

**From:** [Stacy B. Chaney](#)  
**To:** [Council Clerk](#); [Linsey Griffith](#)  
**Subject:** April 23, 2024 comment for the record - Shade Tree Commission  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 23, 2024 9:13:29 AM  
**Attachments:** [Rutherford correspondence.pdf](#)

---

Dear Shade Tree Commissioners,

For your cognizance, I want to make you aware of two issues with the application of the tree code in the Addison Rutherford plans. This is one of the first plans to apply the newly revised Chapter 1168 tree ordinance.

First, the plan calls for a study of the existing tree canopy in order to apply for a tree removal permit. Addison did not complete this step. The Planning Department informs me that they instead did a tree count and these were used to estimate tree canopy.

Secondly, the application of 1168 to this development raised a glaring issue. The new code accounts for trees added to the site at maturity but trees removed are only counted at current size. This creates a discrepancy in counting. The metric should be the same in both cases: all trees should be compared *either* at current size or at full maturity.

I would also like to request that the Shade Tree Commission advise the Planning Department to include tree replacement fees in their Planning Commission and Council staff reports for all developments. We cannot track what we do not record. Having the information on the expected tree fee documented for Council, commissioners, staff, developer, and the public is essential for accountability.

The total tree removal fee under the new 1168 for Addison Rutherford development was \$165, as verified by Anna Kelsey (City of Delaware Planning Department, see attached).

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Stacy Chaney-Blankenship,  
943 Executive Blvd, Delaware, Ohio 43015