

Summary of Decision Requested to Plan Change 2: Protected Trees by Submitter

February / 2019

Table of Contents

Reader’s Guide.....	3
How to read the summary:.....	3
How to make a further submission	4
Submitter Contact Details	5
Axcell, Roger & Searancke, Nola.....	7
Beex, Chris	7
Bridgman, Elizabeth.....	7
Carter, Pamela	8
Carver, Richard	9
Davies, Tom	9
Elliot, Jill and John.....	9
Fairview Motors Ltd.....	10
Floyd, Christopher	10
Gainsford, Jennie.....	11
Jordan, Roger.....	11
Moodie, Jane	12
Phillipps, David	13
Voice, Neil & Rona	13
Wiles, Royce.....	15

Reader's Guide

This document is a summary of the 15 submissions received and the relief sought/decision(s) requested. This summary is ordered in alphabetical order by the submitters surname or the name of the organization. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by a specific submitter (e.g. Jo Smith). If you would like to see all the submissions lodged on a specific topics within the Plan Change, then refer to “Summary of Decisions Requested to Plan Change 2: Protected Trees by Topic”.

The summary of submissions was publicly notified on 7 February 2019 for further submissions. The closing date for making further submissions is Friday, 22 February at 5pm. **No late further submissions will be accepted.**

In the summary, every submitter has been allocated a submitter number and each submission point is referenced by a unique number. This whole number (e.g. 11/1) is required to be referenced when you make a further submission. **EXAMPLE:**

Submission 11/1

11 is the submitter number

1 is the submission point number

How to read the summary:

- This summary is ordered by submitter surname. The summary is ordered alphabetically by surname and or name of the company or organisation. The summary lists all of the submission points made by the submitter.
- If after looking at this summary you wish to look at all the submission points to a particular Topic then you need to refer to the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Plan Change 2: Protected Trees by Topic”.
- For your information separate spell checks have been carried out on the Topic and Submitter reports. In the event of there being any discrepancy the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Plan Change 2: Protected Trees by Topic” will be predominant.

How to make a further submission

People can make a further submission if they represent a relevant aspect of the public interest and/or have an interest in Plan Change 2 greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission can only be made in support or opposition of matters raised in the submissions. No new points can be raised.

Further submissions should be set out in the format shown in the submission form. Copies of the further submission form are available at Council offices or Libraries at Cambridge and Te Awamutu as well as online at www.waipadc.govt.nz.

In accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 a copy of the further submission must be sent to the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of sending the further submission to the Waipa District Council. To assist you with this an address list of all submitters is included in this report.

Submissions can be:

Posted to: Waipa District Council
Private Bag 2402
Te Awamutu 3840

Delivered to: Waipa District Council – Te Awamutu Office
101 Bank Street
Te Awamutu

Delivered to: Waipa District Council – Cambridge Office
23 Wilson Street
Cambridge

Emailed to: submissions@waipadc.govt.nz

Online: waipadc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

Submitter Contact Details

Submitter Name	Submitter's Contact Details	Submitter No.
Chris Beex	kiwifarms@xtra.co.nz	4
Christopher Floyd	PO Box 319 Matakawa 0948	1
David Phillipps	123 Williams Street Cambridge 3434	5
Elizabeth Bridgman	C/- 27 Croydon Road Mt Eden Auckland 1024	12
Fairview Motors Limited	Attn: Steven Dyke PO Box 20400 Te Rapa Hamilton 3240	7
Jane Moodie	92 Fencourt Road RD4 Cambridge 3496	10
Jennie Gainsford	94 Princes Street Cambridge 3434	14
Jill & John Elliott	32 Marlowe Drive Leamington Cambridge 3432	13
Neil & Rona Voice	95 Carlyle Street Leamington Cambridge 3432	11
Nola Searancke	92 Tennyson Street Leamington Cambridge 3432	8

Submitter Name	Submitter's Contact Details	Submitter No.
Pamela Carter	13 Frame Street Leamington Cambridge 3432	15
Richard Carver	49 Cowley Drive Leamington Cambridge 3432	3
Roger Jordan	155 Reid Road Ngahinapouri Ohaupo 3882	2
Royce Wiles	16 Ratcliffe Street Matamata 3400	9
Tom Davies	350 Greenhill Drive Te Awamutu 3800	6

Axcell, Roger & Searancke, Nola

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
8/1	Support	Submitter supports moving to the "STEM" scoring system to allow for pruning of a protected tree without requiring a resource consent and paying a fee.	No relief sought
8/2	Support	The submitter states non-pruning creates a health and safety risk, therefore the new STEM scoring system is positive.	No relief sought

Beex, Chris

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
4/1	Oppose	The submitter opposes changes to the RNZIH scoring system.	No relief sought
4/2	Oppose	Submitter believes trees on private properties belong to the owner, who should decide what to do with those trees.	No relief sought

Bridgman, Elizabeth

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
12/1	Oppose	The submitter opposes that the Golden Elm tree located at 30A Hamilton Road in Cambridge will not be protected under the STEM scoring system. The submitter believes the tree should be protected and be reassessed to go from 117 STEM points to 120 STEM	Reassessment of the tree at 30A Hamilton Road, Cambridge, in order to increase the score under the STEM scoring system (currently 117) so that it continues to be protected.

