

## Public Works Department Maintenance Operations Division

## CITY OF CULVER CITY

9505 West Jefferson Boulevard, Culver City, California 90232



Request for Parkway Tree Removal (Pursuant to Culver City Municipal Code Section 9.08.210: See reverse side of this form)

Applicant: Richard Slechta	Telephone 310-699-8238
4381 Motor Ave. Culver City, CA	
(Address)	
Request for removal of 2 tree(s)	
Location: X In front of, and/or On side of property located at	Left & right side of driveway apron` (Street Address)
Reason for removal: (Criteria set forth in Culver City Municipal Code Section 9.08.	
In less than a year from installing new landscaping, we when we installed the landscaping in March 2019. This foundation, driveway and hard-scaping. We are willing outlined in Urban Forest Master Plan and repair to dam	growth throughout the front yard of our new home construction.  have shallow ficus roots 1.5" in diameter that were not present s presents property damage risk for near and mid term to to pay for removal of trees, replacement with 2 new oak trees as haged concrete sidewalk.
X Supporting documentation is attached.  Request for removal (subject to availability X Request for priority removal at applicant's ex	
availability of City resources and funds. Applicant has the optic	prementioned tree(s) will be accommodated on a priority basis subject to on to be granted priority removal if they agree to pay for the removal at
their expense. Applicant will be presented with a quote from C and payment by applicant, tree(s) will be removed by City's tre	tty's tree trimming contractor prior to removal. Upon authorization of quote e trimming contractor as their schedule permits.
FILING FEE: The applicant shall post a non-refundable filing fee in the amou	unt of \$7.5 along with this request form.
DECISION AND APPEAL: The decision of the Public Works Director is final, unless appeared to the Person. Appeals shall be submitted in writing and filed with the of decision. (See CCMC Section 9.08.210.E and F for more in	aled by the Applicant, a member of the City Council or an Interested City Clerk within 10 days after the decision date identified in the notice formation.)
Date May 19, 2020 Signature	(Applicant)
EO	R CITY USE
1.7	au capa naida
Tree(s) to be removed: 22/25 inches 2	2S-3D feet 25-6 feet
	val at applicant's expense Mino dange to Sidewalk.ca
Date 11/19/2626 Signature	be repaired and mitigated with
White: Property Owner/Applicant Yellow: Public Revised 1/30/14	howhy and how moderate hugu
•	taligo.



