

Submitter	Arborist / Section 42A Recommendation	Key Issues Presented by Submitter	Action taken in response to Key Issues	Revised Section 42A Recommendation
<b>C N &amp; R N Warnakulasoriya</b>	To retain T167 near Forest Lake Road property. Meets the STEM scoring criteria.	Clear and obvious traffic safety issue with position of tree relative to existing property access. Is being added to the schedule via PC9.	A visit being arranged by the Transportation Unit to ascertain whether they would seek to remove the tree for traffic safety issues. Has not occurred as yet.	They have no status at the hearing so not strictly needing a recommendation. Nevertheless, seeking to begin a process whereby HCC Transportation Unit work through the traffic safety issues direct with the landowner to determine outcome. Tree located on road reserve so only HCC could remove and HCC would have to be the consent applicant. <b>Recommendation:</b> Retain T167 in schedule as per notified PC9.
<b>Phil Handford</b>	To retain T40 at 104 Lake Road, the ginkgo tree. Meets the STEM scoring criteria.	His main argument was having a scheduled notable tree is inconsistent with PC12.	-	Retain recommendation as is, no merits to submitter position. <b>Recommendation:</b> Retain T40 in schedule.
<b>Cameron Gray</b>	To retain T12 at 1 Blue Cedar Lane. Meets the STEM scoring criteria.	Clear and obvious safety issues with ongoing dropping of branches onto the dwelling, fence etc. given dwelling is beneath the canopy of the tree. Already scheduled in the ODP.	Grant Sirl HCC arborist has visited property. Conclusion is that tree is clearly notable, but that ongoing (and expensive) maintenance and reporting will be required. An inevitable and ongoing conflict between house and tree.	Already scheduled in the ODP so PC9 is not 'creating' this issue, but neither is it relieving it. Grant Sirl recommendation somewhat ambiguous as recognises ongoing and unresolvable conflict between house and tree and need for ongoing (and expensive) maintenance and reporting will be required. <b>Recommendation:</b> Recommend removal of T12 from schedule, on basis that a clear and non-resolvable tree vs house conflict that will be ongoing. Removal from schedule allows for tree to be physically removed. Apparent that retention in schedule will lead to a complex and protracted consenting process to physically remove tree.
<b>Earthbrooke Properties Dr Megan Balks</b>	To remove T253 at 12A Opoia Road from the schedule. Whilst meets the STEM scoring criteria, is being recommended for removal due to conflicts with powerlines.	Mainly being noted here as an example where pragmatism applied (and the same pragmatism being sought by other submitters in this table). Existing scheduled trees in the ODP. The pragmatism due to proximity of tree trunks to lines (rather than just the canopy which could be managed).	-	<b>Recommendation:</b> Retain s42A recommendation as is, to remove T253 from the schedule due to the unresolvable conflict with the existing power lines.
<b>CK Reddy</b>	To retain T8 at 242 Grey Street in the schedule. Meets the STEM scoring criteria.	Clear and obvious issue with the driveway and the tree.	A visit being arranged by the Transportation Unit to ascertain whether they would seek to remove the tree to alleviate the submitter access issue. Has not occurred as yet.	Clearly not a new situation but one that has developed over decades. The only new element is being added to the schedule via PC9. Tree located on road reserve so only HCC could remove and HCC would have to be the consent applicant. Seeking to begin a process whereby HCC Transportation Unit work through the access issue direct with the landowner to determine outcome. <b>Recommendation:</b> Retain T8 in schedule as per notified PC9.
<b>Jason McKenzie</b>	To retain T50 at 13 Sexton Road in the schedule. Meets the STEM scoring criteria. Note there was no submission from the 13 Saxton Road landowner, only the neighbours x2 in opposition.	Some ongoing neighbour issues with privately planted trees near property boundaries, which are made worse with then these having been scheduled.	-	Landowner at 13 Sexton Road has covered their property in trees which they are entitled to but clearly resulting in problems. Already scheduled in the ODP (since circa 2012) so issues not originating with PC9. Only the landowner can remove those trees however, so even removing from schedule is not resulting in their physical removal. <b>Recommendation:</b> Retain T50 trees in schedule as per notified PC9.
<b>Wise Trust</b>	Relates to Kakariki House at 293 Grey Street and T8.	Wanting 'maintenance plans' for large street trees to be formulated and implemented by HCC.	-	<b>Recommendation:</b> No amendment recommended, an important issue but not something that can be addressed through PC9. Requires Long Term Plan funding to undertake a programme of formulating and then implementing 'maintenance plans'.
<b>Waikato Heritage Group</b>	Should schedule more notable trees at Memorial Park and other places, should address 'notability' criteria in STEM scoring system more fully.	Should schedule more notable trees at Memorial Park and other places, should address 'notability' criteria in STEM scoring system more fully.	-	Jon Redfern has already addressed this, nothing further from a section 42A planning perspective.