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
		points. The submitter states it is a beautiful tree and provides shelter in the summer, habitat for birds and the tree has a historical family value – the submitter's mother had it protected first in 1982.	
12/2	Oppose	The submitter states that Craig Webb identified the tree is the biggest Golden Elm in the Waipa District and the occurrence of such a tree is infrequent.	Reassessment of the tree at 30A Hamilton Road, Cambridge, in order to increase the score under the STEM scoring system (currently 117) so that it continues to be protected.
12/3	Oppose	The submitter notes Cambridge is known as the town of trees, making it unique.	N/A

Carter, Pamela

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
15/1	Support in part	The submitter supports moving to the STEM scoring system as it considers both positive and negative aspects of trees.	No relief sought.
15/2	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about the transfer of risk/cost/responsibility of formerly protected trees from Council to private land owners. The submitter seeks a system that allows land owners to choose to accept or decline responsibility of the tree.	Seeks council to negotiate with landowners whose protected trees change status, to ensure trees are safe and maintained and landowners are able to and willing to take on the responsibility.

Carver, Richard

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
3/1	Oppose	The submitter opposes changes to the RNZIH scoring system.	No relief sought
3/2	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that some of Cambridge's large trees are scored below 138 STEM points which allows for removal without public notification.	No relief sought

Davies, Tom

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
6/1	Support	Submitter supports the entire plan change.	Supports WDC in making the proposed changes.

Elliot, Jill and John

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
13/1	Support in part	The submitter agrees there should be provisions for some trees to be protected.	No relief sought.
13/2	Support in part	The submitter believes there should be scope to remove trees that are a danger to people, plant and animal lives. The submitter seeks Council to identify trees that cause toxicity in humans or animals, allergic reactions or creates toxic zones around the tree that kill other plant life.	The submitter seeks that the criteria for assessing tree removal applications includes an assessment of the danger of a tree to human, animal and plant life. The submitter seeks identification of trees that are toxic/create toxic zones, cause allergic reactions and injure or kill other plant life. The submitter seeks a tree removal application to be discretionary activity.

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
13/3	Support in part	The submitter notes the Black Walnut Tree at 18 Le Quesnoy Place is a danger to human, animal and plant life and has created a toxic zone around it.	The submitter seeks the black walnut tree at 18 Le Quesnoy Place be removed from the protected tree register.

Fairview Motors Ltd

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
7/1	Support	Fairview Motors (the submitter) owns 95 Victoria Street, there is an English Oak tree on the property which drops leaves, branches and a liquid residue on display stock, staff and clients which frequently causes damage. Neighbours at risk if tree falls. Passing pedestrians have been affected.	Removal of the English Oak tree at 95 Victoria Street, Cambridge.

Floyd, Christopher

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
1/1	Oppose	The submitter believes tree protection should be strengthened and the plan change weakens protection.	Decline Plan Change
1/2	Oppose	Exotic mature trees provide important habitat, food sources and stepping stones for native fauna species.	Provide a mechanism for voluntary protection of individual trees on private land.

Gainsford, Jennie

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
14/1	Oppose	The submitter is a former member of the WDC Heritage Council who fought for protection of trees. The submitter is concerned about historic trees being removed off the protected trees list.	To keep all existing protected trees on the protected tree register.
14/2	Oppose	The submitter views Cambridge as the town of trees.	To keep all existing protected trees on the protected tree register.
14/3	Oppose	The submitter views developers and developments as the catalyst of tree removal.	To keep all existing protected trees on the protected tree register.
14/4	Oppose	The submitter notes that the previous Cambridge Borough Council would replace a lost significant tree with two trees, to ensure the town always has mature trees. The Council believes this Council does not do that.	To keep all existing protected trees on the protected tree register.

