr C Buchanan
Seconded Cr P Jensen

That Council:

1. Notes the information in the report.

CARRIED

TMASC3 Review of Tree Removal Request - 3 Tulip Court Parafield Gardens

Moved Cr S Ouk
Seconded Cr C Buchanan

1. In accordance with delegated powers set out in the adopted Terms of Reference in relation to non-regulated/significant trees, the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee approve:
 - a. Removal of 5 Eucalyptus trees in front of 3 Tulip Court Parafield Gardens
 - b. Pruning of overhanging side fence of 3 Tulip Court Parafield Gardens
 - c. that in line with the approved procedures, staff notify residents of appeal outcomes and organise any tree removal and replacement work

AND

That Council:

1. Approves Tulip Court, Parafield Gardens be considered for inclusion in the Streetscape Program for 2022/23.

CARRIED

TMASC4 Tree Replacement Report Request

Moved Cr C Buchanan
 Seconded Mayor G Aldridge

That Council:

1. Notes the expected cost increase to the annual street tree planting program and associated cost resulting from the change to the policy requiring 10 new trees per significant or regulated tree removal.
2. Endorses that no changes be made to the current policy as it already makes provision for the replacement of significant and regulated trees in line with the *Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

Nil.

CLOSE

The meeting closed at 7.21 pm.

CHAIR.....

DATE.....

**INFORMATION
ONLY
ITEM**

TMASC2

TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE**DATE**

11 October 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.

RECOMMENDATIONThat Council:

- 1. Notes the report.

ATTACHMENTS

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

- 1. Tree Removal Requests August 2021

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 upload 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 relevant 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 August 2021.
- 3.2 93 tree removal requests were received in August. Of these requests 74 were approved for removal including 21 significant or regulated trees approved through development applications. 19 applications were refused. Of the 19 refused applications, 11 are related to significant or regulated trees under the *Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.
- 3.3 Tree removal requests often result in ongoing dialogue between the owner of the property and Council on the proposed 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.

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: August 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
Burton	3 Currawong Street	13/08/2021	CRM 376357	Refused
Burton	18 Coolen Crescent	13/08/2021	CRM 373362	Refused
Burton	Greenvale Crescent Reserve - side 32 Lakeridge Crct - tree nearest front of property	27/08/2021	CRM 376218	Approved x 1
Direk	53-55 Mirage Road - DA 21023676 - Tree 1	27/08/2021	DW 6895135	Approved @ Cost
Direk	53-55 Mirage Road - DA 21023676 - Tree 2	27/08/2021	DW 6895135	Approved @ Cost
Green Fields	side 1 McDermott Place - Hilditch Drive - tree nearest corner	20/08/2021	CRM 374860	Approved x 1
Gulfview Heights	3 Cordoba Court - Regulated - next to drive	4/08/2021	CRM 374094	Refused - Regulated
Gulfview Heights	3 Cordoba Court - next to path to house	4/08/2021	CRM 374094	Refused
Gulfview Heights	21 Kiebusch Road - larger tree	4/08/2021	CRM 374909	Approved x 1
Gulfview Heights	2 Annalisa Court - Significant Tree	13/08/2021	CRM 376376	Approval Supported - Significant tree
Ingle Farm	26A Atlanta Avenue - Regulated	9/08/2021	CRM 375347	Refused - Regulated Tree
Ingle Farm	8 Lara Street - Regulated	11/08/2021	CRM 371128	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Ingle Farm	1 Mandy Court	12/08/2021	CRM 376502	Approved
Ingle Farm	24 Luprena Avenue - New Dwelling - DA 21020803	18/08/2021	DW6878444	Refused - dwelling to be flipped
Ingle Farm	Bromley Green - side 17 Yutara Avenue - Significant	20/08/2021	CRM 376606	Approval Supported - Significant tree
Ingle Farm	11 Stuart Avenue	24/08/2021	CRM 377249	Refused
Ingle Farm	32 Devoncourt Avenue - Regulated Tree	24/08/2021	CRM 377128	Refused - Regulated Tree
Ingle Farm	9 Mataro Avenue - Tree 2 - Dwelling - Lot 1 - DA21024726	25/08/2021	DW 6867209	Approved @ Cost x 1
Mawson Lakes	Technology Park Reserve (the tree is located within the council reserve at a south/west location of Main North Rd and Mawson Lakes Blvd intersection)	3/08/2021	ETF 289613	Approval Supported - Significant Tree
Mawson Lakes	Technology Park Reserve - Regulated - (the tree is located within the council reserve at a south/west location of Main North Rd and Mawson Lakes Blvd intersection)	6/08/2021	ETF 289613	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Mawson Lakes	Unit 1 / 10F Lakeside Close - tree on boundary between Unit 1 & Unit 2	11/08/2021	CRM 376420	Approved
Mawson Lakes	25 Innes Circuit	12/08/2021	CRM 375019	Approved