<b>D and B Yzendoorn</b>	Relates to T172, a cluster of Sequoia trees at Galloway Park adjacent to the submitter's private property.	Root protection zone is enormous and covers much of the private property. Should be managed under the Reserves Act 1977 and reserve management plans, so accordingly no need to schedule as notable trees under PC9.	Requested Jon Redfern to provide further comment (see email from him dated 23 May). In particular how RPZ determination is robust for tall trees with narrow dripline. From Jon: A number of the trees in this cluster did not make it to be notable trees on merit. Acknowledged that the location of the trees needs to be updated. For root protection zone, for tall trees with slim canopies the dripline is a poor representation of root zone. Under the ODP formula these were DBH x9 which is similar to that proposed within PC9. The rule amendments in response to Mr David Nielsen on behalf of Waikato Community Hospice sub 453 and Philip Curnow sub 109 to provide for 'maintenance, repair or replacement of impervious surfaces' provides some relief here also.	<b>Recommendation:</b> No change to the section 42A recommendation already provided. The trees are notable (at least the majority of them), the RPZ is expansive across adjacent private land but justified with the canopy shape of the tree not a reason to dispense with or reduce.  The rule amendments in response to Mr David Nielsen on behalf of Waikato Community Hospice sub 453 to provide for 'maintenance, repair or replacement of impervious surfaces' provides some relief here also.
<b>Ross Meehan</b>	Relates to T52 at 953 River Road	Just being noted here as a comparison to the Cameron Gray situation.	-	Arborist recommendation to remove tree from schedule due to clear and obvious ill health of tree. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change to the section 42A recommendation already provided.
<b>Waikato Community Hospice</b>	Relates to T4 on Cobham Drive. Sought two rule amendments to provide for 'impervious surfaces'.	Overly restrictive rules in respect of maintaining, repairing and replacing existing impervious surfaces.	Consideration of the merits of the two rule amendments.	<b>Recommendation:</b> To accept the proposed rule amendments to Rule 20.3 v) v) (now (viii)) and Rule 20.3 w)(ii) proposed by the submitter, as being useful revisions to the permitted activity and restricted discretionary rules.
<b>David Mans</b>	Relates to T136 a row of trees along Claude Street. Wants the trees removed, do not schedule.	Large trees, unstable, will fall down.	-	<b>Recommendation:</b> No change to the section 42A recommendation already provided, as trees are notable, if need to be removed using the emergency removal provisions then can be removed.
<b>Alison Gray</b>	Relates to T2135, a row of street trees at Marire Avenue.	Causing problems with power lines, damage to kerbs and underground services and general problems.	Referred back to Jon Redfern to review position and recommendation. Advice from Jon: "T235.3 and T235.5 are in the same position as the Opoia Road trees with powerline conflicts and should not be scheduled. This was an oversight as the trees have not been reassessed in response to the submission has had been intended. If I had revisited the site it is likely that I would have recommended to remove from the schedule."	<b>Recommendation:</b> Remove from schedule Trees 235.3 and 235.5 – both trees are on the western berm of the road reserve. The powerlines run down that side of the street with inevitable and ongoing conflict. Analogous to Opoia Road as lines in conflict with trunks and not just the canopies.
<b>Foster Develop (Lloyd Stephenson statement) Sub 57</b>	Remove all reference to the notable tree T207.3 from Schedule 9D. As context the submitter opposes the built heritage scheduling of the building at 3 Hardley Street, the land owner holds a Certificate of Compliance for the demolition of the heritage identified buildings and re-development of the	From Jon: The tree was visually reassessed post-submission. Recommend that the tree be retained. This tree meets the 130 STEM score requirement for inclusion.	-	<b>Recommendation:</b> No change to the section 42A recommendation already provided, as tree is notable, the Certificate of Compliance to remove the building (and presumably then re-develop the property) is not a robust reason to remove this notable tree from the schedule.

	site within a root protection zone (there is now a notable tree fronting Hardley Street). The certificate is valid for 5 years and demolition is planned to take place in quarter 4, 2023.			
--	--	--	--	--