

Request for Decision

Tree Removal Request Decision - 823 Morningside Crescent

Presented To:	Hearing Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Mar 23, 2016
Report Date	Wednesday, Mar 02, 2016
Type:	Public Hearings

Resolution

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury decline the request for tree removal from the road allowance at 823 Morningside Crescent, Sudbury.

REPORT

The following documented summary of events is provided for consideration:

November 24, 2014 – A request for tree removal was initially submitted to the City via ACR (#653859). The resident (Mr. Michel Gionet) brought forward a request to the City that a Linden Tree (closest one to the driveway) be removed for the following reasons.

• Tree roots are 4" in diameter and are located 30 to 40 feet from the house which could pose future plumbing problems. No small patches of landscaping can be established in this area due to the oversized roots. The resident also wants to put in a second driveway to accommodate his rental apartment.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Tony De Silva Roads Operations Engineer Digitally Signed Mar 2, 16

Division Review

David Shelsted
Director of Roads & Transportation
Services
Digitally Signed Mar 2, 16

Recommended by the Department

Tony Cecutti General Manager of Infrastructure Services Digitally Signed Mar 4, 16

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Kevin Fowke Acting Chief Administrative Officer Digitally Signed Mar 9, 16

November 26, 2014 – Tree Warden informed Mr. Gionet that he needs to make an application to the City in order to widen his driveway. The City will not remove a tree to accommodate driveway widening. Resident informed Tree Warden that he would submit a driveway widening application. The City is not in receipt of such a driveway widening application to date (February 10, 2016).

April 14, 2015 – The resident called back, was following up on the status of his tree removal request ACR (#672042).

April 22, 2015 - Because the tree is deemed to be healthy; good vigor, no trunk damage, no issues with seam, no disease, no insects, less than 25% deadwood, no overhead lines, the removal was declined. The City was still not in receipt of a driveway widening application by the resident.

May 13, 2015 – The City sent notification to the resident indicating that the Linden Tree would not be removed, it was however placed on a pruning list.

May 15, 2015 – The resident called back and claimed that tree roots are invading his weeping tile, please remove Linden Tree closest to driveway. The City was not provided any proof of this allegation.

July 30, 2015 – Tree Warden attempted to reach resident to inform him of alternatives that exist in the Bylaw.

October 30, 2015 – Resident called to contest Superintendents decision not to remove Linden Tree.

December 11, 2015 – The City sent a letter to Mr. Gionet informing him that his Tree Removal request was denied based on the fact that the trees were healthy and the cost for leaf pickup was not a warrant for tree removal. Although the Tree Warden offered to prune the trees on November 24, 2015, to date, the pruning has been postponed until a decision is rendered by the Hearing Committee.

Subsequently, the property owner requested a Hearing on this matter as allowed for in By-law 2011-243.

Summary of Observations

A property boundary survey was completed and it was determined that the Linden tree in contention is located on City property.

An independent Arborist was secured to provide the City with a second opinion on the health of the Linden tree. The assessment confirmed the Tree Warden's assessment that both trees are healthy.

The Tree bylaw generally discourages removal of healthy right-of-way trees regardless of species for a variety of reasons. The City has a long and proud history of regreening its devastated landscape and transforming it into a Canadian environmental success story. This regreening program dates back to 1973, with planting starting in 1978, and is administered by the Vegetation Enhancement Technical Advisory Committee (VETAC).

In 2010 the **Earthcare Sudbury Action Plan** suggests:"In 2001, the City's Regreening Program noted that Greater Sudbury was losing about 500 street trees a year because of age, damage and disease. Healthy residential areas should have at least 25% tree canopy coverage, but the amount of tree canopy coverage in many Greater Sudbury neighbourhoods has fallen below this threshold."

Furthermore, Section 9.4 of the **City's Official Plan** supporting tree planting and protection of urban tree canopy states: "In the City's urban areas, trees provide environmental benefits including air quality improvement, stormwater retention, summer cooling of the built environment, wildlife habitat, shade canopy, and beautification of our streets and neighbourhoods. To enhance the urban tree canopy, this Plan supports the development of a municipal tree planting initiative to increase the tree cover in the City's Living Areas and Employment Areas."

