

Decision Report to Council for Plan Change 2: Protected Trees

August 2019

Table of Contents

Part 1 – Decision Report	3
1.1 Introduction.....	3
1.2 Plan Change 2 Hearing	3
1.3 Decisions and Reasons	4
1.4 Submissions in General Support	5
1.5 Submissions on Topic 2 1 –Individual Tree Assessments – STEM scores	8
1.6 Submissions on Topic 3 – Cost Transfer	10
1.7 Submissions on Topic 4 – Importance of Trees in Cambridge	11
1.8 Submissions on Topic 5 – Value of Trees	12
1.9 Submissions on Topic 6 – Supports the Plan Change.....	13
1.10 Submissions on Topic 7 - Miscellaneous	14
Part 2 – Appendix	18
Strikethrough version of Waipa District Plan.....	18

Part 1 – Decision Report

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This report is prepared in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 1 the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') in respect of Plan Change 2 ('PC2'). It contains the decisions of the Hearing Panel regarding submissions and further submissions ('submissions') in relation to policies and rules of Definitions, Section 15 – Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision, Section 21 – Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements, Section 23 – Protected Trees and Appendix N4 – Protected Trees within the Waipa District Plan.
- 1.1.2 Plan Change 2 was publicly notified on 29 November 2018 and sought to make a number of changes to the management of protected trees within the Waipa District Plan. It proposed to change the assessment methodology from the current Royal New Zealand Institute of Horticulture (RNZIH) to the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM) and related thresholds for both protection and public notification in the event of an application for removal; changes were also proposed to the extent of permitted activities, the consent status of an application for tree removal and the requirement for planting street trees in new developments.
- 1.1.3 In addition, the assessment criteria associated with an application for tree removal have been expanded to include the negative factors associated with a protected tree and the root protection zone clearly defined.
- 1.1.4 Decisions are contained within the table for each submission point. Further analysis and discussion is then contained in the paragraphs below the table for each topic. Decisions on further submissions are made in conjunction with the submissions to which they relate.
- 1.1.5 The changes proposed as a result of the plan change are illustrated in **Part 2 – Appendix**.

1.2 Plan Change 2 Hearing

- 1.2.1 The hearing for Plan Change 2 was held 17 June 2019. The Hearing Commissioners that sat on the hearing panel are listed below:
- Councillor Bruce Thomas (Chair)
 - Councillor Liz Stolwyk
 - Councillor Clare St Pierre
- 1.2.2 At the hearing the panel heard evidence from the reporting planner Chris Dawson and Consultant Arborist Craig Webb. The following submitters presented evidence at the hearing:
- Roger Jordon
 - Jane Moodie & Joan McCathie (Cambridge Tree Trust)
 - John and Jill Elliott
 - *Charlie Hunter in support of John and Jill*

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

- Royce Wiles
- Helen Gubelmann
- Jennie Gainsford

1.2.3 All other submitters indicated they did not wish to attend the hearing.

1.3 Decisions and Reasons

1.3.1 The hearing addressed submissions received on Plan Change 2. As noted within the plan change document, Plan Change 2 reflects the changes to the urban environment within the Waipa District along with a change of focus for the management of protected trees. There are five main components to amendments to the Waipa District Plan introduced through the plan change. These provisions within the scope of this hearing were:

- *Definitions*
- *Section 15 – Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision*
- *Section 21 – Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements*
- *Section 23 – Protected Trees*
- *Appendix N4 – Protected Trees*

The table below displays which submitters lodged a submission point on the various topics:

Topic	Submitter
Assessment Methodology	1 – Christopher Floyd 2 – Roger Jordon 3 – Richard Carver 4 – Chris Beex 5 – David Phillips 8 – Roger Axcell & Nola Searancke 9 – Royce Wiles
Individual Tree Assessments / STEM scores	7 – Fairview Motors Ltd 10 – Jane Moodie 11 – Kay Rona 12 – Elizabeth Bridgman 13 – John and Jill Elliott
Cost Transfer	11 – Kay Rona 15 – Pamela Carter
Importance of Trees in Cambridge	2 – Roger Jordan 12 – Elizabeth Bridgman 14 – Jennie Gainsford
Value of Trees	1 – Christopher Floyd 9 – Royce Wiles 10 – Jane Moodie 13 – John and Jill Elliott
Supports Plan Change	6 – Tom Davies 13 – John and Jill Elliott
Miscellaneous	2 – Roger Jordan 4 – Chris Beex 9 – Royce Wiles 10 – Jane Moodie 11 – Kay Rona 14 – Jennie Gainsford

1.4 Submissions in General Support

1.4.1 The submission points that are relevant to this topic are as follows:

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision Reference /	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
1/1	Floyd, Christopher	General	Oppose	Decline Plan Change	Reject
FS16/19	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to accepting the requirement to release the other related tree policies which were attached to the s42A report. Reject the part of the further submission relating to delaying the plan change.</i>
FS20/1	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>Lower STEM score for removal from the protected tree list, from 120 to 100 and the score for public notification for tree removal from 138 to 120.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM score for removal from the protected tree list from 120 to 110. Reject the part that relates to lowering the public notification score from 138 to 120.</i>
2/1	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	Submitter is opposed to the de-rating of trees, particularly in Cambridge	Reject With no amendment.
FS16/25	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies which were attached to the s42A report. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/2	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>Lower STEM score for removal from the protected tree list, from 120 to 100 and the score for public notification for tree removal from 138 to 120.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM score for removal from the protected tree list from 120 to 110. Reject the part that relates to lowering the public notification score from 138 to 120.</i>
2/5	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	The submitter does not think mature trees should be removed, stripped or emasculated. No relief sought	Reject With no amendment.
FS16/29	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies which were attached to the s42A report. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/3	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>Lower STEM score for removal from the protected tree list, from 120 to 100 and the score for public notification for tree removal from 138 to 120.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM score for removal from the protected tree list from 120 to 110.</i>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
					<i>Reject the part that relates to lowering the public notification score from 138 to 120.</i>
3/1	Carver, Richard	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes changes to the RNZIH scoring system.	Reject With no amendment.
FS19/2	Elliott, Jill and John	General	Support	Submitter seeks to retain the RNZIH method with additional criteria.	Reject With no amendment.
3/2	Carver, Richard	General	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.	Reject With no amendment.
FS20/4	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	Lower STEM score from public notification of tree removal from 138 to 120.	Reject With no amendment.
4/1	Beex, Chris	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes changes to the RNZIH scoring system.	Reject With no amendment.
5/1	Phillips, David	General	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.	Reject With no amendment.
FS16/7	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/5	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	Lower the STEM score for removal from protection to 100 and the score for public notification to 120.	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM score for removal from the protected tree list from 120 to 110 (not 100). Reject the part of the submission that relates to lowering the public notification score from 138 to 120.</i>
5/2	Phillips, David	General	Support in part	The submitter believes the STEM scoring system is too high and is surprised at how many trees are losing protection.	Accept That relates to lowering the STEM threshold for protection of a tree in the District Plan.
FS16/8	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/6	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	Lower the STEM score for removal from protection to 100 and the score for public notification to 120.	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM score for removal from</i>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
					<i>the protected tree list from 120 to 110 (not 100). Reject the part of the submission that relates to lowering the public notification score from 138 to 120.</i>
8/1	Searancke, R Axcell & N	General	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.	Accept With no amendment.
FS18/2	Gubelmann, Helen	General	Support	<i>Council should maintain trees annually. Non-pruning creates a health and safety risk, therefore the new STEM scoring system is positive.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to adopting the new STEM scoring system. Reject the part of the submission relating to Council maintaining the trees.</i>
9/4	Wiles, Royce	General	Support in part	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).	Accept With no amendment.
FS16/12	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>The relief is release of requested information ahead of the public hearing.</i>	Accept With no amendment.
FS19/3	Elliott, Jill and John	General	Support	<i>Some trees need to be protected.</i>	Accept With no amendment.
9/6	Wiles, Royce	General	Support in part	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.	Accept With no amendment.
FS16/14	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>The relief is release of requested information relating to the other Tree policies ahead of the public hearing.</i>	Accept With no amendment.
15/1	Carter, Pamela	General	Support	The submitter supports moving to the STEM scoring system as it considers both positive and negative aspects of trees.	Accept With no amendment.
FS18/4	Gubelmann, Helen	General	Support	<i>Move to STEM system as it considers both positive and negative aspects of trees. We have similar situation (risk, cost / responsibility)</i>	Accept With no amendment.
FS19/7	Elliott, Jill and John	General	Oppose	<i>Retain the current criteria with assessments as to human, animal and plant life and the trees that pose a danger to human, animal and/or plant life be removed for the Register.</i>	Reject
FS20/7	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>Retain the STEM scoring system but lower the thresholds.</i>	Accept <i>With lowering of the STEM threshold for tree protection from 120 to 110 STEM points.</i>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