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

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: August 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
Mawson Lakes	side 6-8 Park Way - Second Avenue - Tindo Solar	12/08/2021	CRM 374709	Approved x 1
Para Hills	Amundsen Gully Reserve - side 36 Robert Court - 3 native pines	13/08/2021	CRM 375670	Approved x 3
Para Hills	16 Pankala Road	27/08/2021	CRM 377111	Approved
Para Hills West	414 Bridge Road - 2 trees under H/V lines to repair a water main	18/08/2021	CRM 370926	Approved x 2
Para Vista	179 Nelson Road - Regulated Tree	9/08/2021	CRM 375286	Refused - Regulated Tree
Para Vista	rear 7 Barina Avenue - Waters Place - Regulated - Ac. salicina	9/08/2021	CRM 373902	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Para Vista	rear 7 Barina Avenue - Waters Place - Non Regulated - Ac. salicina	9/08/2021	CRM 373902	Approved
Para Vista	42 Malbando Avenue	23/08/2021	ETF 293478	Approved
Para Vista	rear 7 Barina Avenue - Waters Place - Regulated	31/08/2021	CRM 373902	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens	7 Virginia Drive - Regulated Tree	3/08/2021	CRM 373064	Refused - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens	6 Rolls Court - tree nearest drive	4/08/2021	CRM 375163	Approved x 1
Parafield Gardens	18 McDonald Road	9/08/2021	ETF 292814	Approved
Parafield Gardens	11 Primrose Court - Regulated - tree near drive	6/08/2021	CRM 374210	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens	11 Primrose Court - Regulated - tree near drive	9/08/2021	CRM 374210	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens	2 Wingate Crescent - Regulated tree nearest corner	20/08/2021	CRM 375858	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens	2 Wingate Crescent - Regulated tree nearest drive	20/08/2021	CRM 375858	Refused - Regulated Tree
Parafield Gardens	Unit 8 / 19 Palm Court - tree furthest from drive	20/08/2021	CRM 377252	Approved x 1
Paralowie	7 Ludwig Street - DA 21021304 - Lot 701 - north/western street tree	5/08/2021	DW 6845538	Approved @ Cost x 1
Paralowie	side 36 Crosby Way - middle tree	9/08/2021	CRM 375326	Approved
Paralowie	side 36 Crosby Way - outer tree - Regulated	9/08/2021	CRM 375326	Refused - Regulated
Paralowie	side 36 Crosby Way - outer tree - Non Regulated	9/08/2021	CRM 375326	Refused - Non Regulated
Paralowie	66 Tintara Road - Regulated	6/08/2021	CRM 375469	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree

