

Attachment 3 – Summary of Further Submissions

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
027	landowners Coalition Inc	PC129-X051	GEK Property Nominees Limited	Support	h	<p>The proposed threshold of 100 is too low. this will protect trees that do not warrant it, such as the two Jacaranda tress on GEK's Property.</p> <p>NPT.1.1 Describes the purpose and expectations of the chapter as being to protect "...the most significant trees in Whangarei.." This expectation will not be met if trees of less quality are given equal status and protection as those that make a truly significant contribution to the amenity, historical, ecological and cultural values of the District;</p> <p>likewise, Objective NPT1.3.1 refers to the protection of trees with "...significant amenity historical or cultural values.." trees that score between 100 and 126 may have amenity, historical, ecological or cultural values but they are unlikely to be significant.</p> <p>Other territorial authorities that use STEM have set the threshold substantially higher than is proposed eg Thames Coromandel is 170, Matamata-Piako is 140, Taupois 130, Palmerston North is 160, Dunedin is 145 and Queenstown Lakes is 120</p>		Yes	N/A
028	landowners Coalition Inc	PC129-X052	Green D	Support	Not stated	<p>Agree with need to recognise the rights of adjacent neighbours and that council should therefore have a plan for each tree in terms of its management.</p> <p>Council refers to the need for trees to be effectively managed, that should apply to all trees on the register.</p> <p>Individual owners should not trim only to suit their needs while ignoring impact on neighbouring properties. Who if not council, will monitor this to ensure those effected by trees are given due consideration.</p>		No	No
N/A	N/A	PC129-X053	McNab I	N/A	N/A	<p>Trees are a fire hazard to both neighbouring houses. As advised in original submission we continue to support the removal of trees.</p>		No	No
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X054	Transpower New Zealand	Support	a	<p>Support submission point seeking to add additional wording to the final paragraph of NPT.1.1, particularly in relation to the specific recognition of infrastructure and network utilities. Transpower considers this additional wording provides useful information and clarity for plan users.</p>		Yes	Yes
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X054	Transpower New Zealand	Support in part	e	<p>In its original submission Transpower accepted the retention of NPT.1.2 (Eligibility) clause 2 in that it effectively provides a default permitted activity rule. However, support for an explicit permitted activity rule in order to avoid confusion for plan users was also noted. The submission point is supported in part in so far as it seeks to add an explicit new Permitted Activity rule section with specific standards for Public Trees. Transpower considers this approach would be more efficient and effective than relying on the wording provided in NPT.1.2 clause 2 as it provides certainty and clarity in relation to activity status.</p>	<p>Should the Council accept the relief sought by this submission point, Transpower seeks that the amendments sought in its original submission on NPT.1.5 Rule 4 be incorporated into the wording of the new permitted activity rule and standards as follows:</p> <p>Public Trees</p> <p>2. <i>Trimming or alteration of any public tree defined in NPT.1.10.1 which is:</i></p> <p>a. <i>Required for the removal of <u>broken</u>, dead, dying or diseased wood; and</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>c. <i>Undertaken, or authorised, by a network utility operator, where branches are compromising the safe and efficient operation, maintenance or upgrade of overhead or underground network utilities, including road lighting, and the trimming or alteration is required to maintain the <u>security of an existing supply or to restore power or telecommunication infrastructure, or to maintain access to the network;</u> or</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>In addition, should the Council accept the relief sought by this submission point (PC129-036 e), Transpower also seeks the following amendment to the wording of the new permitted activity rule and standards in order to ensure consistency with the amendments Transpower supports in the Northpower submission point PC129-037 j:</i></p>	Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
							2. ... e. Emergency tree works undertaken by the Whangarei District Council, network utility operator or their authorised representative in order to safeguard life or property, or to restore power or telecommunication infrastructure.		