1.4.2 **Those submission points that are accepted in part** are those seeking modifications to the STEM score threshold for a tree to be included on the protected tree list in **Appendix N4**. The STEM score threshold is lowered from 120 STEM points to 110 STEM points in the additional wording inserted prior to the Appendix N4 table along with changes to the table to include all those trees with STEM scores between 110 and 120 STEM points. The amended text is set out in **Part 2 – Appendix 1** to this Decision Report.

1.4.3 The committee considered the lowering of the STEM threshold from 120 to 110 STEM points to be an appropriate response to the submissions seeking to retain more trees on the protected tree list. This desire to retain a greater number of trees better reflects Cambridge as the “Town of Trees” and also aligned with the advice provided by Mr Craig Webb that the STEM threshold was adjustable. An adjusted STEM threshold of 110 STEM points for a tree to be on the protected tree list means that only 19 trees will be removed from the list as opposed to 39 trees that would be removed if the STEM threshold remained at 120.

1.5 Submissions on Topic 2 1 –Individual Tree Assessments – STEM scores

1.5.1 The submission points that are relevant to this topic are as follows:

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
7/1	Fairview Motors Ltd	General	Support	Removal of the English Oak tree at 95 Victoria Street, Cambridge.	Accept Amend the table in Appendix N4 by removing District Plan number 39, English Oak.
FS16/30	Wiles, Royce	General	Oppose	<i>A sound, mature, landmark tree should not be removed simply because a business which moves in near that tree suddenly decides that the tree is a nuisance - the choice of the site was made earlier with the tree already in position.</i>	Reject <i>With no amendment.</i>
FS18/6	Gubelmann, Helen	General	Support	Move to the STEM system	Accept
10/2	Moodie, Jane	General	Support in part	Reconsider the STEM score a tree requires for protection.	Accept Amend STEM threshold score for inclusion from 120 to 110 STEM points.
FS16/2	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/8	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	Lower the threshold for protection to 100.	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM threshold to 110. Reject the part seeking a new threshold of 100 STEM points.</i>
10/3	Moodie, Jane	General	Support in part	Reconsider the STEM score a tree requires for protection.	Accept That relates to lowering the STEM threshold.

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
FS16/3	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation	Accept in part That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.
FS20/9	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	Lower the threshold for protection to 100.	Accept in part That relates to lowering the STEM threshold to 110. Reject the part seeking a new threshold of 100 STEM points.
11/1	Voice, Neil & Rona	General	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.	Reject With no amendment.
11/2	Voice, Neil & Rona	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the trees are not in a safe state to be handed to the owner(s) of 95 Carlyle Street.	Accept in part With no amendment. Following the completion of Plan Change 2, Council will inspect all trees proposed to be removed from the list in Appendix N4 prior to them becoming the full responsibility of the landowner to ensure there are no outstanding health and safety issues with those trees.
11/4	Voice, Neil & Rona	General	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.	Reject With no amendment.
FS20/10	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	That Plan Change 2 includes a description of the measures used in STEM, identifying <u>all possible</u> environmental services of trees	Accept in part With no amendment.
12/1 & 12/2	Bridgman, Elizabeth	General	Oppose	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.	Accept Amend the table in Appendix N4 by adding District Plan number 147, Golden Elm and change the STEM score to 123.
FS20/11	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	Lower the protection threshold to 100.	Accept in part That relates to lowering the STEM threshold to 110. Reject the part seeking a new threshold of 100 STEM points.
13/3	Elliot, Jill and John	General	Support in part	The submitter seeks the black walnut tree at 18 Le Quesnoy Place be removed from the protected tree register.	Accept in part Accept that the STEM score be reviewed and lowered to 138. Reject the part that relates to removing the tree from the

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
					protected tree list in Appendix N4.

1.5.2 Those submission points that are accepted above are reflected in the amended text included for **Topic 1 Appendix N4 – Protected Trees** and the Protected Tree list which includes those trees now retained on the list due to the STEM threshold being lowered from 120 STEM points to 110 STEM points.

1.6 Submissions on Topic 3 – Cost Transfer

1.6.1 The submission points that are relevant to this topic are as follows:

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
11/3	Voice, Neil & Rona	General	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.	Reject With no amendment.
15/2	Carter, Pamela	General	Support	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.	Accept in part With no amendment. Following the completion of Plan Change 2, Council will inspect all trees proposed to be removed from the list in Appendix N4 prior to them becoming the full responsibility of the landowner to ensure there are no outstanding health and safety issues with those trees.
FS17/1	Mason, Jane Catherine	General	Support	Seeks Council to negotiate with landowners of formerly protected trees to ensure trees are safely maintained and that landowners are able and willing to take on the responsibility and at no cost to the land owner.	Accept in part With no amendment. Following the completion of Plan Change 2, Council will inspect all trees proposed to be removed from the list in Appendix N4 prior to them becoming the full responsibility of the landowner to ensure there are no outstanding health and safety issues with those trees.
FS18/5	Gubelmann, Helen	General	Support	Move to STEM system.	Accept With amendments to Appendix N4 text as set out above at paragraph 1.4.2.
FS20/12	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	The plan needs to include a clear and concise outline of the problem and its solutions.	Accept in part With no amendment. Council's Tree Policy and amended Council Guide to Protected Trees clarify the rights and responsibilities of

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
					<i>the owner of a protected tree following the completion of Plan Change 2 along with the role of Council.</i>

1.6.2 **Those submission points that are accepted** are already reflected in changes to the text of Appendix N4 or are addressed through the Council Tree Policy which is being reviewed concurrently with Plan Change 2. The Tree Policy will be finalised following the completion of the plan change. No additional amendments are required.