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

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: August 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
Paralowie	Hausler Reserve - Tamarix aphylla 7-1000 diam	11/08/2021	DW 6855815 PR30219	Approved
Paralowie	10 Manuela Court	13/08/2021	CRM 375254	Refused
Paralowie	adjacent 317A Kings Road - Regulated - Retrospective	11/08/2021	CRM 371414	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Paralowie	adjacent 317A Kings Road - Regulated - Retrospective	11/08/2021	CRM 371414	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Paralowie	30 Arrow Crescent - 2 trees at front	13/08/2021	CRM 375752	Approved x 2
Paralowie	21 Hendrix Crescent - Regulated	13/08/2021	CRM 363599	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Paralowie	31 Bermudez Crescent - New Dwelling - DA 21018903	19/08/2021	DW 6878902	Approved @ Cost
Paralowie	side 78 Magdalena Crescent - tree nearest drive of 34 Mendez	12/08/2021	CRM 376099	Approved x 1
Paralowie	187 Whites Road - 2 trees at front	20/08/2021	CRM 377370	Approved x 2
Paralowie	21 Hendrix Crescent - Regulated	24/08/2021	CRM 363599	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Paralowie	9 Hookes Court - tree next to drive	25/08/2021	CRM 376711	Approved
Paralowie	22 Delamere Drive - Regulated - Near drive	30/08/2021	CRM 376852	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Paralowie	24 Brando Court	30/08/2021	CRM 376583	Approved
Pooraka	7 Reagal Street - Significant Tree	3/08/2021	CRM 375352	Refused - Significant Tree
Pooraka	rear 49 Trenton Terrace - Montague Road - 2 trees on fenceline at rear of property	9/08/2021	CRM 375642	Approved x 2
Pooraka	25 Rains Drive - smaller tree	13/08/2021	CRM 376403	Approved
Pooraka	25 Rains Drive - Regulated Tree	13/08/2021	CRM 376403	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Pooraka	14 Elder Avenue - DA 21024399 - newly planted tree (2020) to be relocated	26/08/2021	DW 6894089	Approved - relocate tree on verge
Pooraka	109 Royal Avenue	27/08/2021	CRM 376498	Refused
Salisbury	Pioneer Park - rear 63-65 Commercial Road (Acacia sp)	4/08/2021	CRM 374525	Approved x 1
Salisbury	60 Eliza Street - New Dwelling - Tree 2 - Lot 101 - Ada Street frontage - DA 21018717 - replant fee only	26/08/2021	DW 6894467	Approved @ Cost - replant fee only

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

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: August 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	60 Eliza Street - New Dwelling - Tree 3 - Lot 100 - Eliza Street frontage - DA 21018717 - replant fee only	26/08/2021	DW 6894467	Approved @ Cost
Salisbury Downs	Salisbury West Library - rhs when heading towards main entrance	19/08/2021	ETF 293262	Approved x 1 (Acacia)
Salisbury Downs	Salisbury Downs Oval - Regulated tree opp 18 Galway Crescent	31/08/2021	CRM 374849	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Salisbury Downs	Salisbury Downs Oval - Regulated tree opp 18 Galway Crescent	27/08/2021	CRM 374849	Approval Supported - Regulated Tree
Salisbury Downs	5 Wicklow Street - Agave plants either side of drive	25/08/2021	CRM 376858	Approved
Salisbury East	12 Howe Court	3/08/2021	CRM 374025	Approved
Salisbury East	Agnes Court Reserve - side 6 Agnes Court	4/08/2021	CRM 374275	Approved x 1
Salisbury East	10 Turquoise Drive	9/08/2021	CRM 375376	Approved
Salisbury East	23 Charlton Drive - tree nearest drive	13/08/2021	CRM 376923	Approved x 1
Salisbury East	15 Birch Avenue	19/08/2021	CRM 377271	Approved
Salisbury Heights	84 Canterbury Drive - Regulated - tree nearest drive of no. 86	4/08/2021	CRM 375039	Refused - Regulated Tree
Salisbury Heights	43D Coomurra Drive - middle tree - DA 21020813	10/08/2021	DW 6853894	Approved @ Cost x 1
Salisbury Heights	93 Stanford Road - Regulated	4/08/2021	CRM 374955	Refused - Regulated
Salisbury Heights	side 1 Bath Court - tree nearest corner on Canterbury Drive	12/08/2021	CRM 375843	Approved
Salisbury Heights	1 Bath Court - tree nearest drive	12/08/2021	CRM 375843	Approved
Salisbury Heights	tree on boundary between 7 and 8 Guildford Close - Regulated	13/08/2021	CRM 376603	Refused - Regulated
Salisbury Heights	21 Pacific Circuit - tree at side, nearest corner	27/08/2021	CRM 375335	Approved x 1
Salisbury North	16 Coordinate Road - dead tree	4/08/2021	CRM 375370	Approved
Salisbury North	15 Uranbo Street - Regulated	3/08/2021	CRM 368413	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Salisbury North	17 Grovely Avenue	13/08/2021	CRM 376541	Approved
Salisbury North	31 Joanne Street	13/08/2021	CRM 375955	Approved
Salisbury North	24 Lelta Avenue - Regulated	27/08/2021	CRM 374288	Approval Supported
Salisbury Park	12 Bindana Avenue - Regulated	12/08/2021	CRM 372268	D/A Approved - Regulated Tree
Salisbury Plain	22-22A Barndioota Road - almond tree - failed	27/08/2021	CRM 377673	Approved
Salisbury South	28-36 Cheviot Road - Tree 1 - Cheviot Road	31/08/2021	DW 6896824	Approved @ Cost