## A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas \*\*TREE HAZARD EVALUATION FORM\*\* 2nd Edition\*\*

Site/Address: 4381 Motor Ave.	HAZARO RATING:
Map/Location: tract 17273 lot 13 block 4300	$\frac{1}{\text{Failure}} + \frac{1}{\text{Size}} + \frac{3}{\text{Target}} = \frac{5}{\text{Hazard}}$
Owner: public X private unknown other	Failure + Size + Target = Hazard   Potential of part Rating Rating
Date: 9/22/2020 Inspector. David Talavera	Immediate action needed
Date of last inspection: 9/22/2020	X Needs further inspection
-	Dead tree
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	
Tree #:1 Species: Ficus Microcarpa nitida	Laborate constraints
DBH: # of trunks: neight: shread:	a are
Form: 🗵 generally symmetric 🗆 minor asymmetry 🗆 major asymmetry 🗆 stump sprout	☐ stag-headed
Crown class: ☐ dominant ☐ co-dominant ☐ intermediate ☐ suppressed	
Live crown ratio: 95 % Age class: □ young ☑ semi-mature □ mature □ over	
Pruning history: ⊠ crown cleaned ⊠ excessively thinned □ topped □ crown raised □ pollarde	i □ crown reduced □ flush cuts □ cabled/braced
none multiple pruning events Approx. dates:	
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☒ street tree ☐ screen	□ shade □ indigenous □ protected by gov. agency
TREE HEALTH	
	h obstructions:
Foliage density: □ normal 🖾 sparse Leaf size: ☑ normal □ small □ sta	kes 🗌 wire/ties 🔲 signs 🔲 cables
	b/pavement 🗆 guards
Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☐ poor ☐ none ☐ oth	er Parkway 7'
Vigor class: □ excellent ☑ average □ fair □ poor	
Major pests/diseases: None	
SITE CONDITIONS	
Site Character: ⊠ residence □ commercial □ industrial □ park □ open space □ no	tural
Landscape type: ⊠parkway □ raised bed □ container □ mound □ lawn □ shrub	border
Irrigation: ☑ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wettled	
stringactors	
DOMESTIC AND RESIDENCE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	line clearing Site clearing
30 APRIL OF FOUL PO 750 75 1000/ Brus	line clearing site clearing  ment lifted? Y N
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pav	
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pave % dripline w/ fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
% dripline paved:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%       Paventy Compacted         % dripline w/ fill soil:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%         % dripline grade lowered:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%         Soil problems:       □ drainage       □ shallow       □ compacted       □ droughty       □ saline       □ akaline       □ acidic	ement lifted? Y N
% dripline paved:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%       Paventy of the	ament lifted? Y N  □ small volume □ disease center □ history of fail
% dripline paved:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%       Paventy Compacted         % dripline w/ fill soil:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%         % dripline grade lowered:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%         Soil problems:       drainage       shallow       compacted       droughty       saline       akaline       acidic         Clay       expansive       slope       sapect       sapect         Obstructions:       signage       line-of-sight       view       overhead lines       underground	ament lifted? Y N  □ small volume □ disease center □ history of fail  d utilities □ traffic □ adjacent veg. □ None
% dripline paved:  0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pave dripline w/ fill soil:  0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%  % dripline grade lowered:  0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%  Soil problems: □ drainage □ shallow □ compacted □ droughty □ saline □ alkaline □ acidic □ clay □ expansive □ slope □ aspect:  □ clay □ expansive □ slope □ overhead lines □ underground □ structions: □ lights □ signage □ line-of-sight □ view □ overhead lines □ underground □ structions: □ lights □ signage □ below canopy □ above canopy □ recently exposed □ wire	ament lifted? Y N    small volume   disease center   history of fail   dutilities   traffic   adjacent veg.   None     dward, canopy edge   area prone to windthrow
% dripline paved:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%       Paventy Compacted         % dripline w/ fill soil:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%         % dripline grade lowered:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%         Soil problems:       drainage       shallow       compacted       droughty       saline       akaline       acidic         Clay       expansive       slope       sapect       sapect         Obstructions:       signage       line-of-sight       view       overhead lines       underground	ament lifted? Y N    small volume   disease center   history of fail   dutilities   traffic   adjacent veg.   None     dward, canopy edge   area prone to windthrow
% dripline paved: % dripline w/ fill soil: % dripline w/ fill soil: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline w/ fill soil: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline w/ fill soil: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline w/ fill soil: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline w/ fill soil: % dripline grade lowered: % dripline w/ fill soil: % dripline w/ fill soi	small volume □ disease center □ history of fail d utilities □ traffic □ adjacent veg. □ None dward, canopy edge □ area prone to windthrow dom □ regularly
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Paventy   % dripline w/ fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%   % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%   Soil problems: drainage shallow compacted droughty saline alkaline acidic   Clay expansive slope sapect   Clay expansive slope overhead lines undergroun   Exposure to wind: signage line-of-sight view overhead lines undergroun   Exposure to wind: signage line-of-sight view overhead lines undergroun   Exposure to wind: signage lelow canopy above canopy recently exposed wind   Prevailing wind direction: N/E Occurrence of snow/ice storms never sel   TARGET    Use Under Tree:   building   parking   traffic pedestrian   recreation   recreation   landscape	ament lifted? Y N  □ small volume □ disease center □ history of fail  d utilities □ traffic □ adjacent veg. □ None  dward, canopy edge □ area prone to windthrow  dom □ regularly
% dripline paved:       0%       10-25%       25-50%       50-75%       75-100%       Paventh of the part of the	ament lifted? Y N  □ small volume □ disease center □ history of fail  d utilities □ traffic □ adjacent veg. □ None  dward, canopy edge □ area prone to windthrow  dom □ regularly
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Paventy   % dripline w/ fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%   % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%   Soil problems: drainage shallow compacted droughty saline alkaline acidic   Clay expansive slope sapect   Clay expansive slope overhead lines undergroun   Exposure to wind: signage line-of-sight view overhead lines undergroun   Exposure to wind: signage line-of-sight view overhead lines undergroun   Exposure to wind: signage lelow canopy above canopy recently exposed wind   Prevailing wind direction: N/E Occurrence of snow/ice storms never sel   TARGET    Use Under Tree:   building   parking   traffic pedestrian   recreation   recreation   landscape	ament lifted? Y N  □ small volume □ disease center □ history of fail  d utilities □ traffic □ adjacent veg. □ None  dward, canopy edge □ area prone to windthrow  dom □ regularly