1.7 Submissions on Topic 4 – Importance of Trees in Cambridge

1.7.1 The submission points that are relevant to this topic are as follows:

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
2/2	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	No relief sought.	Reject With no amendment.
FS16/26	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/13	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>In order to retain more of these trees, the threshold should be lowered to 100.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM threshold to 110. Reject the part seeking a new threshold of 100 STEM points.</i>
12/3	Bridgman, Elizabeth	General	Oppose	Submitter notes that Cambridge is known as the town of trees. No relief sought.	Reject With no amendment.
FS20/14	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>In order to retain more of these trees, the threshold should be lowered to 100.</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to lowering the STEM threshold to 110. Reject the part seeking a new threshold of 100 STEM points.</i>
14/2	Gainsford, Jennie	General	Oppose	To keep all existing trees on the protected tree register.	Reject With no amendment.
FS16/22	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>

1.7.2 **Those submissions that have been accepted** are addressed through the amendments to the text of **Appendix N4** set out at **Part 2, Appendix 1** to this report.

1.8 Submissions on Topic 5 – Value of Trees

1.8.1 The submission points that are relevant to this topic are as follows:

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
1/2	Floyd, Christopher	General	Oppose	Provide a mechanism for voluntary protection of individual trees on private land.	Reject With no amendment.
FS16/20	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/15	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>Plan change 2 include a process for identifying the new protected trees for the future.</i>	Accept in part With no amendment. <i>Council's Tree Policy will ensure that trees are planted for continuity on Council land. This reflects the shift of Council focus from trees on private land to trees on public land.</i>
9/9	Wiles, Royce	General	Support in part	Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation	Accept in part That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.
FS16/17	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/16	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>The Plan Change 2 be incorporated in and consistent with WDC Tree Policy and that this form an arm of WDC environment and climate change policies.</i>	Accept With no amendment.
10/5	Moodie, Jane	General	Support in part	The submitter agrees that visual, heritage and habitat values should be identified.	Accept With no amendment.
FS16/5	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS19/4	Elliott, Jill and John	General	Support	Agree that trees that impact human health need to be identified and not be protected	Accept in part with no amendment.

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision Reference /	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
				<i>and/or removed from the Register.</i>	
10/6	Moodie, Jane	General	Support in part	Identify the climate change mitigation, cleaner air, temperature modulation, flood mitigation and human health impacts (physical and psychological) values of trees.	Accept in part With no amendment.
FS16/6	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS19/5	Elliott, Jill and John	General	Support	<i>Agree that trees that impact human health need to be identified and not be protected and/or removed from the Register.</i>	Accept in part with no amendment.
FS20/17	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	<i>Plan Change 2 and STEM scoring to identify climate change mitigation, flood mitigation, cleaner air, temperature modulation, habitat and human health impacts (physical and psychological) as important attributes.</i>	Accept in part With no amendment.
13/2	Elliot, Jill and John	General	Support in part	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.	Accept in part With no amendment.

1.8.2 Those submission points that are accepted in part above have no consequential amendments to the plan change provisions. The accepted submission points are factors that are already addressed in the plan change text or in the STEM provisions as currently drafted.

1.9 Submissions on Topic 6 – Supports the Plan Change

1.9.1 The submission points that are relevant to this topic are as follows:

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision Reference /	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
6/1	Davies, Tom	General	Support	Supports WDC in making the proposed changes.	Accept With no amendment.
FS18/1	Gubelmann, Helen	General	Support	<i>Move to Stem system.</i>	Accept <i>With no amendment.</i>
13/1	Elliot, Jill and John	General	Support in part	The submitter agrees there should be provisions for some trees to be protected.	Accept With no amendment.

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
FS19/6	Elliot, Jill and John	General	Support	No relief sought.	Accept With no amendment.

1.9.2 **These submission points in support are accepted** with no consequential amendments required in the text of the plan change.

1.10 Submissions on Topic 7 - Miscellaneous

1.10.1 The submission points that are relevant to this topic are as follows:

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
2/3	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	The submitter believes that if a tree is not suitable for their environment/adjacent building then that should have been addressed at building/resource consent stage and building should not have progressed through consenting processes.	Reject
FS16/27	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
2/4	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	Submitter does not agree with the justification provided for the Plan Change.	Reject
FS16/28	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS19/1	Elliott, Jill and John	General	Support	<i>Need for additional criteria to assess tree removal. (danger to human life, animal life, plant life)</i>	Accept in part With no amendment.
4/2	Beex, Chris	General	Oppose	Submitter believes trees on private properties belong to the owner, who should decide what to do with those trees.	Reject
9/1	Wiles, Royce	General	Support in part	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).	Accept

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
2/3	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	The submitter believes that if a tree is not suitable for their environment/adjacent building then that should have been addressed at building/resource consent stage and building should not have progressed through consenting processes.	Reject
FS16/27	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
2/4	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	Submitter does not agree with the justification provided for the Plan Change.	Reject
FS16/28	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS16/9	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
9/2	Wiles, Royce	General	Support in part	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).	Accept With no amendment.
9/3					
9/5					
9/7					
9/8					
9/10					
FS16/10	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS16/11					
FS16/13					
FS16/15					
FS16/16					
FS16/18					
10/1	Moodie, Jane	General	Support in part	No relief sought.	Accept With no amendment.
FS16/1	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject that part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Submission / Point	Submitter	Provision / Reference	Support / In Part / Oppose	Decision Requested	Decision
2/3	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	The submitter believes that if a tree is not suitable for their environment/adjacent building then that should have been addressed at building/resource consent stage and building should not have progressed through consenting processes.	Reject
FS16/27	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
2/4	Jordan, Roger	General	Oppose	Submitter does not agree with the justification provided for the Plan Change.	Reject
FS16/28	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject the part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
10/4	Moodie, Jane	General	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.	Accept in part With no amendment.
FS16/4	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject that part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>
FS20/18	Cambridge Tree Trust	General	Support	Plan Change 2 should include a process by which the next generation of protected trees can be identified.	Accept in part With no amendment.
11/5	Voice, Neil & Rona	General	Oppose	No relief sought.	Reject
FS17/2	Mason, Jane Catherine	General	Support	Owners of protected trees do not have confidence in the tree pruning and maintenance programmes	Accept in part With no amendment. See discussion above for 15/2.
14/1 14/3 14/4	Gainsford, Jennie	General	Oppose	To keep all existing trees on the protected tree register.	Reject
FS16/21 FS16/23 FS16/24	Wiles, Royce	General	Support	<i>Delay of this change to the plan until WDC has released a full suite of background and policies (in draft if need be) to show the overall context and policy direction with trees and thus allow meaningful public consultation</i>	Accept in part <i>That relates to releasing the full suite of tree related policies. Reject that part of the submission seeking to delay the plan change.</i>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

- 1.10.2 Those submission points that are accepted in part are addressed through the existing provisions of Plan Change 2 or the release of the draft Waipa District Council Tree Policy with the s42A report on the Plan Change. No further amendments are required.