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X054	Transpower New Zealand	Support	f	In its submission on NPR.1.5 Transpower did not specifically raise concerns with the rule framework, and rather sought amended wording to address concerns outlined in its original submission. Notwithstanding this, the submission point is supported in part in so far as it seeks an amended discretionary activity rule which reflects the insertion of an explicit new Permitted Activity rule section with specific standards for Public Trees (as sought by Submission Point PC129-036 e) Transpower considers this approach would be more efficient and effective than relying on the wording provided in NPT.1.2 Eligibility clause 2 and a discretionary activity rule which essentially contains a list of permitted activity standards.	If the Council accepts this relief, Transpower seeks that the erroneous reference to 'Notable Tree' in the submission's drafting of amended Rule 4 be corrected to "Public Tree", and that the amendments sought in Transpower's original submission on NPT.1.5 Rule 6 be incorporated into the wording of the amended discretionary activity rule and standards, as follows: <i>Public Trees</i> 4. Trimming or alteration of any Notable Tree <i>Public Tree</i> defined in NPT.1.10.1 which does not comply with (Insert appropriate permitted activity rule reference). ... 6. Damage or Removal of any public tree defined in NPT.1.10.1 which does not comply with (Insert appropriate permitted activity rule reference).	Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X055	Transpower New Zealand	Support in part	f	Transpower supports in part the amendments sought to the wording of NPT.1.4 Policy 2 clause 'd' (amended to clause 'e' in the Northpower relief) in so far as it seeks to add the word " <u>development</u> " before "operation, use, maintenance and upgrading" as this appropriately recognises the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008 and the need to ensure the 'operation, maintenance, upgrading and development' of the National Grid is not compromised.	Transpower supports the submission point in so far as it seeks to amend the wording of NPT.1.4 Policy 2 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure consistent reference to "<u>network utilities</u>" throughout the plan as this will assist with plan interpretation and ensure clarity of plan provisions; add a new clause 'c' as outlined as this will ensure tree selection appropriately recognises infrastructure and network utility requirements; and add a new clause 'f' to provide for emergency tree works as this will ensure clarity of plan interpretation and enable appropriate works to public trees to provide for network utilities. In terms of the relief sought to add " <u>including trimming or alteration</u> ", Transpower prefers the relief sought in Transpower's original submission to insert the words " <u>including removal</u> " on the basis the reference to removal would recognise that in some instances removal may be required to provide for the safe and efficient functioning of network utilities. If Transpower's relief sought in its original submission is not supported by Council, Transpower could support the amendment sought by Northpower.	Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
037	Northpower	PC129-X055	Transpower New Zealand	Support in part	j		<p>Transpower supports the submission point in part in so far as it seeks to amend rule NPT.1.5 Rule 4 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend clause 'a' to insert the word "<u>broken</u>" as this is consistent with Transpower's original submission relief and recognises broken debris can be removed without compromising the tree; • Amend clause 'c' to include reference to network utility operators and additional wording to provide consistency with the wording of the equivalent Notable Trees rule provision as this appropriately recognises the role of network utility operators. <p>Transpower notes however that in relation to the PC129's discretionary activity rules, it supports (and prefers) the approach sought by Submission Point PC129-036 f which seeks an amended discretionary activity rule that reflects the insertion of a new Permitted Activity rule section with specific standards for Public Trees. Should the Council accept this amended approach to the permitted and discretionary activities, Transpower's preferred relief in terms of the wording of the discretionary activity rules for Public Trees is outlined above in response to Submission Points PC129-036 e and PC129-036 f.</p>	Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X055	Transpower New Zealand	Support in part	m	Notwithstanding Transpower submitted in support of NPT 1.7, Transpower supports the amendment sought by the Northpower submission point to amend clause 'h' to add reference to "network utilities" as this will ensure consistency of plan provisions, assist plan users and aid interpretation.		Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X055	Transpower New Zealand	Support	n	Transpower supports the submission point in part in so far as the suggested wording for the definition of "Trimming" is supported, and the addition of a definition for "Alteration" is supported. These amendments will provide clarity and certainty to plan users and aid interpretation. The provision of definitions reflects the relief sought in Transpower's original submissions. (Note: Transpower is neutral in regards to the part of the submission point that seeks to add a definition of "dripline").		Yes	Yes
009	Dennis Morgan and Marrie Ward	PC129-X056	Gunson V	Support	Not stated	Support request to be relieved of the need for a resource consent for removing or maintaining the ailing Heritage Tree. The tree is causing a great deal of stress to the property owner as it close to their house. Twice large branches have broken off during high wind, one falling on power lines. The tree is obviously reaching the end of it's natural life if such weakness is shown. The submitters should be allowed to reduce the size of the tree due to risk to their property and personal safety.		No	No
009	Dennis Morgan and Marrie Ward	PC129-X057	Baddeley K and Payen J	Support	Not stated	The tree blocks out the sun both in summer and winter. We are afraid either the tree or branches will fall and take out the power lines. This has previously happened with another tree on the property. In autumn easterly winds dump a massive amount of leaf litter from the tree which causes issues with our guttering. We are also worried that the tree will fall on our cars.		No	Yes
022	Heather Rye	PC129-X058	Northpower	Support	e	Submission point is supported t in principle as Northpower has obligations under the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 to protect the security of supply of electricity and the safety of the public, according to the legal minimum space surrounding powerlines outlined in the Tree Regulations 2003. The relief sought reflects Northpower's original submission points to specifically recognise that trimming and maintenance of notable trees and public trees should be enabled where it is necessary to accommodate		Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
						the efficient operation of network utilities and to comply with the Tree Regulations 2003.			