From a fiscal perspective, actual expenditures have exceeded the Council approved budget for tree removals (approximate budget of \$170,000 in 2015) in each of the last three years. Tree removal is a non-discretionary budget as an unhealthy tree represents a risk to safety. Therefore, if the tree needs to be removed due to its condition, the budget may be exceeded.

The species of tree in question is a Linden. The tree is not a prohibitive species as defined in Bylaw 2011-243. The tree was inspected by the City's Tree Warden in 2014 and 2015 and deemed to be healthy. The Tree Warden determines the general health of a tree by examining the condition of such items as Root Damage, Trunk Damage, Disease, Insect Infestation, Cavity and Vigor to name a few. The attached tree inspection report (see supporting documents) summarizes these findings for the Linden tree in contention.

Schedule 'C' of the City's Tree Bylaw 2011-243 (see supporting documents) states that the General Manager of Infrastructure may at his discretion authorize the removal of a healthy right of way tree (approved species) if the resident can prove that the tree is causing property damage and / or personal duress. Since none of these conditions are deemed to exist the tree removal request was denied. Therefore, it is still the City's recommendation that the request for tree removal from the road allowance at 823 Morningside Crescent, Sudbury, be declined.

The supporting documents include a Google Streetview photographs of the site from 2014 and 2015 for your review and consideration. Also attached are pictures taken by the Tree Warden in October of 2014.



REGISTERED MAIL

December 11, 2015

Mr. Michel Gionet 823 Morningside Crescent Sudbury ON P3A 4B9

Dear Mr. Gionet:

RE: REQUEST FOR TREE REMOVAL

823 MORNINGSIDE CRESCENT, SUDBURY

PO BOX 5000 SIN A 200 BRADY STREET SUDBURY ON P3A 5P3

CP 5000 SUCC A 200, RUE BRADY SUDBURY ON PSA.5P3

705.671.2489

www.greatersudbury.ca www.grandsudbury.ca Please take notice that the City of Greater Sudbury has determined that the tree (Linden) located in front of the above noted property, on the City's right of way, should not be removed in accordance with the City of Greater Sudbury By-law 2011-243. The following observations are provided in support of this position;

The Linden tree is deemed to be healthy;

o There is insufficient evidence that property damage has been caused by the tree;

The Linden tree will be placed on the pruning list;

A request for a second driveway or widening of the existing driveway must be approved by the City. You are advised to contact 311 to initiate this process if so desired.

If you are unsatisfied with this decision, the by-law allows an appeal process. You may appeal this decision within fifteen (15) business days from the date of this letter by filling with Tanya Thompson, Deputy City Clerk at:

Clerk's Services Department P.O. Box 5000, Stn. "A" 200 Brady Street Sudbury ON P3A 5P3

If an appeal is filed, it will be heard by a Hearing Committee constituting of five (5) members of City Council. The appeal should set out the objection to the decision and the reason(s) in support of the objection. Once an appeal has been filed, you will be notified of the date of your Hearing.

 \vee

Yours truly,

Thny De Silva P. Eng., Road Operations Engineer.

TD/kb

c.c.:

Ward 8 Councillor, Al Sizer

Tony Cecutti, General Manager of Infrastructure Services David Shelsted, Director of Roads and Transportation Services