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

TREE REMOVAL REQUESTS

MONTH: August 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 South	28-36 Cheviot Road - Tree 2 - Cheviot Road	31/08/2021	DW 6896824	Approved @ Cost
Salisbury South	28-36 Cheviot Road - Tree 3 - Cheviot Road	31/08/2021	DW 6896824	Approved @ Cost
Valley View	20-22 Flinders Drive - nearest letterbox	30/08/2021	CRM 377851	Approved

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

ITEM	TMASC3
	TREE MANAGEMENT APPEALS SUB COMMITTEE
DATE	11 October 2021
HEADING	Review of Tree Removal Request - Various Locations
AUTHORS	Jamie Hosking, Team Leader Urban Built Assets, City Infrastructure Craig Johansen, Team Leader Natural 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. That the Tree Management Appeals Sub Committee, in accordance with its delegated powers set out in the adopted Terms of Reference in relation to non-regulated/significant trees:
 - a. Approves the removal of 1 Eucalyptus tree in front of 15 Blasess Drive, Paralowie.
 - b. Approves the retention of the regulated Eucalyptus sideroxylon in front of 54 Eyre Crescent, Valley View.
 - c. Notes that the two regulated Eucalyptus leucoxylon in front of 9 Townsend Avenue, Parafield Gardens, have been identified for removal through the streetscape program in 2022.
 - d. Approves the retention of the regulated Eucalyptus leucoxylon in front of 22 Shorney Road, Parafield Gardens
 - e. Approves the retention of the regulated leucoxylon in front of 8 Briony Way, Paralowie
 - f. Approves the retention of regulated Eucalyptus sideroxylon, 9 Scott Avenue, Salisbury Heights

AND

That Council:

1. Approves the lodgement of development applications seeking removal of;
 - a. The two regulated Eucalyptus leucoxylon trees in front of 6 Sandy Crescent, Parafield Gardens, noting that should the application be approved four replacement trees will be planted in the verge in front of 4 and 6 Sandy Crescent, Parafield Gardens.

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

2. CONSULTATION / COMMUNICATION

2.1 Internal

2.1.1 Staff

2.2 External

2.2.1 Residents

2.2.2 Ward Councillors in line with the adopted procedures

3. REPORT

3.1 The following appeals have been lodged under the Tree Removal Policy; the resident is seeking the removal of the trees.

Street	Suburb	Ward	Trees
15 Blaess Drv	Paralowie	Central	1 x Eucalyptus leucoxylon
54 Eyre Crescent	Valley View	South	1 x regulated Eucalyptus sideroxylon
6 Sandy Crescent	Salisbury Park	East	2 x regulated Eucalyptus leucoxylon
9 Townsend Avenue	Parafield Gardens	Para	2 x regulated Eucalyptus leucoxylon
22 Shorney Road	Parafield Gardens	Para	1 x regulated Eucalyptus leucoxylon
8 Briony Way	Paralowie	Central	1 x regulated Eucalyptus leucoxylon
9 Scott Avenue	Salisbury Heights	East	1 x regulated Eucalyptus sideroxylon

4. 15 BLAESS DRIVE PARALOWIE



Assessment

- 4.1 Request for assessment of tree in front of 15 Blaess Drive, Paralowie was received 22 March 2021.
- 4.2 Assessment was undertaken on 13 April 2021, and identified:
 - 1 mature *Eucalyptus leucoxylon* present within the verge in front of the property; the health was found to be fair with fair density and foliage colour. The structure was found to be fair with no structural flaws. Remedial pruning and canopy reduction works were recommended.
- 4.3 The resident identified that he would like to install a new front fence, he was concerned the tree would impact the new footing for the new fence and the continued deterioration of the footpath.