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X059	Northpower	Support	a	Submission point is supported in seeking to add additional wording to the final paragraph of NPT.1.1, particularly in relation to the specific recognition of infrastructure and network utilities. This additional wording provides clarity and useful information to plan users. It is particularly important to ensure subdivision design and layout avoids future conflict between planned infrastructure and areas proposed to be planted or vegetated, especially considering the Whangarei District Plan requires new electricity supply and telecommunications lines and connections to be located underground (for example, see Rules 71.3.16 and 71.3.17).		Yes	Yes
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X059	Northpower	Support	b	Submission point is supported as it recognises that the future subdivision, use and development can have significant adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of network utilities. The amendment would encourage plan users to consider potential effects on Northpower assets when considering accommodating existing and new trees and vegetation into design and layout of future subdivision and development.		Yes	Yes
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X059	Northpower	Support in part	c	Submission point is supported in so far as it seeks to enable trimming and alteration necessary to provide for the safe and efficient use and operation of network utilities. In its original submission, Northpower sought additional changes to enable 'maintenance' as necessary works for the safe and efficient 'development', 'maintenance', operation and 'upgrading' of network utilities, on the basis that they would not be inappropriate if they were undertaken in accordance with arboricultural best practice. Northpower supports WDC Infrastructure Department's requested relief for the additional policy 3d, which is intended to manage conflict between future and existing trees and network utility infrastructure, for the reasons set out in response to submission points PC129-036 b and PC129-015 c above.	Northpower prefers the relief sought in Northpower's original submission relating to clause 'c' on the basis that development, maintenance and upgrading should also be enabled. If Northpower's relief sought in its original submission relating to clause 'c' is not supported by Council, Northpower could support the amendment sought by WDC Infrastructure Department, but seeks that the policy refers to 'the roading network <u>or</u> network utilities' rather than ' <u>and</u> network utilities' to recognise that some works will be necessary to enable the safe and efficient use and operation of certain network utilities only (e.g. on private property), and other works will be necessary to enable the safe and efficient use and operation of only the road network (e.g. maintenance of sight lines).	Yes	Yes
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X059	Northpower	Support in part	d&e	In principle the relief sought in terms of wording amendments is supported but Northpower prefers the relief sought in its original submission. Northpower could support alternative relief recommended by the Council that achieves the intent of Northpower's original submission as well as WDC Infrastructure Department's original submission, to enable tree works that are necessary to provide for the safe and efficient development, maintenance, operation or upgrading of network utilities. Submission points are supported in so far as they seek to add an explicit new Permitted Activity rule section with specific standards and in so far as it seeks to enable tree works that are necessary to provide for the safe and efficient use and operation of network utilities. The new explicit Permitted Activity rule section approach would be more efficient and effective than relying on the wording	Should the Council accept the relief sought by this submission point, Northpower seeks that the amendments sought in its original submission into the wording of the new permitted activity rule(s) and standards as follows: Amend rule NPT.1.5.1 as follows: <i>Trimming or alteration of Notable Trees listed in NPT.1.9.1 which does not comply with the following: where:</i> <i>a. The trimming or alteration is required for the removal of <u>broken</u>, dead, dying or diseased wood, <u>or</u></i> <i>b. Tree works undertaken in accordance with arboricultural best practice where:</i> <i>iii. Any works must retain the natural shape, form and branch habit of the tree, or</i> <i>c. Emergency tree works undertaken by the Whangarei District Council, <u>network utility operator</u> or their authorised representative in order to safeguard life or property, or to restore power or telecommunications infrastructure, <u>or</u></i> <i>d. Tree works undertaken by a qualified arborist on behalf of a network</i>	Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