Randy Halverson, Manager of Operations

Guido Mazza, Director of Building Services / Chief Building Officer

Rick Jalbert, Citywide Superintendent


Tanya Thompson, Clerk's Services Department



してるの今之 request for tree removal from road allowance

Date: Apr 15 15	
,	823 Morning SiDe Cres
Owner's Name: Michel	Chionet (1342 AHIEF AUF)
	: I him sen (classet to someway)
Reason for Removal Request:	Afoneoune is's Regular
o a sreaW -	47 COD Engine was.
- Roots cott	ing mean foundation (4" in DIMETER
ist coal -	
·	CHI PRIMING DOQUINED (HEIGHT SOU
Roof de	Answer food
proposed by the control of the contr	
Tree Warden's Recommendation	ns ·
REMOVE Rea	son:
REPLACE	will not be removed at This
DO NOT REMOVE	time
to	me Both Trees.
•	
AUTHORIZED BY:	DATE: April 22/15
OPERATIONS DIVISION / FORES	TRY SECTION
DATE REMOVED:	
DATE STUMPED:	
)	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY DATE ADDRESS SIDE STREET GENERAL SITE DESCRIPTION MECHANICAL DAMAGE (% circ. affected Special Codes Land Use Root Damage Vigor 1) playground 1) residential 1) 0 - 25% affected 2) 25 - 50% affected 1) good 2) vacant lot 2) commercial 2)Ťair 3) hospital 3) industrial 3) 50 - 75% affected 3) boot 4) school 4) recreational 5) undeveloped 4) 75 - 100% affected 4) dead 5) med. Strip 5)none 6) bank 6) downtown 7) church B) airport 9) other - specify 10) none SPECIFIC TREE SITE DESCRIPTION Overhead Lines Trunk Damage Seam 1) 10 - 20 feet 2) 20 - 30 feet Tree Lawn Width 1) 0 - 25% affected 1) minor 1) 2 feet 2) 25 - 50% affected 2) moderate 2) 3 feet 3) 30 feet and up 3) severe 3) 50 - 75% affected 4) Cable a) none 3) 4 feet 4) 75 - 100% affected 5) Hydro 4) 5 feet 6) Rell 5) Hydro NOWS 7) none 6) 7 feet and up 7) on other side 8) no sidewalk 9) container Street Light Clearance Building Clearance Cavity Crotch Split 1) inadequate (w/ 3' of bldg) 1) inadequate 1) minor 1) minor 2) adequate (not w/3') 2) yadequate 2) moderate 2) moderate 3) severe 3) severe 4) none 4) none Traffic Triangle Stop Sign Clearance Disease insect 1) tree w/i triangle 1) inadequate (obscured) 1) Leaf 1) leaf eating 2) tree not w/i triangle 2) adequate (not obscured) 2) Dieback/decline 2) sap sucking 3) Planting shock 3) meristematic 4) Canker 4) gall 5) Root rot 5) borers 6) Heart, sap rot _6))none 7) Leaf scortch 8) Chlorosis 9) Welwood 10) none SPECIFIC TREE DESCRIPTION Deadwood (%) Extent Extent Species 1) less than 25% 2) 25 - 50% regind 1) light 1) light Year Planted 2) moderate 2) moderate 3) 50 - 75% DBH ~/~ 3) heavy 3) heavy NA 4) 75 - 100% Height Largest Dead Limb Estimated Life of Tree Complaint Type 1) 0 - 15 feet 3) 1 – 4 inches 1) 1 - 3 years 1) non approved species 2) 4 - 8 inches 3) 8 - 12 inches 2) 15 - 30 feet 2) 3 - 5 years 2) Joots 3) 30 - 45 feet 3) 5 - 10 years 3) lawn 4) 45 feet and up 4) 10 years and over 4) sap 5) fruit Crown Spread Lowest Limb Monitor 6) other (specify) いれいて 1) 0 - 10 feet ENTENDING 1) 0 - 6 feet 1) 6 months 2) 10 - 20 feet 2) 6 - 8 feet 2) 1 year Drung 3) 8 - 10 feet 3) 20 - 30 feet 2 years 4) 10 feet and up 4) 30- 40 feet 5) 40 feet and up Property I) City property 2) Private property



WORK REQUEST

Case ID:

672042

Date:

14 Apr 2015 01:44:11 PM

Case Type: Removals

Caller: Michel Gionet

823 MORNINGSIDE CRESCENT

SUDBURY, ON

(Work) (Fax)

Problem Location: 1342 ATTLEE AVENUE, SUDBURY, ON, CANADA

Subject:

Tree Removal

DETAILS:


Resident called to follow-up on this matter; city advised caller lat year that if the tree is healthy they will not remove it. But, caller wants to remove it simply because the roots are 4-inches in diameter and are placed approximately 30-40 feet from the house) which could pose future plumbing issues, and as well no small patches of landscaping can be done in that area; caller wants to put in a second driveway as it is the norm with owners of duplexes. Caller would like city to reconsider decision and have one tree removed, and have the second one pruned.