Part 2 – Appendix

Strikethrough version of Waipa District Plan

Note:

- Text from the Waipa District Plan is included in the same colour and text as the notified version.
- Text included in response to submissions is in black and underlined [submission number] and text deleted in response to submissions is in black and struck through e.g. ~~this text is recommended for deletion.~~
- Text included in response to the Hearings Committee decision is in red and underlined [submission number].

Definitions

~~‘Minor pruning’ means the removal of up to 10% of the foliage of a tree in any one calendar year, using recognised arboriculture practices.~~

‘Protected Tree’ means any tree listed in Appendix N4.

‘Qualified Arborist’ means an arborist qualified at least to level four in Arboriculture on the NZQA National Framework or equivalent Arboricultural qualification.

Section 15 – Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision

Objective - Integrated development: environmental enhancement

Policy - Minimising adverse effects on the landscapes, protected trees, and natural areas identified in this Plan at time of development and subdivision

15.3.6.2 To maintain and enhance the landscape values stated in this Plan, for the identified landscapes on the Planning Maps, by avoiding development and subdivision patterns that would lead to the inappropriate siting of buildings, associated infrastructure, or driveways in identified landscape areas, viewshafts, significant natural areas, or other areas of biodiversity or ecological value.

(new) To protect trees which have been identified in this Plan as having high historic, botanic, or amenity value by avoiding development and subdivision patterns that would lead to the inappropriate siting of buildings and lot boundaries within the Root Protection Zone of a Protected Tree.

Rules - Lot design

15.4.2.5 Each new lot created shall be able to incorporate the lot shape factor in a position which does not encroach on any building setback or easement requirement.

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

- 15.4.2.6 Subdivision within the urban limits, and any Large Lot Residential Zone shall not create more than two rear lots, unless provided for by Rule 15.4.2.59.
- 15.4.2.7 New residential and large lot residential lots, other than corner lots, shall have frontage to only one road or street.
- 15.4.2.8 In any zone where lots are to be prevented from obtaining direct access to an adjacent road an access denial or segregation strip shall be vested in Council. The performance standards for development and subdivision in the underlying zone do not apply to lots created for the purpose of access denial or segregation.

(new) Any new Lot created must be able to accommodate all buildings outside of the Root Protection Zone of a Protected Tree whether the Protected Tree is on the new lot or on an adjacent site.

(new) The Root Protection Zone of any protected tree must be contained entirely within any new allotment.

Activities that fail to comply with Rules 15.4.2.3 to 15.4.2.8 (new) will require a resource consent for a discretionary activity.

Infrastructure & Services

(To follow on after current rule 15.4.2.23 Rules – Stormwater)

Rules – Tree Planting on Roads: Residential and Large Lot Residential Zones

(new) Where any subdivision in the residential or large lot residential zone includes the creation of new roads; the design, layout, construction and formation of the new road, except for service lanes, must provide for the planting of street trees.

(new) Planting of street trees must be at an equivalent rate of one tree per residential property road frontage using an appropriate species for the location. Council may approve groups of trees where the kerb line and location of services and the area available are sufficient to accommodate the group of trees in the long term.

Advice note: Council's Tree Policy as updated from time to time provides guidance on the appropriate species of tree to be planted, along with standards for tree planting, protection of underground services and tree maintenance.

Activities that fail to comply with Rules 15.4.2.(new) to 15.4.2.(new) will require a resource consent for a non-complying activity.

Section 21 – Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements

21.1.15 Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision

Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision Assessment Criteria	
21.1.15.27	Design and layout: (a) The extent to which each new boundary is practically and appropriately located taking into account the following factors: general

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision Assessment Criteria	
	<p>(i) The location of existing or proposed buildings, roads, fence lines, drains, shelter belts/hedges, <u>Protected Trees</u>, the topography of the landform, areas of vegetation, wetlands, streams, rivers, internal roading, footpaths and cycleways, heritage, the retention of cultural and/or archaeological sites within one title, cultural landscapes, and other physical features, as identified in the site and surrounding area analysis; and</p> <p>(ii) The operational characteristics of the existing planned activities on the site including the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent activities; land use activity within the subdivision, <u>capacity to accommodate permitted activities without adversely affecting any Protected Trees</u>, and the ability to mitigate those effects through the design, shape or development of the subdivision or subsequent development.</p> <p>(b) In the Residential Zone, where any subdivision involves the division of an infill housing or compact housing residential development into separate lots for each household unit then the size, shape and arrangement of the unit site areas, shall be in accordance with any approved land use consent and site approved development plan and shall be such as to adequately accommodate:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(i) Outdoor living areas; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(ii) Access, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iii) Provision for ensuring the convenience and privacy of the occupants; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iv) Provision of infrastructure services.</p> <p>(c) In the Residential Zone, where any subdivision involves dividing an apartment building into separate allotments for each dwelling the configuration of the development shall be such that the individual dwellings can be held in separate ownerships and the size, shape and arrangement of such allotments and provision for access thereto shall be such as to:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(i) Adequately provide for the convenience, privacy and leisure needs of the occupants; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(ii) Make appropriate provision for vehicles including the allocation of car parks for each unit; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iii) Provide and allocate ownership or responsibility for the part of the lot not built upon; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iv) Provide and allocate ownership and responsibility for the provision of infrastructure services.</p> <p><u>(d) The effects of any proposed impermeable surfaces on the health and viability of any Protected Tree, including soil aeration and hydrological balance.</u></p> <p><u>(e) The mitigation methods proposed to ensure the values of any Protected Tree are not compromised, including its health and structural integrity, and its contribution to community amenity.</u></p> <p><u>(f) The effect of the subdivision on the values for which any Protected Tree was protected.</u></p> <p><u>(g) The potential for the location of the Protected Tree to cause significant damage or harm to buildings, services or property, whether public or privately owned, or people, now or in the future.</u></p>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision Assessment Criteria	
	(h) <u>The extent to which the Protected Tree has the potential now or in the future to cause significant hardship to nearby residents, including any significant loss of sunlight or extraordinary leaf and debris drop.</u>

