

**From:** [Michael Behrendt](#)  
**Subject:** Eversource - email from John Parry  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 24, 2019 11:48:52 AM

---

To the Planning Board,  
Please see the email from John Parry below.

**Michael Behrendt**

Durham Town Planner  
Town of Durham  
8 Newmarket Road  
Durham, NH 03824  
(603) 868-8064  
[www.ci.durham.nh.us](http://www.ci.durham.nh.us)

---

**From:** John Parry [mailto:jeparry3@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 24, 2019 11:44 AM  
**To:** Michael Behrendt  
**Cc:** Karen Edwards  
**Subject:** Comment to Planning Board on Utility Trimming

Dear Durham Planning Board;

I am writing concerning the current resolution for utility line trimming in Durham (I sent previous comments on June 25).

A main concern I have is that too much of the tree crown is being removed, and too many wounds created in the current trimming. I feel after multiple pruning cycles a significant number of these trees may decline and become higher risk for failure. I want to share a few thoughts related to addressing this.

I think the recommendation for the Town to hire a consulting arborist or urban forester is a very good idea. Ideally it would be wise to get input from that person before finalizing the specifications for the trimming. If you get the right person they likely would have useful recommendations on this. Other wise it is

kind of like hiring an architect to supervise home construction after the house has been designed.

The current practice calls for cutting branches at the closest lateral branch or at the trunk (rather than leaving a stub). This is generally considered a good arboriculture practice because sprouting will be minimized and the wound will close better. It appears to me that many of the cuts are made back to the trunk, and not very many at a lateral branch, which would leave more of the branch and foliage on the tree. Also, it should be noted that cutting back to the trunk generally makes the cutting zone much wider than 8' to the side. I would emphasize this, and include language that states "as much as possible cuts will be made at suitable lateral branches, rather than all the way back to the trunk".

I believe part of the reason that a cutting zone is identified, is that it makes the cutting work clear and simple for the people doing the work. With that in mind, and with the goal to remove less of the tree crown, considering changing the trimming zone and the language such as, "the trimming zone will be 10 feet above and 5 feet below and 8' to the side of the lines. Outside of that zone, only branches that are dead or have a high risk of failure will be removed".

I feel the biggest impact in using the current trim zone, occurs on small - medium size trees. In many cases, a tree 40 - 50 feet tall has most of one side removed. An option to address this could be reducing the trim zone size for trees under a certain size. For instance "for any tree under 14 inches in diameter, a smaller trim zone (10' above and 5 feet below?) would be used".

I did also have one question to clarify the distance below the lines. Can you clarify what lines this refers too (the lowest energized line I assume and not the phone/cable lines). It seems that 8' below is a lot of clearance. I can understand this standard for trees growing vertically, directly under the line, but for branches growing laterally from trees to the side (which will not grow up) that

seems like a lot of clearance. If this is to create clearance for the phone/cable lines, it seems that the cleared distances below and to the side could be less, since these lines are not energized.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Parry

5 Denbow, Durham, NH