ACTIONS TAKEN	rel Applieton processo.	
	Prisult was senous	
Apr/22/15-	Ringral Denico - adden to	unterprot
Date Completed:	pruning list	

Foreperson: 496 LIZETTE CARLSON

Printed By: Jennifer Sloan

https://acr.greatersudbury.ca/ACRUploads/Attachments/187807/MichelGionet-%20Case%... 11/9/2015




Copyright © 2015. Active Citizen Request is part of The Active Network, Inc. All rights reserved.



21 Apr 2015 10:22:17 AM Other Reactivate on: 15 Apr	Case Postponed	13	Reactivate on: 15 Apr 2016 2 Lindens (front)	Removals	Lizette Carlson
	2016				
Descripsto on: 15 Apr	2016				
Reactivate on 12 Apr					
2 Lindens (front)					
Homeowner (landlord)	wants linden closest t	o drivew	ray removed and second linden at least pruned.		
Removal application st	arted. Result pending				
16 Apr 2015 08:58:31 AM	Case Note	8	Awaiting call back from Michel - Did he do ap	Removals	Lizette Carlson
Awaiting call back from	Michel - Did he do ap	plication	for driveway expansion?		
16 Apr 2015 08:56:59 AM	Case Assignment	8	Case ID: 672042 has been assigned to Dispatch	Removals	Lizette Carlson
UPDATE LOCATION IN	FORMATION				
		tcher 2	(Charbonneau, Melanie).		
			NT (rental unit). Callers' address is 1342 Attlee A	ive.	
14 Apr 2015 02:12:33 PM	Document	(3)	MichelGlonet- Case 672042 - WorkRequest.htm	Work Request	Jennifer Sloan
System					
Document Printed for I	Michel Gionet.				
14 Apr 2015 02:10:56 PM	Case Assignment	6	Case ID: 672042 has been assigned to Tree War	Removals	Jennifer Sloan
Assigned Case to Owne	er				
Case ID: 672042 has b	een assigned to Tree	Warden	(Carlson, Lizette).		
14 Apr 2015 02:10:27 PM	Case Assignment	B	Case ID: 672042 has been assigned to Dispatch	Removals	Jennifer Sloan
System					
Case ID: 672042 has b	een assigned to Dispa	tcher 1	(Sloan, Jennifer).		
14 Apr 2015 01:44:11 PM	Case Notification	(3)	Case was notified to Dispatcher 1(Sloan, Jenn	Removals	Suzanne Lepage
System					
	spatcher 1(Sloan, Jen	nifer), Di	ispatcher 2(Charbonneau, Melanie).		
14 Apr 2015 01:44:11 PM	Case Submission	0	Case was submitted by Suzanne Lepage.	Removals	Suzanne Lepage
System					
Case was submitted by	Suzanne Lepage.				
					Back to Search

Copyright © 2015. Active Citizen Request is part of The Active Network, Inc. All rights reserved.



Copyright © 2015. Active Citizen Request is part of The Active Network, Inc. All rights reserved.

WORK REQUEST


Case ID: 653859

Date: 24 Nov 2014 12:12:31 PM

Case Type: Removals

Caller: Michel Gionet

1342 ATTLEE AVENUE SUDBURY, ON P3A 3L8




Problem Location: 1342 ATTLEE AVENUE, SUDBURY, ON, CANADA

Subject: Tree removal


DETAILS:

a tree near his aronarty ha


Resident calling to request that a free near his property be removed. Says he wants to put in a second driveway, on the left hand side. This is a duplex. Says there is another tree which he would like pruned, as it has been causing problems for his tenants.	
ACTIONS TAKEN	
Assisted to apply for permil.	_
Date Completed:	-
Foreperson: 496 - LIZETTE CARLSON	
Printed By: Melanie Charbonneau	ment
https://acr.greatersudbury.ca/ACRUploads/Attachments/179045/Case%20653859%20-%2 11/9/20	15




Copyright @ 2015. Active Citizen Request is part of The Active Natwork. Inc., All rights reserved.



Copyright @ 2015. Active Citizen Request is part of The Active Network. Inc. All rights reserved.



Copyright © 2015. Active Citizen Request is part of The active Network. Inc. All rights reserved.



Copyright © 2015. Active Citizen Request is part of The Active Network, inc. All rights reserved.