TREE DEFECTS				
Suspect root rot: YN Mus	hannya laamirihan alest nanco-	: YN ID:		
•				
ixposed roots: 🗆 severe 🔯	moderate  low U	ndermined: 🗆 severe 🏻	□ moderate □ low	
Root pruned: 2' distance	from trunk Roet area a	ffected: <u>50</u> % Bu	nttress wounded: Y (N) Who	)n:
Restricted root area: 🗡 severe	☐ moderate ☐ low	Potential for root failure:	□ severe □ moderate Ď k	DW
EAN: 0 deg. from verti		ural □ self-corrected :	Soil heaving: Y N	
	_	-	yon nearing. I is	
decay in plane of lean: Y 🕦	Reets broken Y N	Soil cracking: Y		
Compounding factors: None			Lean severity: 🗌 severe	a □ moderate □ low
CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate prese	nce of individual defects and	rate their severity (s = severe	, m = moderate, I = low) N= Ne	egative
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				L
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks		Y 42	L	M
Multiple attachments		1.	L	IVI
Included bark	N .	a 4	N	
Excessive end weight			N N	
Cracks/splits Hangers			N N	N .
Girdling	N			
Wounds/seam	M			rp ft.
Decay	N		N	
Cavity	N	N .	N	N
Conks/mushrooms/bracket	N	N	N s	N N
Bleeding/sap flow	N	N :	N · N	· N
Loose/cracked bark	N	N `	N N	N
Nesting hole/bee hive Deadwood/stubs	N M		N ·	7.7.
Borers/termites/ants	IVI '		N	. N
Cankers/galls/buris	7777		N N	A Maria
Previous failure				Ń
AZARD RATING				
ree part most likely to fail:	mall branches		Failure potential: 1 - low: 2 -	medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe
	hi	ath an	Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cm)	
iopooron portou	nual biannual	other	3 - 18-30" (45-7	75 cm); 4 ->30" (75 cm)
ailure Potential + Size of Part + Ta	rget Hating = Mazaro Hating		Target rating: 1 - occasional	
<u> </u>	3 = 5		3 - frequent u	se; 4 - constant use
AZARD ABATEMENT.				
	t     reduce end weight	crown clean 🏻 thin 🗀 ra	ise canopy □ crown reduce □	restructure 🗆 shape
	L INDUCTION TOWN			
Cable/Brace:	_		nspect further: Toot crown	посау шавтаг штиотко
lemove tree: Y N Replac	e? Y N Move target	Y (N) Other:		
flect on adjacent trees: 🛛 🖾 no	ne 🗆 evaluate		=: 1320 11 125	# 9 G %
otification: 🖄 owner 🗆 man	aner Kilpoverning agency	Date: 9/22/202	**	
	Man ma Anacissis after the	D4101		
COMMENTS				
	e tree NO hazard at this n	noment		
	ry from ficus disease			
	on the past full recovery			
	ted and is OK to repair if i	s necessary		
	es clear from traffic			
only 25 % o	of canopy on top of the pri	vate landscape no berries	at this time	
Recommer	dation : preserve the tree	and manage the inconver	niences	

· \* \_ \* ^ .