21.1.23 Protected Trees

Protected Tree Assessment Criteria	
Restricted Discretionary Activities	
<u>21.1.23.1</u>	<p>Any pruning or maintenance of a protected tree that is not a permitted activity.</p> <p>(a) <u>The extent to which the work will affect the health of the tree or adversely affect any identified factor or value of the tree or any protected trees within the vicinity.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>The extent to which pruning will adversely affect the surrounding landscape character of the area in which the tree is located.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>The necessity for carrying out the works, including whether the works are required to prevent damage to buildings, services or property or to alleviate a significant hardship to nearby residents.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>The methods to be used and whether this is in accordance with accepted arboricultural practice.</u></p>
Discretionary Activities <i>Refer also to 21.1.1 Assessment Criteria for ALL discretionary activities</i>	
<u>21.1.23.1</u>	<p>Works on a protected tree</p> <p>(a) The extent to which the work will enhance or increase the health of the tree.</p> <p>(b) The extent to which the work will reduce the value of the protected tree or other protected trees within the vicinity.</p> <p>(c) The extent to which the condition of the tree constitutes a hazard unless the works are undertaken.</p> <p>(d) The extent to which the work will result in the protected tree becoming a hazard, particularly in relation to any proposed structures.</p> <p>(e) The extent to which there are alternative options, avoiding the need for the work to be undertaken on the protected tree.</p> <p>(f) The extent to which measures have been put in place to mitigate potential damage to the values of the protected tree.</p>
<u>21.1.23.12</u>	<p><u>Removal of a Protected Tree</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Whether the Protected Tree or trees are causing, or likely to cause significant damage or harm to buildings, services or property, whether public or privately owned, or people.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>The extent to which the Protected Tree has grown to the point of causing a significant hardship to nearby residents, including any significant loss of sunlight or extraordinary leaf and debris drop, and whether minor trimming or pruning will not or has not ameliorated the problem.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Whether there are any alternatives that would avoid the need for the Protected Trees removal.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>The condition and STEM score of the Protected Tree.</u></p> <p>(e) <u>The impact of the loss of amenity values that the Protect Tree provides for the surrounding environment.</u></p> <p>(f) <u>Whether a replacement tree or trees can be established and maintained in an appropriate location.</u></p>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Protected Tree Assessment Criteria	
21.1.23.2	<p>Activities within the root protection zone of a protected tree</p> <p>(a) The extent to which the activities within the root protection zone of a protected tree will:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(i) Alter the soils levels or water levels through excavation or compaction; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(ii) Discharge or disperse any agent toxic to the tree; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iii) Result in impervious surfacing; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iv) Result in any damage to the protected tree or detract from its appearance.</p> <p>(b) <u>The necessity for carrying out the works, including whether the Protected Tree is causing damage to property or infrastructure and whether there are any alternative locations available to the applicant or alternative methods available to protect the tree.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>The extent of trimming and/or maintenance of the roots and the methods to be employed including whether this is in accordance with accepted arboricultural practice.</u></p>

21.2.23 Protected Trees

Protected Trees Information Requirements	
21.2.23.1	<p>Protected Trees</p> <p>(a) <u>Where a report is required from a Qualified Arborist the report shall:</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(i) <u>Document the rationale for the required works; and</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(ii) <u>Include photos of the tree before the works are undertaken; and</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iii) <u>where the tree is to be retained, assess the effects of the proposed works on the long term health and vitality of the tree; and</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(iv) <u>document the replacement planting and any rehabilitation of the site required.</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(v) <u>Where the development proposal seeks to alter the environment around a Protected Tree, the arborist report shall recommend specific measures to protect the tree.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>An arborist report will be required under Rule 21.2.23.1(a) where the effects on the tree have the potential, in the opinion of Council, to alter the form or amenity value of the tree or have a detrimental impact on its health or longevity.</u></p>

Section 23 - Protected Trees

23.1 Introduction

23.1.1 Trees are a valued community feature as they provide visual amenity, soften the built landscape and contribute to a sense of heritage - a living symbol that connects past, present and future. Trees also provide food and important habitat for a range of different species. The Waipā District, particularly Cambridge, contains a number of significant specimen trees, of historic, botanic and amenity value, many of which date from early European settlement.

23.1.2 The Plan contains provisions which seek to protect trees which have been identified as having high historic, botanic and amenity value. The focus in this section is on the

protection of listed specimen trees on private property, from inappropriate pruning, trimming, removal, or inappropriate development within their root protection zone. These trees are listed in Appendix N4. The protected trees are primarily within the urban areas, with only a few located in the rural area.

23.1.3 This Plan contains other methods to protect vegetation, in particular indigenous vegetation. The provisions relating to the protection of significant natural areas and specified indigenous bush stands and habitats are contained in Section 24 - Indigenous Biodiversity.

~~23.1.4 Many other significant trees are located on Council property, either in the road berm or on Council reserves. These trees are managed through Council's Tree Policy, which contains direction relating to the care and removal of trees on Council land. Council also funds the pruning and maintenance of listed trees on private land and this is stated within Council's Tree Policy.~~

23.2 Resource Management Issues

23.2.1 The significant pruning of protected trees ~~by inexperienced people~~ can adversely affect the health and amenity of significant trees.

23.2.2 The removal and damage of protected trees (both exotic and native) can impact on the character and amenity of the District's urban and rural areas.

23.2.3 Works within the root protection zone of protected trees can adversely affect the health of a tree.

23.3 Objectives and Policies

Please also refer to the objectives and policies of Part C, Part D and Part E, as relevant.

Objective - Protected trees

23.3.1 To maintain the protected trees in the District's urban and rural areas (refer to Appendix N4).

Policy - Protected trees

23.3.1.1 Ensure protected trees within the District are retained to contribute to the character and amenity of the areas in which they are located.

Policy - Work on protected trees

23.3.1.2 To enable work, such as pruning, to be undertaken on protected trees where the work will:

- (a) Not adversely affect ~~assist in maintaining~~ the health ~~of the tree,~~ structural integrity, or amenity value of the tree; or
- (b) Minimise the risk from the tree to public safety, property, buildings and infrastructure.

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Policy - Building and excavations affecting a protected tree

- 23.3.1.3 To ensure the health and existing values of any protected tree are maintained by considering alternative building locations, techniques or materials, and avoiding or minimising excavation within the root protection zone of a protected tree.

Policy - Removal of protected trees

- 23.3.1.4 ~~To ensure that the removal of a protected tree, or the removal of the protected tree status from a tree, only occurs when the values associated with the protected tree have significantly deteriorated and/or the tree is causing a significant hazard to life or property.~~

To ensure that a Protected Tree is only removed in an emergency situation, where the tree is dead or dying or is causing, or likely to cause significant damage or harm to buildings, services, property, or people, or has grown to the point of causing a significant hardship to nearby residents.

23.4 Rules

The rules that apply are contained in:

- (a) *The activity status table in this section; and*
 (b) *The activity status tables and the performance standards in Part D Zone Provisions, Part E District Wide Provisions, and Part F District wide Natural and Cultural Heritage provisions of the Plan.*

23.4.1 Activity Status Tables

23.4.1.1	Permitted activities
(a)	<p>Emergency works to, or the removal of, a protected tree where the tree is causing there is an imminent hazard threat to human life or property, provided that:</p> <p>(i) <u>The need for emergency works or the removal is confirmed by a Qualified Arborist; and</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>Notification of the need for the removal or emergency works is required to be made to Council’s arborist prior to commencing the works where practicable; and</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>With the exception of removal, any works are carried out by a Qualified Arborist; and</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>The works do not exceed what is necessary to alleviate the imminent threat to human life or property.</u></p> <p>Note: Following the emergency works to, or removal of, a protected tree, a report from a professionally recognised Qualified aArborist, outlining the reasons for the removal or emergency works is required to be submitted to Council’s arborist no later than 10 working days following the tree removal or emergency works.</p>
(b)	<p><u>The removal of any protected tree that is dead, or Council’s arborist is satisfied that the tree is dying and will not recover. A report from a Qualified Arborist must be approved by Council prior to any works or removal of the tree commencing.</u></p>
(c)	<p>Pruning or shaping of the protected tree, undertaken by Council under the direction of, and in accordance with, the recommendations of a professionally recognised arborist. Pruning limited to one or more of the following:</p> <p>(i) <u>Pruning of roots less than 25 mm in diameter at the point of severance; or</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>Removal of broken branches, deadwood or diseased vegetation; or</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Removal of branches physically interfering with existing buildings or pedestrian and vehicle access ways, where such work is carried out by, or in accordance with advice from, a Qualified Arborist. Or Minimum clearance distances under rule</u></p>