						<p>provided in NPT.1.2 clause 2. This would be easier for plan users to interpret, is consistent with other parts of the Whangarei District Plan and provides greater certainty and clarity in relation to activity status.</p>	<p><i>utility operator where branches or tree roots are interfering with overhead wires or other network utilities and the trimming or alteration is required in order to maintain the security of an existing supply or to restore power or telecommunication infrastructure, and</i> <i>e. Except for tree works under clause (c) and (d), Council are notified in writing at least five working days prior to the tree works being undertaken.</i></p> <p>Amend rule NPT.1.5.2 as follows: <i>2. Construction or alteration of any structure, excavation of land, compaction of soil or formation of any new impervious surfaces within the dripline of a Notable Tree listed NPT.1.9.1 except where:</i> <i>a. The works are thrusting to a depth of greater than 650mm for the installation of network utilities supervised by a qualified arborist, or</i> <i>b. the works are for the installation, maintenance or repair of network utilities where:</i> <i>i. Any excavation works are undertaken or supervised by a qualified arborist, are limited to hand digging or hydro excavation, and limited to the minimum area of disturbance required to carry out the works, and</i> <i>ii. the works do not involve the creation of new impervious areas other than the replacement of existing impervious areas, or</i> <i>c. The works are for the mounting of telecommunications cables or pipes to existing structures or to the ground.</i></p> <p>Amend Rule NPT.1.5.5 as follows: <i>Construction or alteration of any structure, excavation of land, compaction of soil or formation of any new impervious surfaces within the dripline of any public tree identified in NPT.1.10.1 except where:</i> <i>a. The works are thrusting to a depth of greater than 650mm for the installation of network utilities supervised by a qualified arborist, or</i> <i>b. the works are for the installation, maintenance or repair of network utilities where:</i> <i>i. Any excavation works are undertaken or supervised by a qualified arborist, are limited to hand digging or hydro excavation, and limited to the minimum area of disturbance required to carry out the works, and</i> <i>ii. the works do not involve the creation of new impervious areas other than the replacement of existing impervious areas, or</i> <i>c. The works are for the mounting of telecommunications cables or pipes to existing structures or to the ground.</i></p> <p>Amend Rule NPT1.5.6 as follows: Damage to or <i>Removal of any public tree defined in NPT.1.10.1, except where:</i> <i>i. The removal or partial removal is confirmed by a qualified arborist or Council officer as emergency tree works necessary to safeguard life, property or network utilities from immediate danger or to restore power or telecommunication infrastructure, and the works are undertaken by a network utility operator or their authorised representative.</i></p>		

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X059	Northpower	Support in part	f	<p>For the same reasons outlined in response to submission points PC129-036 d and e, Northpower supports this submission point in so far as it seeks to ensure the Discretionary activity rules only apply to the activities that do not comply with the permitted activity rules and associated criteria.</p> <p>In relation to the content of WDC Infrastructure Department's submission points (suggested wording amendments), in principle the relief sought is supported but Northpower prefers the relief sought in Northpower's original submission. Northpower could support alternative relief recommended by the Council that achieves the intent of Northpower's original submission as well as WDC Infrastructure' Department's original submission, to enable tree works that are necessary to provide for the safe and efficient development, maintenance, operation or upgrading of network utilities.</p>	<p>Should the Council accept the relief sought by this submission point and submission points PC129-036 d and e, Northpower seeks that the amendments sought in its original submission be incorporated into the wording of the amended discretionary activity rules as follows: Amend NPT.1.5 as follows:</p> <p>Notable Trees:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trimming or alteration of Notable Trees listed in NPT.1.9.1 which does not comply with the following: <u>(insert relevant rule reference)</u>. Remove rules 1.a through 1.e 2. Construction or alteration of any structure, excavation of land, compaction of soil or formation of any new impervious surfaces within the dripline of a Notable Tree listed NPT.1.9, <u>which does not comply with (insert relevant rule reference)</u>. 3. Damage to or Removal of a Notable Tree listed in NPT.1.9.1 <u>which does not comply with (insert relevant rule reference)</u> <p>Public Trees:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Trimming or alteration of any public tree defined in NPT.1.10.1 which does not comply with the following: <u>(insert relevant rule reference)</u>. Remove rules 4.a through 4.e 5. Construction or alteration of any structure, excavation of land, compaction of soil or formation of any new impervious surfaces within the dripline of any public tree identified in NPT.1.10.1 <u>which does not comply with (insert relevant rule reference)</u>. except where: Remove rule 5.a 6. Damage to or Removal of any public tree defined in NPT.1.10.1 <u>which does not comply with (insert relevant rule reference)</u>. 	Yes	Yes
015	Transpower	PC129-X060	Northpower	Support in part	c	<p>Northpower supports the submission point in so far as it seeks to amend the wording of NPT.1.4.2 to include 'removal' in clause (d) on the basis that the addition would recognise that in some instances, removal may be required to provide for the safe and efficient functioning of network utilities.</p>	<p>If Council requested the relief sought, clause (d) of the policy could read as follows: Enabling appropriate works to public trees, <u>including trimming, alteration or removal</u>, to provide for the safe, efficient operation, use, maintenance and upgrading of, <u>and access to</u>, network utilities.</p>	Yes	Yes