## A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas \*\*TREE HAZARD EVALUATION FORM 2nd Edition\*\*

Site/Address: 43 81 Motor Tree #2	HAZARD RATING:
Map/Location: Trast 17273 Lot 13 Block 43000	$\frac{1}{\text{Failure}} + \frac{1}{\text{Size}} + \frac{3}{\text{Target}} = \frac{5}{\text{Hazard}}$
Owner: public X private unknown other	Failure + Size + Target = Hazard Potential of part Rating Rating
David Talayera	Immediate action needed
Date of last inspection: 9/22/2020	X Needs further inspection
Date of last mappendix.	Dead tree
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	
Tree #: 2 Species: Ficus Microcarpa nitida	ED P
DBH: 22" # of trunks: 1 Height: 25-30' Spread; 25	
Form: ☐ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry ☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout	stag-head <del>e</del> d
Crown class: ⊠ dominant ☐ co-dominant ☐ intermediate ☐ suppressed	
Live crown ratie: 80 % Age class: □ young □ semi-mature □ mature □ over	
Pruning history: 🛮 🖾 crown cleaned 🖾 excessively thinned 🗀 topped 🗀 crown raised 🗀 pollarded	I 🗠 crown reduced □ flush cuts □ cabled/braced
none multiple pruning events Approx. dates:	
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☒ street tree ☐ screen	☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by gov. agency
TREE HEALTH	
Foliage color: Inormat Chlorotic Inecrotic Epicormics? Y N Growti	n obstructions:
Foliage density: ☐ normal ☑ sparse Leaf size: ☐ normal ※☐ small ☐ state	ces 🗆 wire/ties 🗀 signs 🗀 cables
Milling along Alongs, Caracas,	b/pavement
Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☐ poor ☐ none ☐ other	er
Vigor class: □ excellent □ average □ fair □ poor	
	20.08
Major pasts/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease	2 10 10
200/ an annual from Four disperse	
Major pasts/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease	
Major pasts/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character: ☑ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ na	
Major pests/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character: ☑ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ na	tural
Major pasts/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character: A residence   commercial   industrial   park   open space   na  Landscape type: A parkway   raised bed   container   mound   lawn   shrub  Irrigation: A none   adequate   inadequate   excessive   trunk wettled	tural
Major pests/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:	tural □ woodlandVorest border □ wind break
Major pests/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:  residence  rommercial  ndustrial  park  park  space  na  Landscape type:  parkway  raised bed  container  mound  lawn  shrub  Irrigation:  none  adequate  nadequate  excessive  trunk wettled  Recent site disturbance?  N  construction  soil disturbance  grade change	tural
Major pasts/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:	tural woodlandVorest border wind break ine clearing site clearing imant lifted? Y
Major pests/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character: A residence   commercial   industrial   park   open space   na Landscape type: A parkway   raised bed   container   mound   lawn   shrub Irrigation: A none   adequate   inadequate   excessive   trunk wettled  Recent site disturbance? N   construction   soil disturbance   grade change   10	tural woodlandVorest border wind break ine clearing site clearing imant lifted? Y
Major pests/diseases: 80% recovery from ficus disease  SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:  residence   commercial   industrial   park   open space   na Landscape type:  parkway   raised bed   container   mound   lawn   shrub   Irrigation:  none   adequate   inadequate   excessive   trunk wettled   Recent site disturbance?  N   construction   soil disturbance   grade change   10	tural woodland/forest border wind break ine clearing site clearing ment lifted? YN
SITE CONDITIONS   Site Character:   Park   Open space	tural   woodlandVorest border   wind break ine clearing   site clearing imant lifted? Y N    small volume   disease center   history of fail   dutilities   traffic   adjacent veg.   none
SITE CONDITIONS   Site Character:   residence   commercial   industrial   park   open space   na Landscape type:   parkway   raised bed   container   mound   lawn   shrub   Irrigation:   none   adequate   inadequate   excessive   trunk wettled   Recent site disturbance?   N   construction   soil disturbance   grade change   10	tural
SITE CONDITIONS   Site Character:   Park   Open space	tural
SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:	tural   woodlandVorest border   wind break ine clearing   site clearing imant lifted? Y N    small volume   disease center   history of fall   dutilities   traffic   adjacent veg.   none     dward, canopy edge   area prone to windthrow   regularly
SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:	tural   woodlandVorest border   wind break ine clearing   site clearing imant lifted? Y N    small volume   disease center   history of fall   dutilities   traffic   adjacent veg.   none     dward, canopy edge   area prone to windthrow   regularly
SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:	tural   woodlandVorest border   wind break ine clearing   site clearing imant lifted? Y N    small volume   disease center   history of fall   dutilities   traffic   adjacent veg.   none     dward, canopy edge   area prone to windthrow   regularly
SITE CONDITIONS  Site Character:	tural   woodlandVorest border   wind break ine clearing   site clearing imant lifted? Y N    small volume   disease center   history of fall   dutilities   traffic   adjacent veg.   none     dward, canopy edge   area prone to windthrow   regularly