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

23.4.1.1	Permitted activities
	<u>23.4.1.1(c)(iii) shall be 1 metre from any Building, 4.5 metres above a Road and 2.5 metres above a walking/cycling path.</u>
(d)	<p><u>Pruning in the bottom third of any Protected Tree, other than provided for in (23.4.1.1(c)) limited to the following:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Removal of any branches less than 50 mm in diameter at the point of severance, where the natural shape, form and branch habit of the tree is retained; or</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>Removal of any branches between 50 mm and 100 mm in diameter at the point of severance, where the natural shape, form and branch habit of the tree is retained and the work is carried out by, or in accordance with advice from, a Qualified Arborist.</u></p> <p><u>Advice note: Tree height is measured from Ground Level to the top of the canopy.</u></p>
(e)	<p><u>Pruning in the top two thirds of any Protected Tree, other than provided for in (23.4.1.1(c)), limited to the removal of foliage of no more than 10% over any three-year period (including that foliage removed under Rule 23.4.1.1(d), with the maximum amount of foliage removed in any one year limited to no more than 5%, where:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>The work is undertaken, or supervised, by a Qualified Arborist; and</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>The natural shape, form and branch habit of the tree is retained.</u></p> <p><u>Advice note: Tree height is measured from Ground Level to the top of the canopy.</u></p>
(f)	<p><u>Any work to any Protected Tree required under and carried out in accordance with, clause 14 of the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 provided that:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>The work shall be undertaken by, or under the supervision of a Qualified Arborist employed or contracted by a network utility operator, and</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>The network utility operator shall notify the Council within 5 working days that the work has been undertaken.</u></p>
ε (g)	Maintenance of the ground within the root protection zone of a protected tree, including lawn mowing and gardening, provided that the maintenance does not alter the soil levels, remove soil, or cause any damage to the tree root system.

23.4.1.2	Controlled activities
(a)	There are no controlled activities.

23.4.1.3	Restricted discretionary activities
(a)	<p>There are no restricted discretionary activities. <u>Any pruning or maintenance of a Protected Tree that is not a permitted activity.</u></p> <p><u>Assessment will be restricted to the following:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Impact on the health and value of the tree; and</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>Impact on the amenity of the surrounding area; and</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Necessity for carrying out the works; and</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>Methods to be used.</u></p>

23.4.1.4	Discretionary activities
(a)	Any building works including disturbance of the ground within the root protection zone of a protected tree (other than maintenance permitted by this Plan in Rule 23.4.1.1(g) (b) & (c)
(b)	Any pruning or shaping of a protected tree not undertaken by Council. Any removal of a Protected Tree.

23.4.1.5	Non-complying activities
(a)	Any removal of a protected tree except for as specified in Rule 23.4.1(a). There are no non-complying activities.

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

23.4.1.6	Prohibited activities
(a)	There are no prohibited activities.

23.4.2 Performance Standards

There are no performance standards relating to the trees protected in this section. The only rules in this section are contained within the activity status table.

23.5 Assessment Criteria

There are no controlled activities ~~and restricted discretionary activities.~~

23.5.1 Discretionary activities

For discretionary activities Council shall have regard to the assessment criteria in Section 21. The criteria in Section 21 are only a guide to the matters that Council will consider and shall not restrict Council's discretionary powers.

23.5.2 Notification

Applications for the removal of a protected tree under Rule 23.4.1.4 (b) where the tree has more than 138 STEM points will be publicly notified. Applications for removal of a protected tree under Rule 23.4.1.4 (b) where the tree has 138 STEM points or less shall be considered on a non-notified basis.

Appendix N4 – Protected Trees

(Maps will be updated to reflect amendments to Appendix N4 when the Plan Change is adopted. Additional wording below to be added before table in Appendix N4)

The Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM) for the assessment of trees has been adopted. This method attributes a value (points score) to the tree based on an assessment of the following categories:

1. Condition Evaluation comprising Form, Occurrence, Vigor and Vitality, Function and Age;
2. Amenity Evaluation comprising Stature, Visibility, Proximity, Role and Climate; and
3. Notable Evaluation comprising Stature, Historic association and Scientific value.

The threshold for determining if trees will be classed as protected trees in the District Plan is a minimum of ~~110~~¹ 120 STEM points. There is a higher threshold for trees that will require notification when an application is received to remove a tree with more than 138 STEM points. These trees have some outstanding features that contribute to the amenity and/or heritage of the community and make a positive impact on the district. In addition to meeting the threshold the tree needs to appear healthy and structurally sound and not be of a weed species.

¹ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Map Number	District Plan Number	Location	Legal Description	Description	STEM score
4	165	3/1215 Kaipaki Road, Cambridge	LOT 3 DPS 66088	1 <i>Juglans nigra</i> (Black Walnut)	<u>150</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2 Kelly Road, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 2 DP 410038</u>	<u>1 <i>Rhododendron species</i> (Rhododendron)</u>	<u>114²</u>
24	8	1 Vogel Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 42899	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>144</u>
24	27	13 Grey Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 353034	1 <i>Agathis australis</i> (Kauri)	<u>132</u>
24	9	16 Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 11 DPS 2024	1 <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> (Southern Magnolia)	102
24	11	16B Hall Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DP 410197	1 <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> (Tulip Tree)	<u>156</u>
24	12	16A Hall Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 410197	1 <i>Nothofagus menziesii</i> (Silver Beech)	<u>132</u>
24	149	197 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 48833	1 <i>Dacrydium cupressinum</i> (Rimu)	<u>150</u>
24	151	197 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 48833	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>126</u>
24	152	197 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 48833	1 <i>Picea smithiana</i> (Himalayan Spruce)	<u>132</u>
24	31	201 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 48833	1 <i>Tilia x europaea</i> (Lime or Linden)	108
24	14	23 Hall Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 12097	1 <i>Acer palmatum</i> (Maple)	<u>129</u>
24	15	23B Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 5520	1 <i>Juglans regia</i> (Walnut)	108
<u>24</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>23B Hamilton Road, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 2 DPS 5520</u>	<u>1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)</u>	<u>114³</u>
24	17	23B Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 5520	1 <i>Cedrus deodara</i> (Indian Cedar)	<u>126</u>
24	43	24 Grosvenor Street, Cambridge	PT ALLT 318 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>123</u>
24	49	22B Grosvenor Street, Cambridge	LOT 3 DP 468835	1 <i>Tilia x europaea</i> (Lime or Linden)	<u>126</u>
24	18	27B Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 88895	1 <i>Castanea sativa</i> (Spanish Chestnut)	<u>132</u>
24	19	27B Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 88895	1 <i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i> (Lawson Cypress)	<u>138</u>
24	20	27B Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 88895	1 <i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i> (Lawson Cypress)	<u>126</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>28 Grey Street, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 5 DP 20137</u>	<u>1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)</u>	<u>114⁴</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>30A Hamilton Road, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 1 DPS 3436</u>	<u>1 <i>Ulmus procera Louis van Houtte</i> (Golden Elm)</u>	<u>117-123⁵</u>
24	26	31 Queen Street, Cambridge	PART ALLT 79 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	removed
24	21	32A Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 80308	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	108

² Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

³ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

⁴ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

⁵ Submission of Elizabeth Bridgman 12/1 & 12/2

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Map Number	District Plan Number	Location	Legal Description	Description	STEM score
24	46	34 Grosvenor Street, Cambridge	LOT 3 DPS 4403	1 <i>Cornus capitata</i> (Strawberry Tree)	108
<u>24</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>34 Queen Street, Cambridge</u>	<u>PART ALLT 106 TN OF Cambridge East</u>	<u>1 <i>Dacrydium cupressinum</i> (Rimu)</u>	<u>114⁶</u>
24	22	36 Grey Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 72617	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>132</u>
24	25	42 Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 7928	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>120</u>
24	29	46B Hamilton Road, Cambridge	LOT 2 DP 331279	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>132</u>
24	45	48 Grosvenor Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 6163	1 <i>Ulmus glabra</i> 'Pendula' (Weeping Elm)	<u>102</u>
24	88	57 Bowen Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 40440	1 <i>Ulmus glabra</i> 'Pendula' (Weeping Elm)	<u>96</u>
24	89	59 Bowen Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 40440	1 <i>Quercus coccinea</i> (Scarlet Oak)	<u>165</u>
24	91	59 Bowen Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 40440	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>135</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>62A Bowen Street, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 2 DPS 45831</u>	<u>1 <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> (Tulip Tree)</u>	<u>114⁷</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>63 Hamilton Road, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 1 DPS 62968</u>	<u>1 <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> (Maidenhair Tree)</u>	<u>114⁸</u>
24	81	64 Bowen Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 45831	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>138</u>
24	82	64 Bowen Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 45831	1 <i>Tilia x europea</i> (Lime or Linden)	<u>138</u>
24	163	9 Glenroy Place, Cambridge	LOT 68 DP 339408	1 <i>Platanus hispanica</i> (Plane Tree)	<u>138</u>
24	33	49 Bryce Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 41835	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>141</u>
<u>25</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>12 Stafford Street, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 2 DP 33715</u>	<u>1 <i>Idesia polycarpa</i> (Wonder Tree)</u>	<u>114⁹</u>
25	113	147 Taylor Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 6188	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>126</u>
25	122	164 Williams Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 34893	1 <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> (Southern Magnolia)	removed
25	164	63 Bowen Street, Cambridge	LOT 6 DPS 12166	1 <i>Ulmus procera</i> Louis van Houtte (Golden Elm)	<u>126</u>
26	60	91 Coleridge Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 22634	1 <i>Ulmus glabra</i> 'Pendula' (Weeping Elm)	<u>123</u>
26	63	91 Coleridge Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 22634	1 <i>Ulmus procera</i> (English Elm)	<u>150</u>
26	64	91 Coleridge Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 22634	1 <i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (California Redwood)	<u>156</u>
26	65	91 Coleridge Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 22634	1 <i>Psuedotsuga menziesii</i> (Douglas Fir)	<u>144</u>
26	68	91 Coleridge Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 22634	1 <i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (California Redwood)	<u>150</u>
26	69	91 Coleridge Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 22634	1 <i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (California Redwood)	<u>156</u>

⁶ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

⁷ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

⁸ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

⁹ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Map Number	District Plan Number	Location	Legal Description	Description	STEM score
26	74	51 Moore Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 57427	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>102</u>
26	75	285 Shakespeare Street, Leamington	LOT 3 DPS 89285	1 <i>Podocarpus totara</i> (Totara)	<u>132</u>
26	76	91 Coleridge Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 22634	1 <i>Juglans nigra</i> (Black Walnut)	<u>156</u>
26	79	62 Arnold Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 20346	1 <i>Taxus baccata fastigiata</i> (Irish Yew)	<u>126</u>
26	80	62 Arnold Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 20346	1 <i>Taxus baccata fastigiata</i> (Irish Yew)	<u>126</u>
27	98	37 Byron Street, Leamington	LOT 20 DPS 5928	1 <i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (California Redwood)	<u>126</u>
27	105	60 Browning Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 1150	1 <i>Ulmus glabra</i> 'Pendula' (Weeping Elm)	<u>147</u>
27	107	66B Thompson Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 37990	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	108 ¹⁰
27	<u>109</u>	<u>66A Thompson Street, Leamington</u>	<u>LOT 1 DPS 37990</u>	<u>1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)</u>	<u>123</u> ¹¹
27	117	102 Tennyson Street, Leamington	LOT 10 DPS 86566	1 <i>Plantanus x acerifolia</i> (London Plane)	<u>138</u>
27	118	98 Tennyson Street, Leamington	LOT 1 DPS 81881	1 <i>Plantanus x acerifolia</i> (London Plane)	<u>138</u>
27	119	96 Tennyson Street, Leamington	LOT 6 DPS 86566	1 <i>Plantanus x acerifolia</i> (London Plane)	<u>138</u>
27	120	104 Tennyson Street, Leamington	LOT 11 DPS 86566	1 <i>Plantanus x acerifolia</i> (London Plane)	<u>138</u>
27	121	92 Tennyson Street, Leamington	LOT 5 DPS 86566	1 <i>Plantanus x acerifolia</i> (London Plane)	<u>132</u>
27	123	1 Frame Street, Leamington	LOT 29 DPS 9581	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>132</u>
27	124	3 Frame Street, Leamington	LOT 28 DPS 9581	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	102
27	138	13 Frame Street, Leamington	LOT 14 DPS 9581	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	108
<u>27</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>113 Arnold Street, Leamington</u>	<u>LOT 29 DPS 86566</u>	<u>1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)</u>	<u>114</u> ¹²
27	133	95 Carlyle Street, Leamington	LOT 30 DPS 86566	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	84
27	134	95 Carlyle Street, Leamington	LOT 30 DPS 86566	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	108
27	135	93 Carlyle Street, Leamington	LOT 32 DPS 86566	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	Removed
27	136	8 Hilliard Place, Leamington	LOT 4 DPS 66023	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	Removed
<u>27</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>14 Hemans Street, Leamington</u>	<u>PT ALLOT 68 DP 18004 Cambridge West</u>	<u>1 <i>Schinus molle</i> (Pepper Tree)</u>	<u>114</u> ¹³
27	142	99 Wordsworth Street, Leamington	LOT 33 DPS 745	1 <i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i> (Liquidambar)	<u>144</u>

¹⁰ See comments in discussion on Topic 2: Individual Tree Assessments – 66B Thompson Street, Cambridge

¹¹ See comments in discussion on Topic 2: Individual Tree Assessments – 66A Thompson Street, Cambridge

