

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND DECISIONS REQUESTED TO PLAN CHANGE H(b): NOTABLE TREES				
Submitter Name and No.	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
Suzanne Wood S1/1	Notable Trees Schedule: Tree 8, Magnolia campbellii, Road Reserve, Waituna West	Doesn't state	Asks if the notable tree comes down onto submitter's property causing damage, who indemnifies this? Will hold Council accountable for all damages incurred. Notable tree is on reserve land (McLaren Street). It is Council's responsibility to take care of the Magnolia tree. There are noted threats to the tree, slope stability and disease, significant nuisance and negative factors such as damage to a structure if the tree was to fall, possibly endangering lives. Tree will need regular inspections by Council and pruning as needed to ensure the health and vitality of the tree. Council's responsibility to sort out land discrepancies. Holding Council responsible for failure to inform landowner of the designation before the land was purchased. Submission provides mapping and aerial photo information of the site.	Not specified, but requests that any damages resulting from the tree are covered by Council. The Magnolia tree will need annual inspections and pruning as needed to ensure health and vitality of the tree. Council's responsibility to sort out land discrepancies and boundary placements.

<p>Clare and Adrian Hare, including Garry Wood and Barbara Wiley, Max Bryant and Daniel Bryant, Andrew White and Julie White S2/1</p>	<p>Notable Trees Schedule: Tree 6 Sequoiadendron giganteum; TREE-R2 Gardening within Root Protection Area; TREE-R4 Removal of a Notable Tree</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The assessment by the Arborist is different from what the submitters understood to be the Arborist's opinion at time of the site visit. Two issues: Health and safety of people/property; Incremental damage to the existing Pines Court accessway and future maintenance works triggering a resource consent. Considered by surrounding residents to be a health and safety hazard due to its size (provides information on extent of risk if tree falls); tree is damaging existing buildings; encroaching under Pines Court access leg (serves 6 other properties); ongoing maintenance burden for nearby residents; is an exotic species; planted by Colonel Halcombe or family; would've been appropriate when Feilding was smaller, now considered inappropriate for the location. Appears that STEM result does not consider health and safety of people. Without a secondary opinion from a Level 6 Arborist at the owners cost, unsure which consent category tree removal might be. Bestows additional cost upon the owner. Will need consent for any future maintenance of the damage from the root system which has cracked the concrete and for tree to be removed. Submission is not objecting to the proposed rules but objects to Tree 6 being listed in the schedule.</p>	<p>Removal of Tree 6 from the Notable Trees Schedule.</p>
--	--	---------------	---	---

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND DECISIONS REQUESTED TO PLAN CHANGE H(b): NOTABLE TREES				
Submitter Name and No.	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
Mrs H L Perry / Judith Perry S3/1	Inclusion of Tree 13 (Giant Redwood) in the Notable Trees Schedule	Oppose	The tree is now a very ugly specimen of no aesthetic value to the area since the stripping of three quarters of the limbs off the south-west side in a storm. It no longer fulfills the requirement for a notable tree as it is very lopsided and lean of tree is even more pronounced, and looks ugly viewed from submitter's house. The tree sheds a lot of sizeable old dead branches, twigs and foliage onto submitter's property and footpath, being dirty and dangerous for foot traffic using path, many of who stop and remark on how ugly the tree is.	Removal of Coast Redwood, 11 South Street from the Notable Trees Schedule (Tree 1)
Horizons Regional Council S4/1	Rule TREE-1: Standards: TREE-S1 and TREE-S2	Support with amendments	Rule TREE-R1: support standards TREE-S1 and TREE-S2, however this could be strengthened by requiring confirmation of the arborist to be used and their qualification level to be supplied at the time notification of the works is given to Council.	To strengthen standards TREE-S1 and TREE-S2 by requiring confirmation of the arborist to be used and their qualification level to be supplied at the time notification of the works is given to Council. OR seeks any further alternative or consequential relief that achieves the outcomes sought.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND DECISIONS REQUESTED TO PLAN CHANGE H(b): NOTABLE TREES				
Submitter Name and No.	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
Horizons Regional Council S4/2	Standards: TREE-S1, TREE-S2, TREE-S3	Support with amendments	Standards TREE-S1, TREE-S2 and TREE-S3 require two different timeframes for notifying council. TREE-S1(ii) states council be "advised to working days prior to works taking place", whereas TREE-S2(i) and TREE-S3(i) requests notification "as soon as reasonably practicable". In HRC's view, this creates inconsistency, particularly in relation to TREE-R1 which references both TREE-S1 and TREE-S2. Suggest the 10 working day timeframe be applied to all three standards.	Standards TREE-S1, TREE-S2 and TREE-S3: suggest the 10 working day timeframe be applied to all three standards. OR seeks any further alternative or consequential relief that achieves the outcomes sought.
Horizons Regional Council S4/3	Rule TREE-R4 (Standard TREE-S3)	Support with amendments	Comments in relation to Rule TREE-R1 also apply. Suggest confirmation of the Level 6 arborist to be used be supplied at the time council is notified of the works.	Rule TREE-R4 (Standard TREE-S3): Suggest confirmation of the Level 6 arborist to be used be supplied at the time council is notified of the works. OR seeks any further alternative or consequential relief that achieves the outcomes sought.