	fushroom/conk/bracket present	9		
xposed roots: 🗆 severe	i moderate □ low U	ndermined: 🗆 severe 🗆	□ moderate □ low	
oot pruned: 0 dista	nce from trunk Roef area af	fected: 0% But	ttress wounded: Y N Who	en:
estricted root area: sev	ere 🖾 moderate 🖂 low	Potential for root failure:	□ severe □ moderate □ l	ow
			26.	
	ertical 🖒 natural 🗆 unnatu		oil heaving: Y (1)	
ecay in plane of lean: Y	Roots broken Y N	Soli cracking: Y N		
ompounding tactors: none	5		Lean severity: 🗆 seven	e 🗆 moderate 🗀 low
				legative
ROWN DEFECTS: Indicate pr	esence of individual defects and	rate their severity (s = severe,	We will be a second of the sec	
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper			L	<u> </u>
Bow, sweep			M	
Codominants/forks		* * *	IVI.	
Multiple attachments		N N	N .	M
Included bark		, VI		
Excessive end weight			L ·	
Cracks/splits		N	N · ·	
Hangers			N	N
Girdling	N		M .	14 ST 1 1 1
Wounds/seam	N		N 2 4	
Decay	N	Ν ,	N	
Cavity Conks/mushrooms/bracket	N N .		N	
Bleeding/sap flow	N	-3	N	N .
Loose/cracked bark	N		N	N
Nesting hole/bee hive	N		N	11.5 31.93
Deadwood/stubs	N		N	101 (8
Borers/termites/ants	N		N	
Cankers/galls/burls	N		N	N
Previous failure	N		N	N ·
AZARD RATING	<del></del>			
ee part most likely to fail:	Small branches		Failure potential: 1 - lowr 2 -	medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe
•			Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cm)	•
	annual biannual	other		75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)
illure Potential + Size of Part +	Target Rating = Hazard Rating		Target rating: 1 - occasional	
1 + 1 +	- 3 = 5			se; 4 - constant use
AZADD ADATEMENT				
AZARD ABATEMENT			***************************************	
rune: 🗡 remove defective (	part 🖄 reduce end weight 🖄	crown clean 🗀 thin 🗀 rais	se canopy 🔲 crown reduce 🗆	] restructure ☐ shape
able/Brace:			spect further: 🗆 root crown 🗆	decay 🗆 aerial 🗀 monif
	lace? Y N Move target:			•
		T IN GUIGI.	1 4 5 16	1 W 2 8
	none evaluate	nate: 9/22/2020		•
attringiton: LA Aumor I In	nanager 🖾 governing agency	Date: 9/22/2020		
OMMENTS				
OMMENTS	ewalk damage			

· 1/2 .

