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, there is minor disturbance of the footpath which is within level of service. Impact to the proposed fence would be unlikely given the existing masonry letter box is unaffected by the tree.
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 Program"	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	<p>Genuine hardship</p> <p>a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or;</p> <p>b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or;</p> <p>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</p> <p>d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.</p>	No.
----	--	-----

Appeal

- 4.5 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the applicant and Ward Councillors. This occurred on 15 September.
- 4.6 Discussion reinforced the outcome of the initial tree assessment and justification for retention based on the heath and structure of the tree.
- 4.7 It was noted that the footpath was in poor condition but still met proper level of service and that the potential impact to the proposed fence would be unlikely given the condition of the existing letter box.
- 4.8 It was agreed that the tree would be removed and a more suitable species planted.

5. 54 EYRE CRESCENT, VALLEY VIEW



Item TMASC3

Assessment

- 5.1 Request for assessment of tree in front of 54 Eyre Crescent Paralowie was received 5 March 2021. The tree has previously been assessed:
- 2009 when requested removal for a second driveway, a request for second driveway isn't a criteria for removal and was therefore refused
 - 2014 when requested for removal due to leaf litter, leaf drop and nuisance which aren't criteria for removal and was therefore refused. Pruning works were undertaken to reduce canopy and overhang of the private property.

- 2020 works to remove tree roots in stormwater pipes was completed noting that previous poor repair of the stormwater was causing the ingress to tree roots

5.2 Assessment was undertaken on 14 March 2021, and identified;

- 1 regulated *Eucalyptus sideroxylon* present within the verge in front of the property. The health was found to be fair with fair density and foliage colour. The structure was found to be fair with no structural flaws. Remedial pruning and canopy reduction works were recommended.

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	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 Program"	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 The regulated tree when considered against the provisions within the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* would be unlikely to meet criteria for removal and a Development Application would not be supported.

Desired Outcome - Conservation of regulated trees to provide aesthetic and environmental benefit and mitigate tree loss.

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	No	

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	NA	
(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	

Appeal

- 5.2 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the Ward Councillors. This occurred on 16 September.
- 5.3 Discussion reinforced the outcome of the tree assessment and justification for retention based on the health and structure of the trees.
- 5.4 It was agreed that the tree would be retained due to it not meeting criteria for removal under the City of Salisbury policy or through the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

6. 6 SANDY CRESCENT, SALISBURY PARK



Item TMASC3

Assessment

- 6.1 Request for assessment of trees in front of 6 Sandy Crescent Salisbury Park was received 29 April 2021.
- 6.2 Assessment was undertaken on 14 March 2021, and identified:
 - 2 regulated *Eucalyptus lecoxylon* present within the verge in front of the property. The health was found to be fair with fair density and foliage colour. The structure was found to be fair with no structural flaw. Remedial pruning and canopy reduction works were recommended.

6.3 When assessed against Council's tree removal criteria:

1	The tree is in an unsuitable location and is unreasonably obstructing approved infrastructure	No, works have been undertaken to reduce the impact on the kerb and water table by construction of a new kerb and water table around the roots. However, it is noted that stormwater builds up in the kerb and water table which has an impact on the two properties; this is likely due to the flat grade of the area.
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	Yes, however this has been managed through the recent kerb works
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, likely that the kerb and water table will be impacted in future years
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	No

	"Streetscape or Landscape Redevelopment Program"	
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.

- 6.4 The regulated trees when considered against the provisions within the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* would be unlikely to meet criteria for removal and a Development Application would not be supported.

Desired Outcome - Conservation of regulated trees to provide aesthetic and environmental benefit and mitigate tree loss.