ALLMAC TREE SERVICE

523-2808

Certified Arborist ISA #ON-190A **Jim Allsop**



WSIB Coverage INSURANCE \$3,000,000.00 Public Liability & Public Damage



PLEASE MAIL CHEQUES TO: 2973 HENRI STREET SUDBURY, ON P3G 1C2

NAME: CITY OF GREATER SUBBURY ADDRESS: 823 Mornings1015 PHONE: Alln: Rick	DATE: <u>FCB 2/16</u>
Description Inspection + Dritten For Linden Teers AT 823 Morningside - THE MARLES LINDEN AT - THE LINDEN has Goes Theres Ares No Frost Co Deadwarp: No Preming no	Frent of Frent of Frent is in Geen Health! Leaf Bud mass, factor + very Lottle coled as THIS TIME.
□ Remove Brush □ To GrindStump(s) □ Leave Brush 6" - 8" Below Grass Level □ Leave Wood 16" □ To Backfill Hole With Mulch □ Leave Wood Lengths □ Stump(s) measure diameter □ Remove Wood At Grass Level □ To Cut Stump As Low As Possible	
Method of Payment "This work proposal includes only a visual inspection of the tree to determine the scope of the work and shall not be considered a tree risk assessment. Risk assessment involves a more extensive inspection and is conducted as a separate work item at an additional charge." Any changes in the work and the price to be charged for same shall be made in writing. A delay in acceptance of more than 10 days will require a review of the proposal and re-dating before the agreement becomes binding. Respectfully Submitted. Per: ACCEPTANCI You are hereby authorized to furnish labour and complete the work mentioned in the the amount mentioned in said proposal, and according	above proposal, for which the undersigned agrees to pay
Date Signat	ure

SCHEDULE C TO BY-LAW 2011-243

Page 1 of 2

Removal of Healthy Right of Way Trees on Request of Applicant

1. Action to be taken:

Problem	Action	Action
	Prohibited Species on Schedule B	Species other than Prohibited Species on Schedule B
Allergic reactions to tree / sap/ insects / pollen.	Tree will not be removed.* [exception	-see below]
Stress to homeowner caused by fear or dislike of trees and/or branches being blown down in a windstorm; Or Trees drop things on 'their' property such as seeds, fruit, leaves, twigs, sap and insects which require cleanup.	If tree may cause damage to a house and/or occupant due to proximity, lean and size (age) of tree, and is causing stress to homeowners and all other means to save the tree have been exhausted (i.e. pruning, volunteers to clean fruit, etc), the General Manager on consultation with the Ward Councillor, may authorize the removal of the tree.	Tree will not be removed.* [exception-see below]
Trees attract unwanted critters such as wasps, bees, caterpillars, birds, insects, chipmunks, squirrels, etc.	Tree will not be removed.* [exception	-see below]
Roots in sewer, weeping tile or foundation.	If the applicant proves to the satisfaction of the General Manager that sewer lines are being blocked by the roots of the healthy right of way tree, the General Manager, in his or her discretion may arrange to have the sewer re-lined at the City's expense or alternatively arrange to have the tree removed. If the applicant proves to the satisfaction the General Manager that there are roots from the healthy right of way tree in the applicant's weeping tiles or foundation, the General Manager may in his discretion authorize the removal of the tree.	
Tree causes soil shrinkage: roots ruin lawn, tripping hazards, tree at risk of falling.	If the applicant proves by way of a soils report or other evidence satisfactory to the General Manager that hazardous conditions have resulted from soil shrinkage caused by the healthy right of way tree, the General Manager may authorize the removal of the tree.	
Damage by a tree of a Prohibited Species on Schedule B to a house, lawn, vehicles or driveway.	Where it will solve the problem, the tree will be pruned and placed on a future priority list for removal. Where damage cannot be mitigated, the General Manager may authorize the removal of the tree.	Not applicable.

^{*} The tree may be removed if the Owner can prove to the General Manager's satisfaction that the tree poses a health risk, or is causing serious and ongoing damage to property. In those circumstances, subject to Clause 3 of this Schedule, the homeowner shall bear 50% of: (a) the full cost of the removal and; (b) at the City's option, the replanting of another accepted species of tree.