	Transpower	PC129-X061	Northpower	Support in part	e		<p>Northpower supports the submission point in part in so far as it seeks to amend rule NPT.1.5 Rule 4 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend clause (a) to insert the word "<u>broken</u>" as this is consistent with Northpower's original submission relief and recognises broken debris can be removed without compromising the tree; • Amend clause (d) to include 'or alteration', as this is consistent with Northpower's original submission relief and it is important that Northpower is able to trim or alter any vegetation that could affect the safe and efficient operation, maintenance or upgrade of its network utilities. Northpower also supports enabling tree works required to maintain access to its network. <p>In its original submission, Northpower also sought amendments to Rule 4 to incorporate 'tree roots' in clause (d), and new text to clause (c) to enable emergency tree works by network utility operators to restore power or telecommunications infrastructure for the reasons outlined in the original submission.</p> <p>Northpower supports Transpower's submission point relating to Rule 6 in so far as it seeks to amend Rule NPT.1.5 Rule 6 to remove the term 'damage'. This relief sought is consistent with Northpower's original submission relief, as the term 'damage' usually means accidental harm and could lead to plan interpretation and application issues.</p>		
015	Transpower	PC129-X060	Northpower	Support	f	<p>Northpower supports the removal of the term 'damage' from the rule framework for the reasons outlined in its original submission and as stated in relation to submission point PC129-015 e above.</p>		Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
015	Transpower	PC129-X060	Northpower	Support in part	g	Notwithstanding Northpower submitted seeking an amendment to clause 'h' of NPT 1.7 to add reference to "network utilities" to ensure consistency of plan provisions and aid interpretation, Northpower supports the retention of NPT.17 clauses (e) and (h) as otherwise notified, as these clauses acknowledge the issue of risk and the functional and operational needs of network utilities and infrastructure.		Yes	Yes
015	Transpower	PC129-X060	Northpower	Support in part	h	Northpower supports the submission point in part in so far as it requests definitions for the terms 'trimming', 'alteration' and 'removal'. Northpower requested specific definitions for the terms "trimming", "alteration" and "dripline" in its original submission to address the lack of clarity to plan users and acknowledge the need to provide certainty as to the activities that are enabled or restricted by the relevant rules. The provision of definitions reflects the relief sought in Northpower's original submission, however as stated in its submission, Northpower considers that the term 'removal' is clear in its interpretation. Northpower requested specific definitions for 'trimming', 'alteration', and 'dripline'.		Yes	Yes
039	NZTA	PC129-X061	Northpower	Support in part	b	Northpower supports the submission point in so far as it requests that the removal of trees in certain circumstances are provided for as a permitted activity. NZ Transport Agency's submission point reflects the relief sought by Northpower in its original submission points (including PC129-037 I) to enable removal of public trees for emergency tree works necessary to safeguard life, property or network utilities from immediate danger or to restore power or telecommunications infrastructure, for the reasons stated in Northpower's original submission.		Yes	Yes
009	Dennis Morgan and Marrie Ward	PC129-X062	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	Personal safety is more important than the preservation of an aging, exotic tree		Yes	N/A
011	Laurel Mary Wheeler	PC129-X063	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	Safety of residents should take precedence over the preservation of inappropriately-located trees		Yes	N/A
012	Robyn Te Whata	PC129-X064	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	Tree-lined streets are great in principle, but in planting such trees, Council must accept responsibility for their associated maintenance without imposing undue costs or safety concerns on local residents.		Yes	N/A
013	Whangarei Intermediate School	PC129-X065	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	The health and safety of pupils and staff in a school environment should not be compromised by the preservation of a mis-identified exotic tree.		Yes	N/A
014	Housing NZ Corporation	PC129-X066	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	The health and safety of residents is more important than attempting to preserve decaying trees		Yes	N/A
016	F J Hammer	PC129-X067	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	Property owners have a right to enjoy daylight and sunlight. Building regulations restrict the height of nearby buildings so as not to restrict the availability of reasonable daylight (District Plan Rules 36.4.2, 36.4.4 and 36.4.9). The same restrictions should apply to trees of inappropriate size in an urban location.		Yes	N/A

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
018	Patrick Cox	PC129-X068	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	Some trees become inappropriate in an urban location when their growth exceeds the reasonable capacity of their urban environment to accommodate them without compromising residents' reasonable rights to provide for their safety and well-being (see Article 5 of the RMA). Property owners should have the same rights to provide for their health and safety as would be required of an employer on the same site. Trees should be assessed under Health & Safety regulations. Councils who ignore health and safety issues are betraying the interests of the residents whom they are supposed to represent, all in the pursuit of over-zealous green ideology.		Yes	N/A
