



Arboricultural Addendum

To: Delilah McIntyre, Project Planner, Civix Ltd delilah@civix.co.nz
From: Andrew Barrell, Consultant Arborist Tree 3 Ltd andybarrell@xtra.co.nz
Date: 26 April 2022
Re: 20 Melia Place, Whangaparaoa – *site development vs trees*
Updated arboricultural comments re: trees worthy of consideration for retention

Introduction

- 1) I was initially engaged by Melia Development Limited in 2021 to provide an arboricultural assessment of a site development proposal at 20 Melia Place Whangaparaoa ("*the site*"). The main focus of this assessment was originally based on what trees were to be removed, which were to be retained and the scale of effects upon retained trees associated with the proposed development works. This assessment was completed on 2 September 2021.
- 2) That assessment was based on limited information, including the final extent of groundworks and their effect upon the viability of retaining trees around the periphery of the site. As such a definitive conclusion was unable to be provided. Subsequent to that assessment, an earthworks consent was granted for the earthworks component of the project (LUC60386828); however, there was a requirement to update any arboricultural conclusions and assessments based on the consented earthworks plans. I reviewed the consented earthworks plans along with the then current version of the landscape plans on 22 April 2022.
- 3) The aim of this addendum is to provide updated arboricultural comments relating to which trees are now deemed worthy of consideration for retention with regard to the confirmed extent of earthworks and associated ground disturbance as consented.
- 4) I have arboricultural experience and qualifications, the details of which are summarised on my website at the following address: <http://tree3.co.nz/about-us/andy-barrel-cv/>. I have based this addendum on my initial site observations and review of consented documentation and the subsequent comments have been made in light of my experience.

Updated arboricultural conclusions

- 5) It appears that retaining walls and/or significant earthworks are to occur along the northern and south-western boundaries, practically to the boundaries themselves. This means there will definitely be ground disturbance within 3-4m of any trees along these boundaries and as such there is no scope to realistically retain any of the trees, at least in a condition that would be considered reasonably safe or healthy.
- 6) In other words, some trees close to earthworks may be able to be retained but there is a high likelihood that they would have their health and/or stability compromised to the point where the values they provide are outweighed by the risk they present and/or the associated maintenance burdens required to maintain acceptable levels of safety into the future.
- 7) My initial report was based on limited and indeterminate information with respect to the extent and scale of the earthworks required for the proposal. Now that specific and precise information is available from the granted earthworks consent, it is evident that the consented cut and fill works will effectively preclude the potential to retain any trees along these boundaries, either for the reasons outlined in paragraph 6 above (for trees close to earthworks) or simply because the trees will be directly upon areas that need to be dug up.
- 8) This renders the recommendations and conclusions in that initial report as they pertain to anticipated retention of trees along the northern and south-western boundaries as effectively redundant as there is no scope to retain any trees along these boundaries.
- 9) With regard to the landscaping proposal, it appears that the areas in question (northern and south-western boundaries) are reliant in part on existing trees augmenting the screening that will be provided by new planting. My conclusion here is that screening will be totally dependent on new planting and that there may be complications on the northern boundary in particular with finding locations to plant large-growing trees due to the proximity of retaining walls to each other and spatial limitations for root development and future tree stability.
- 10) This issue can be resolved by using site-appropriate species that do not require large rooting areas and do not become large but still generate enough green coverage to provide adequate screening. It is my opinion that sufficient screening can be achieved with infill planting, and that the scale and type of infill planting required to replace the vegetation that needs to be removed, which I understand is intended to be predominantly native species, will ultimately result in better outcomes for the site than if the existing trees and vegetation were to be retained.
- 11) There are no particularly fine or outstanding specimens along either the northern or south-western boundaries so, in my opinion, there will be no major environmental or amenity losses if they are all removed. In reality, a planned planting scheme has the potential to provide a much more effective and sustainable long-term amenity and ecological asset in these areas as opposed to trying to retain what are in effect low quality trees that will compete with and retard the establishment and development of new planting.
- 12) As such I consider it to be a more robust and effective long-term strategy to assume all trees on these boundaries are to be removed and to adapt the landscaping plan to provide maximum screening on its own merit. The landscaping specifications along these boundaries can be tailored to accommodate this outcome.

Please feel free to contact me if you require further clarification of any of the above points.

Andrew Barrell

Director, Tree3 Ltd

26 April 2022