SCHEDULE C TO BY-LAW 2011-243

Page 2 of 2

Removal of Healthy Right of Way Trees on Request of Applicant

2. Replacement of Tree:


Where the General Manager authorizes the removal of a healthy right of way tree for any of the reasons noted above, it shall be placed on a list and removed within twelve months. The removed tree may be replaced at a future date, in accordance with Schedule "A".

3. Owner May Retain Own Contractor:

Despite any requirement in this By-law that work be performed by City personnel, the Applicant may retain his or her own contractor for:

- a) the removal of the tree; and
- b) if directed by the General Manager, the replacement of the tree pursuant to section 13 of this Bylaw,


provided that the contractor's accreditation is approved in advance by the General. Manager. In this circumstance, the Applicant shall bear the full cost of removal and replacement.



he Benefits of Trees

- · Trees provide food for people and animals (fruit, berries and nuts).
- Trees make the air more breathable by reducing particulate matter.
- By planting trees and shrubs, you can reduce noise pollution.
- Tree-lined streets increase traffic safety by making streets appear narrower.
- · Trees capture carbon and become carbon 'sinks' which reduce the Greenhouse Effect.
- Trees' root systems help prevent soil erosion, which prevents water pollution.

- Trees provide shade that cools water, benefitting certain species of fish (notably salmonids) - their roots and branches provide space for fish to hide from predators.
- Properties with trees are generally valued higher in the real estate
- Trees provide employment in the forestry field: foresters, arborists, lumber, research, tree workers, etc.
- Trees provide recreation and attract tourists: hiking trails, camp grounds.
- Trees provide shade in the summer, which saves on air conditioning costs, conifers insulate homes in the winter, reducing heating costs.
- Trees shade asphalt, making streets and parking lots cooler and extend the life of the asphalt.
- Trees planted in fields shield against wind and snow and help protect crops.
- block out unattractive views.
- Trees provide shelter for wildlife.
- Trees provide health benefits such as stress reduction and speed the healing process.
- Trees bring us closer to nature and help us to reconnect with culture.



Google Maps Morningside Crescent




Image capture: Jul 2009 © 2016 Google

Sudbury, Ontario

Street View - Jul 2009



Google Maps

Google Maps

Morningside Crescent




Image capture: Apr 2012 © 2016 Google

Sudbury, Ontario

Street View - Apr 2012



Google Maps

Google Maps

Morningside Crescent



Image capture: May 2014 © 2016 Google

Sudbury, Ontario

Street View - May 2014



Google Maps

Google Maps

Morningside Crescent




Image capture: Aug 2015 © 2016 Google

Sudbury, Ontario Street View - Aug 2015



Google Maps



REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF TREE REMOVAL

*Return form to City Wide Superintenent c/o Frobisher Depot	
CC: Richard Jalbert, Randy Halverson	Today's Date: Nov. 6/15
ADDRESS: 823 MORNIN	IGSIDE CRES., SUDBURY M. GiONET.
DATE OF REQUEST: APRIL 14/15	_
RECOMMENDED FOR REMOVAL: Yes No DATE	MAY 13/13
CITY WIDE SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE:	DATE: Nov. 6/15
TYPE OF TREE (S): LINDEN	Roads/Transportation
APPROVED SPECIES:	iano
Ash-fall gold, green Locust-shade master Maple-amur, tatarian, royal, red, sugar Hackberry Hawthorne-thornless Flowering Crab-spring snow	Oak-burr, red Japanese lilac Linden-pyramidal Elm-prospector Mayday
NON-APPROVED SPECIES:	
Manitoba Maple Walnut Butternut Chestnut Poplars (all types) Willows (all types)	Cherry Silver Maple Elm (all types, except Elm-prospector) Evergreens (all types) Any fruit bearing tree
COUNCILLOR RECOMMENDATION: Yes No No	t Applicable
EMAIL ATTACHED: Yes No No	t Applicable
	lise Owner to contact City when
RECOMMENDATION: next planning to tree is confeir CEO, then fre prune as requi	ting with weeping tile according to may be removed. Otherwise ired and do not remove tree.
SIGNATURE: 1 Cecutto	DATE: 1/04,27,2015

Reference: By-Law 2009-250 A By-law of the City of Greater Sudbury to authorize, regulate and protect the planting, maintenance, protection and removal of trees on municipal rights of way.