022	Heather Rye	PC129-X069	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	Some trees become inappropriate in an urban location when their growth exceeds the reasonable capacity of their urban environment to accommodate them without compromising residents' reasonable rights to provide for their safety and well-being (see Article 5 of the RMA). In assessing a tree's protected status, consideration should be given by WDC to negative aspects, as other local authorities do. Undue costs should not be imposed on property owners who simply wish to protect their wellbeing, safety, right to warm, dry dwelling, etc.		Yes	N/A
025	Heather Thomason	PC129-X070	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	Private property owners should not have to endure loss of amenity value, damage to property and high maintenance costs caused by a tree growing to an inappropriate size in an urban location.		Yes	N/A
026	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	PC129-X071	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	The STEM system fails to take account of a tree's negative aspects associated with its: - size and location; adverse health & safety aspects; loss of amenity value (excessive shading, lack of sunlight, dampness); high maintenance costs imposed on individuals. The proposed plan change retains the subjective STEM system, used by only half of NZ local authorities, with an arbitrary threshold level much lower than is used by others. It fails to differentiate between native trees and exotics which may have a proven potential to become invasive. Past tragic events have demonstrated that there is no reliable means of assessment of the risk to life posed by aging trees. Routine monitoring may satisfy a bureaucratic process but it does not guarantee safety.		Yes	N/A
027	landowners Coalition Inc	PC129-X072	Northland District Masonic Trust	Support	All	The proposed plan change fails to respect private landowners' rights to manage natural resources "in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety" as enshrined in Section 5 (Purpose) of the RMA. The STEM system fails to take account of a tree's negative impacts on private property and residents. Other local authorities have acknowledged this and make allowance for negative impacts. Given Whangarei's location between the bush-clad western hills and Parihaka, the loss of 1, or even 10 urban trees has less than minor significance on a district-wide scale of amenity and natural values. The removal of 1 tree on an urban private property should be a permitted activity.		Yes	N/A
001	McNab M	PC129-X073	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Negative effects and risks of the trees should be factored into the assessment.		Yes	Yes
009	Morgan and Ward	PC129-X074	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Danger and risks should be recognised by Council. Council provide assistance if protected status is retained.		Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
010	O'Hara L	PC129-X075	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Address issues regarding risks and nuisance.		Yes	Yes
011	Wheeler L	PC129-X076	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Address issues regarding risks and nuisance.		Yes	Yes
012	Te Wata R	PC129-X077	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Raises negative effects of trees that are not recognised by Council. Address negative effects through tree removal or council mitigation.		Yes	Yes
013	Whangarei Intermediate School	PC129-X078	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	The Health and Safety aspects identified should be factored into the assessment of the trees merit. Clearly the Council has not given sufficient regard to children's health and safety.		Yes	Yes
018	Cox P	PC129-X079	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Suitability of location for big trees in residential areas. Tree assessments should be under the Health and Safety Act, and Council has a responsibility to meet that Act.		Yes	Yes
019	Yanko M	PC129-X080	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Costs that fall upon effects property owners. Negative effects, including leaf fall and dangers.		Yes	Yes
022	Rye H	PC129-X081	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	That assessment should include appropriateness of the location Tree should not impose costs, risks or liability upon a landowner. Remove the tree from the register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
023	Northland Regional Council	PC129-X082	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Recognise flooding risks in the plan and right of a council to undertake emergency work.		Yes	Yes
025	Tomason H	PC129-X083	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Given the adverse effects, removal of the tree from the Register. In addition, the tree is a fire risk due to the power lines.		Yes	Yes
027	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	PC129-X084	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Takes negative effects into account.		Yes	Yes
028	Percy E	PC129-X085	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Demonstrates conflicts of large trees and residential activities; Council need to address negative effects, and do so as a matter of policy. Landowner often not in a position to adequately maintain large trees.		Yes	Yes
029	Jones B	PC129-X086	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Demonstrates negative effects; arbitrary nature of the STEM assessments.		Yes	Yes
030	DC Empires Ltd	PC129-X087	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	That the STEM assessments be required.		Yes	Yes