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	Yes	
c)	provide an important habitat for native fauna	No	

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 D. Local Heritage Place E. State Heritage Place F. 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	NA	
(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	

Appeal

- 6.5 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the Ward Councillors. This occurred on 14 September 2021.
- 6.6 Discussion reinforced the outcome of the tree assessment and justification for retention based on the health and structure of the trees.
- 6.7 It was agreed that due to the impact of the stormwater and the close proximity to the kerb and water table that would continue to be impacted, the trees would be put forward for removal through a development application.

7. 9 TOWNSEND AVE PARAFIELD GARDENS



Assessment

- 7.1 A request for assessment of tree in front of 6 Sandy Crescent Salisbury Park was received 17 May 2021.
- 7.2 Assessment was undertaken on 24 May 2021, and identified:
- 2 regulated *Eucalyptus lecoxylon* present within the verge in front of the property. The health was found to be fair with fair density and foliage colour. The structure was found to be fair with no structural flaws. Remedial pruning and canopy reduction works were recommended.

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 Program"	Yes, Townsend Ave has been included within the 2020/21 Street Tree Program; the two trees have been identified for removal through the program.

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.

- 7.4 The regulated trees when considered against the provisions within the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*, are likely to meet criteria for removal. Given the two trees have been recommended for removal as part of the Streetscape Program a Development Application would be supported.

Desired Outcome - Conservation of regulated trees to provide aesthetic and environmental benefit and mitigate tree loss.

PO1.1	Performance Outcome. Regulated Trees are retained where they	Satisfied	Comments
a)	make an important visual contribution to local character and amenity	No	The trees have been identified for removal through the street tree program and when considered within the context of the whole of street removal would no longer be consistent with the character and amenity of the area.

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	Yes	
c)	provide an important habitat for native fauna	No	

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 G. Local Heritage Place H. State Heritage Place I. 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	NA	
(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	

Appeal

- 7.5 Following receipt of appeal against the decision for retention an on-site meeting was arranged with the resident and Ward Councillors. This occurred on 15 September 202.
- 7.6 Discussion reinforced the outcome of the tree assessment and justification for removal based on inclusion within the street tree program.

8. 22 SHORNEY ROAD, PARAFIELD GARDENS**Assessment**

- 8.1 Request for assessment of the verge tree in front of 22 Shorney Road was received 12/05/2020. The tree was assessed by staff and a letter of refusal was provided October 2020.
- 8.2 Assessment of the street tree in relation to this enquiry was undertaken 18 July 2020.
- 8.3 The tree was found to be in good health and fair structure, meeting minimal criteria of Councils Removal Criteria.
- 8.4 Request for the removal of the tree was due to the impact of roots on private property. In 2019 Council undertook root pruning at this address.

8.5 The resident identified within their property roots that radiated from the tree and extend well into their front yard. As well as displacement of the front fence and concrete plinth which has caused the fence panel and post to become separated and the fence panel is secured with wire.

8.6 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	Yes
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 Program"	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	<p>Genuine hardship</p> <p>a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or;</p> <p>b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or;</p> <p>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</p> <p>d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.</p>	No.
----	--	-----

Appeal

- 8.7 An appeal of the decision was received in November 2020, seeking action to rectify damage to private property attributed to roots of the street tree.
- 8.8 An assessment was undertaken on 15 July 2021, with the 2 Ward Councillors. The following was identified:
- A single mature *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* (River Red Gum) present within the verge in front of the property and was assessed;
 - Tree was noted to be in good health with good density and foliage colour. The structure was found to be fair with no structural flaws. There was evidence that remedial pruning and canopy reduction works have been completed in the past.
 - The tree has overhead power lines through the canopy of the tree, with insulation on lines in contact with tree branches being noted.
- 8.9 Resident identified within their property roots extending well into their front yard, as well as displacement of the front fence and concrete plinth which has caused the fence panel and post to become separated and is secured with wire.
- 8.10 Discussion on site with the Ward Councillors reinforced the outcome of the tree assessment and justification for retention based on the health and structure of the tree, noting that the tree is classified as a Regulated Tree under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

9. 8 BRIONY WAY, PARALOWIE



Item TMASC3

Assessment

- 9.1 Request for assessment of the verge tree in front of 8 Briony Way was received 19/12/2020, where the tree was assessed by staff and a letter of refusal was provided January 2021.
- 9.2 Assessment of the street tree in relation to this enquiry was undertaken 5 January 2021.
- 9.3 The tree was found to be in good health and fair structure, meeting none of the Councils Removal Criteria. Following this inspection works were raised to reduce the canopy of the tree, which were completed in February 2021.