Jordan, Roger

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
2/1	Oppose	Submitter is opposed to the de-rating of trees, particularly in Cambridge	No relief sought
2/2	Oppose	The submitter states that trees are the heart, soul and character of Cambridge and are an identifiable characteristic of Cambridge.	No relief sought
2/3	Oppose	The submitter believes that if a tree is not suitable for their environment/adjacent building then that should	No relief sought

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
		have been addressed at building/resource consent stage and building should not have progressed through consenting processes.	
2/4	Oppose	Submitter does not agree with the justification provided for the Plan Change.	No relief sought
2/5	Oppose	The submitter does not think mature trees should be removed, stripped or emasculated.	No relief sought

Moodie, Jane

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
10/1	Support in part	The submitter is a member of the Cambridge Tree Trust and has previously met with Council staff about PC2.	N/A
10/2	Support in part	The submitter supports adopting the STEM scoring system but thinks the score a tree requires for protection is too high (120).	Reconsider the STEM score a tree requires for protection.
10/3	Support in part	The submitter states that over one third of trees will be no longer protected which will be a loss to the community.	Reconsider the STEM score a tree requires for protection.
10/4	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about a lack of a process to protect the next generation of trees or to replace existing protected trees when they die.	No relief sought.
10/5	Support in part	The submitter agrees that visual, heritage and habitat values should be identified.	No relief sought.

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
10/6	Support in part	The submitter states that the following additional values of trees should also be identified/considered for protecting trees: climate change mitigation, cleaner air, temperature modulation, flood mitigation, human health impacts both physical and psychological. The submitter questions when Council will consider these values with trees, in particular protected trees.	Identify the climate change mitigation, cleaner air, temperature modulation, flood mitigation and human health impacts (physical and psychological) values of trees.

Phillipps, David

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
5/1	Support in part	The submitter states that 1/3 of currently protected trees will no longer be protected, the submitter is surprised at the number of trees losing their status.	No relief sought
5/2	Support in part	The submitter believes the STEM scoring system is too high and is surprised at how many trees are losing protection.	No relief sought

Voice, Neil & Rona

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
11/1	Oppose	The submitter does not agree that the protected trees on the property at 95 Carlyle Street should be removed from Council protection to landowner responsibility.	No relief sought.

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
11/2	Oppose	The submitter notes it was a requirement of a resource consent issued in 2000 that Council has a responsibility to maintain the trees at 95 Carlyle Street. Removing protection off the trees removes Council's responsibility to maintain the trees and it is the submitter's opinion that the Council have not maintained the trees previously resulting in rotting up to 350mm deep. The submitter is concerned that the trees are not in a safe state to be handed to the owner(s) of 95 Carlyle Street.	No relief sought.
11/3	Oppose	Costs of repairs and maintenance of an already damaged trees at 95 Carlyle Street required to make the tree safe again will be transferred from Council to the land owner(s).	No relief sought.
11/4	Oppose	The trees located at 95 Carlyle Street help with flooding on the property (high water table in the area according to bore drilling companies) therefore submitter does not want to remove the trees.	No relief sought.
11/5	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns regarding the money spent on maintaining protected trees and whether the maintenance had been done. The submitter believes PC2 is a cost cutting process for Council.	No relief sought.

Wiles, Royce

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
9/1	Support in part	The submitter cannot locate Waipa District's Tree Policy that was referred to in Craig Webb's report.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/2	Support in part	The submitter questions if Craig Webb's recommendation numbered 5.1 in his report will be accepted. This recommendation says that the plan change should not happen in isolation. The submitter questions what other policies are up for review.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/3	Support in part	The submitter questions why Waikato District Council's Tree Policy is not being reviewed concurrently to PC2 and how the Tree Policy relates to PC2. The submitter asks Council to send the Tree Policy to them.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/4	Support in part	The submitter requests an overview on the changes between the STEM scoring system and the RNZIH to understand why a tree may not be protected under the STEM scoring but it was protected under RNZIH. The submitter questions what values are involved in the STEM scoring.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/5	Support in part	The submitter identifies that PC2 suggests protecting significant forest area (item 4.4) and questions if that has been addressed.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/6	Support in part	The submitter questions what the result of other Council's using the STEM system has been and	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to

Submission No.	Support/Oppose	Summary	Decision Requested
		identifies that not all Council's use the STEM system and it may not be the best possible system.	evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/7	Support in part	The submitter questions if unprotected trees will be removed following PC2.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/8	Support in part	The submitter questions what mitigating steps are planned for the attrition of tree coverage.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/9	Support in part	The submitter questions if tree protection is being considered in isolation to other related concerns such as heritage landscapes, tree planting and retention of character areas.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.
9/10	Support in part	The submitter states that Cambridge is known for its tree canopy and questions what Council's initiatives are to maintain that tree canopy.	The submitter requests to see Council's policies linked to the proposed plan change in order to be able to evaluate the entire proposal. (i.e. WDC Tree Policy). No other relief sought.