031	Griffiths T	PC129-X088	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Highlights conflict of large trees and residential use; costs associated with resource consent which we agree is onerous and should be a Council cost given assumed public benefit.		Yes	Yes
032	GEK Property Nominess (Northland Hospitals Limited)	PC129-X089	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	As stated in para 5 of the submitters submission.		Yes	Yes
033	Wolland D	PC129-X090	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Limited rights of a property owner to manage the negative effects of a large tree; recognition of the public value of a heritage tree and public contribution towards costs.		Yes	Yes
034	Department of Conservation	PC129-X091	landowners Coalition Inc	Oppose	All	This plan change is not the appropriate mechanism to control Kauri dieback, except in so far that it is a cause for removal of a tree.		Yes	Yes
035	Davies-Lawson N	PC129-X092	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	The benefit of the tree should be reassessed given the adverse effects as the tree does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X093	landowners Coalition Inc	Support with qualification	All	Agree with including negative effects noted in NPT1.1	but extend for private property owners as well as roading infrastructure, on all changes requested. Generally this could be achieved by adding "and private property owners" after references to road network and road users.	Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X094	landowners Coalition Inc	Support in part	All	Support inclusion of definitions of 'Dripline', 'Trimming' and 'Alteration', but with an amendment to the dripline definition from "whichever is the greater" to "whichever is the lesser", and amendment to Trimming definition adding, after structures, "...public safety, residential amenity,".		Yes	Yes
038	Story S	PC129-X095	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	The heritage value of the tree should be reassessed given the adverse effects. Remove from register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
047	Northland Masonic Trust	PC129-X096	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	Plan change does not take into account the social, economic and cultural well-being of local people and communities who are adversely affected by trees of inappropriate size in an urban environment. Plan change does not give effect to Section 5 of the RMA which gives priority to people's and communities' social (etc.) wellbeing. That the Council has taken too narrow a definition of trees worthy of protection. That various councils have a STEM threshold much greater than the WDC, with the effect that the WDC is protecting trees that are not heritage trees and not worthy of protection, and therefore in breach of its RMA requirements. That the STEM assessments are arbitrary and inaccurate. The S32 Analysis: - fails to note in comparison with other local authorities that WDC has opted to adopt a much lower STEM score rating for total protection. - fails to note that trees inevitably age and die, sometimes causing injury or death. Remove 508 from register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
049	Macgregor V and B	PC129-X097	landowners Coalition Inc	Support	All	The heritage value of the tree should be reassessed given the adverse effects. Remove from register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
001	McNab M	PC129-X098	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Negative effects and risks of the trees should be factored into the assessment.		Yes	Yes
009	Morgan and Ward	PC129-X099	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Danger and risks should be recognised by Council. Council provide assistance if protected status is retained.		Yes	Yes
010	O'Hara L	PC129-X100	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Address issues regarding risks and nuisance.		Yes	Yes
011	Wheeler L	PC129-X101	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Address issues regarding risks and nuisance.		Yes	Yes
012	Te Wata R	PC129-X102	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Raises negative effects of trees that are not recognised by Council. Address negative effects through tree removal or council mitigation.		Yes	Yes
013	Whangarei Intermediate School	PC129-X103	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	The Health and Safety aspects identified should be factored into the assessment of the trees merit. Clearly the Council has not given sufficient regard to children's health and safety.		Yes	Yes
018	Cox P	PC129-X104	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Suitability of location for big trees in residential areas. Tree assessments should be under the Health and Safety Act, and Council has a responsibility to meet that Act.		Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
019	Yanko M	PC129-X105	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Costs that fall upon effects property owners. Negative effects, including leaf fall and dangers.		Yes	Yes
022	Rye H	PC129-X106	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	That assessment should include appropriateness of the location Tree should not impose costs, risks or liability upon a landowner. Remove the tree from the register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
023	Northland Regional Council	PC129-X107	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Recognise flooding risks in the plan and right of a council to undertake emergency work.		Yes	Yes
025	Tomason H	PC129-X108	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Given the adverse effects, removal of the tree from the Register. In addition, the tree is a fire risk due to the power lines.		Yes	Yes