- 9.4 Request for the removal of the tree was due to the trees impact on private property, with the dropping of debris and the hazard that this creates within their property, along with the residents' concern that the tree is dangerous due to the tall nature of the tree. Historically the resident has identified roots within their property which Council have pruned each time that Council has been informed.
- 9.5 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 Program"	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	<p>Genuine hardship</p> <p>a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or;</p> <p>b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or;</p> <p>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</p> <p>d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.</p>	No.
----	--	-----

Appeal

- 9.6 An appeal of the decision was received in late January 2021, seeking action to address their concerns about the mess/ debris the tree creates in the street and the hazard this debris can cause.
- 9.7 Assessment was undertaken on 15 July 2021, with the 2 Ward Councillors where the following was identified:
- A single mature *Eucalyptus leucoxylon* (SA Blue Gum) present within the verge in front of the property and was assessed;
 - Tree was found to be in good health with good density and foliage colour. The structure was found to be fair with no structural flaws. There was evidence of remedial pruning and canopy reduction works having been completed recently.
 - It was noted with the resident that the splitting in the branches that the tree displayed were growth splits and are not detrimental to the structure of the tree, but evidence that the tree is in good health and in active growth
- 9.8 Discussion on site with the Ward Councillors reinforced the outcome of the tree assessment and justification for retention based on the health and structure of the trees, noting that the tree is classified as a Regulated Tree under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

10. 9 SCOTT AVENUE, SALISBURY HEIGHTS



Item TMASC3

Assessment

- 10.1 Request for assessment of the verge tree in front of 9 Scott Avenue was received 15/12/2020, where the tree was assessed by staff and a letter of refusal was provided January 2021.
- 10.2 Assessment of the street tree in relation to this enquiry was undertaken 12 January 2021.
- 10.3 The tree was found to be in good health and fair structure, meeting no criteria of Council's Removal Criteria. Following this inspection works were raised to reduce the canopy of the tree, completed in February 2021.

10.4 Request for the removal of the tree was due to the trees impact on private property. Through the dropping of debris and small branches within private property which are a threat to occupants of the property. and the concern of the resident that the tree is dangerous due to the tall nature of the tree. This enquiry is one of many that Council received following the incidents related to large trees at the end of 2020.

10.5 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 Program"	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	<p>Genuine hardship</p> <p>a. The person/resident is receiving HACC or a community care service or;</p> <p>b. The person/resident does not have the functional ability to relieve the nuisance caused by the tree or;</p> <p>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</p> <p>d. The person/resident is a carer of a person that meets the above criteria.</p>	No.
----	--	-----

Appeal

- 10.6 A letter of reply was received in response to the refusal letter in late January 2021. Staff followed up with the resident on this correspondence to confirm that they were seeking a review of the decision.
- 10.7 Assessment was undertaken on 15 July 2021, with the 2 Ward Councillors where the following was identified:
- A single *Eucalyptus sideroxylon* (Ironbark) present within the verge in front of the property and was assessed;
 - Tree was noted to be of good health with good density and foliage colour. The structure was found to be fair with no structural flaws. There was evidence of remedial pruning and canopy reduction opportunities.
- 10.8 Discussion on site with the Ward Councillors reinforced the outcome of the tree assessment and justification for retention based on the health and structure of the tree, noting that the tree is classified as a Regulated Tree under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

11. CONCLUSION / PROPOSAL

- 11.1 In accordance with the approved tree removal procedure, some decision relating to the retention of trees have been appealed.
- 11.2 Site meetings have been completed and recommendations are made regarding the tree removal appeals and actions recorded.