¹² Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

¹³ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Map Number	District Plan Number	Location	Legal Description	Description	STEM score
27	143	10 Glover Street, Leamington	LOT 13 DPS 745	1 <i>Fraxinus oxycarpa</i> 'Raywoodii' (Claret Ash)	<u>120</u>
27	144	93 Kingsley Street, Leamington	LOT 2 DPS 37061	1 <i>Juglans regia</i> (Walnut)	<u>138</u>
28	38	108 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 36382	1 <i>Ulmus glabra</i> 'Pendula' (Weeping Elm)	96
28	36	129 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 6547	1 <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> 'Pendula' (Weeping Ash)	<u>120</u>
28	39	95 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 38368	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	90
28	34	115 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 4 DPS 69391	1 <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> (Italian Cypress)	<u>132</u>
28	35	115 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 4 DPS 69391	1 <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> (Italian Cypress)	<u>126</u>
28	37	115 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 4 DPS 69391	1 <i>Camellia pilida</i>	<u>114¹⁴</u>
28	40	36 Lake Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 80662	1 <i>Dacrydium cupressinum</i> (Rimu)	<u>150</u>
28	41	36 Lake Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 80662	1 <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> (Maidenhair Tree)	removed
28	44	5 17 Coleridge Street, Leamington	ALLT 157 TN OF Cambridge West Lot 1 DP 451845	1 <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> (Tulip Tree)	<u>120</u>
28	61	17 Coleridge Street, Leamington	ALLT 158 TN OF Cambridge West	1 <i>Ulmus Procera Louis</i> 'Van Houtte' (Golden Elm)	<u>114¹⁵</u>
28	55	9 Coleridge Street, Leamington	ALLT 157 TN OF Cambridge West	1 <i>Ulmus procera Louis</i> 'Van Houtte' (Golden Elm)	<u>114¹⁶</u>
28	48	25 Coleridge Street, Leamington	ALLT 159 TN OF Cambridge West	1 <i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i> (Liquidambar)	96
28	70	38 Princes Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 77632	1 <i>Dacrydium cupressinum</i> (Rimu)	<u>126</u>
28	52	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>126</u>
28	54	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>114¹⁷</u>
28	57	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>114¹⁸</u>
28	58	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>126</u>
28	59	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>126</u>
28	62	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>126</u>

¹⁴ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

¹⁵ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

¹⁶ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

¹⁷ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

¹⁸ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Map Number	District Plan Number	Location	Legal Description	Description	STEM score
<u>28</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>51 Empire Street, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 1 DP 317811</u>	<u>1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)</u>	<u>114¹⁹</u>
28	67	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>126</u>
28	71	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>120</u>
28	72	51 Empire Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DP 317811	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>126</u>
28	87	17 Victoria Street, Cambridge	LOT 1 DPS 58719	1 <i>Erythrina crista-galli</i> (Coral Tree)	<u>120</u>
<u>28</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>18 Le Quesnoy Place, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 10 DP 365123</u>	<u>1 <i>Juglans nigra</i> (Black Walnut)</u>	<u>144-138²⁰</u>
28	90	5 Le Quesnoy Place, Cambridge	LOT 14 DP 365123	1 <i>Picea smithiana</i> (Himalayan Spruce)	<u>132</u>
28	83	7 Le Quesnoy Place, Cambridge	LOT 13 DP 365123	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>144</u>
28	85	7 Le Quesnoy Place, Cambridge	LOT 13 DP 365123	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>120</u>
28	78	68-70 Duke Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 26842	1 <i>Acer negundo</i> (Box Elder)	<u>141</u>
28	93	21 & 23 Anzac Street, Cambridge	ALLT 402 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Phyllocladus trichomanoides</i> (Tānekaha)	<u>126</u>
28	94	21 & 23 Anzac Street, Cambridge	ALLT 402 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Phyllocladus trichomanoides</i> (Tānekaha)	<u>132</u>
28	95	21 & 23 Anzac Street, Cambridge	ALLT 402 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Phyllocladus trichomanoides</i> (Tānekaha)	<u>132</u>
28	97	46 Thornton Road, Cambridge	LOT 3 DP 31550	1 <i>Acer palmatum</i> (Japanese Maple)	Removed
28	96	7 Bowen Street, Cambridge	PT SEC 328 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Ulmus glabra</i> 'Pendula' (Weeping Elm)	96
<u>28</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>26 Wordsworth Street, Leamington</u>	<u>ALLT 141 TN OF Cambridge West</u>	<u>1 <i>Rhododendron</i> (Rhododendron) 'Sir Robert Peel'</u>	<u>114²¹</u>
28	101	52 Thornton Road, Cambridge	PART ALLT 354 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Acer palmatum</i> (Japanese Maple)	108
28	103	63 Princes Street, Cambridge	PART ALLT 355 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Magnolia cambellii</i> (Tulip Magnolia)	<u>120</u>
<u>28</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>63 Princes Street, Cambridge</u>	<u>PART ALLT 355 TN OF Cambridge East</u>	<u>1 <i>Nothofagus menziesii</i> (Silver Beech)</u>	<u>114²²</u>

¹⁹ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

²⁰ Submission of Jill & John Elliot (13/3)

²¹ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

²² Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN: PLAN CHANGE 2 – PROTECTED TREES

Map Number	District Plan Number	Location	Legal Description	Description	STEM score
28	106	63 Princes Street, Cambridge	PART ALLT 355 TN OF Cambridge East	1 <i>Sophora tetraptera</i> (Kowhai)	90
<u>28</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>60 Thornton Road, Cambridge</u>	<u>LOT 4 DP 15686</u>	<u>1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)</u>	<u>114</u> ²³
28	114	94 Princes Street, Cambridge	LOT 2 DPS 27226	1 <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	<u>132</u>
28	125	57 Shakespeare Street, Leamington	LOT 2 DPS 69965	1 <i>Cedrus deodara</i> (Indian Cedar)	<u>156</u>
35	3	101 Great South Road, Ohaupo	LOT 1 DPS 90659	1 <i>Araucaria araucana</i> (Monkey Puzzle)	<u>126</u>
36	1	661 Franklin Street, Pirongia	SECT 25 TN OF Pirongia East	1 <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> (Tulip Tree)	Removed
36	2	567 Beechey Street, Pirongia	LOT 1 DP 347402	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>147</u>
36	170	21 McClintock Street, Pirongia	LOT 1 DPS 69869	1 <i>Quercus palustris</i> (Pin Oak)	<u>102</u>
38	6	655 Teasdale Street, Te Awamutu	LOT 1 DPS 12925	1 <i>Podocarpus totara</i> (Totara)	<u>138</u>
42	166	213 Rewi Street, Te Awamutu	LOT 3 DPS 26819	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>120</u>
<u>42</u>	<u>167</u>	<u>213 Rewi Street, Te Awamutu</u>	<u>LOT 3 DPS 26819</u>	<u>1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)</u>	<u>114</u> ²⁴
42	168	213 Rewi Street, Te Awamutu	LOT 3 DPS 26819	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>126</u>
42	169	213 Rewi Street, Te Awamutu	LOT 3 DPS 26819	1 <i>Quercus robur</i> (English Oak)	<u>120</u>

²³ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust

²⁴ Submissions 5/1 Phillips, 10/2 & 10/3 Moodie, further submissions FS20/2, FS20/3, FS20/5, FS20/9, FS20/13 Cambridge Tree Trust