027	landowners Coalition Inc	PC129-X109	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Demonstrates fundamental flaws in Council's management of heritage trees. STEM system is subjective and flawed; should take negative effects into account, or the threshold level of 100 should be increased. Highlights health and safety issues. Council staff should be accountable (criminally liable) for the safety of public and residents. Where the public have an interest in a tree, the public should contribute to the costs of management and adverse effect mitigation in proportion to the public/private benefit.		Yes	Yes
028	Percy E	PC129-X110	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Demonstrates conflicts of large trees and residential activities; Council need to address negative effects, and do so as a matter of policy. Landowner often not in a position to adequately maintain large trees.		Yes	Yes
029	Jones B	PC129-X111	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Demonstrates negative effects; arbitrary nature of the STEM assessments.		Yes	Yes
030	DC Empires Ltd	PC129-X112	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	That the STEM assessments be required.		Yes	Yes
031	Griffiths T	PC129-X113	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Highlights conflict of large trees and residential use; costs associated with resource consent which we agree is onerous and should be a Council cost given assumed public benefit.		Yes	Yes
032	GEK Property Nominess (Northland Hospitals Limited)	PC129-X114	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	As stated in para 5 of the submitters submission.		Yes	Yes
033	Wolland D	PC129-X115	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	Limited rights of a property owner to manage the negative effects of a large tree; recognition of the public value of a heritage tree and public contribution towards costs.		Yes	Yes
034	Department of Conservation	PC129-X116	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Oppose	All	This plan change is not the appropriate mechanism to control Kauri dieback, except in so far that it is a cause for removal of a tree.		Yes	Yes
035	Davies-Lawson N	PC129-X117	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	The benefit of the tree should be reassessed given the adverse effects as the tree does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
036	WDC Infrastructure	PC129-X118	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support with qualification	All	Agree with including negative effects noted in NPT1.1		Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X119	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support in part	All	Support inclusion of definitions of 'Dripline', 'Trimming' and 'Alteration', but with an amendment to the dripline definition from "whichever is the greater" to "whichever is		Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
						the lesser", and amendment to Trimming definition adding, after structures, "...public safety, residential amenity,..".			
038	Story S	PC129-X120	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	The heritage value of the tree should be reassessed given the adverse effects. Remove from register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
047	Northland Masonic Trust	PC129-X121	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	<p>Plan change does not take into account the social, economic and cultural well-being of local people and communities who are adversely affected by trees of inappropriate size in an urban environment.</p> <p>Plan change does not give effect to Section 5 of the RMA which gives priority to people's and communities' social (etc.) well being.</p> <p>That the Council has taken too narrow a definition of trees worthy of protection.</p> <p>That various councils have a STEM threshold much greater than the WDC, with the effect that the WDC is protecting trees that are not heritage trees and not worthy of protection, and therefore in breach of its RMA requirements.</p> <p>That the STEM assessments are arbitrary and inaccurate.</p> <p>The S32 Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fails to note in comparison with other local authorities that WDC has opted to adopt a much lower STEM score rating for total protection. - fails to note that trees inevitably age and die, sometimes causing injury or death. <p>Remove 508 from register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.</p>		Yes	Yes
049	Macgregor V and B	PC129-X122	Kelbrook Holdings Ltd	Support	All	The heritage value of the tree should be reassessed given the adverse effects. Remove from register as it does not achieve the objectives of the RMA.		Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X123	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	e		Allowed within the amendment to recognise the activity wording amendments sought in WDC infrastructure submission	Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X123	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	f		Allowed within the amendment to recognise the activity wording amendments sought in WDC infrastructure submission	Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X123	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	g	Supported except for the addition of "or" in each sentence	Allowed with amendment to recognise the activity wording amendments sought in WDC infrastructure submission	Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X123	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	i	Support the intent of this amendment and that works should be able to be undertaken to remove trees where they are emergency works. Do not Generally support that the emergency works should be confirmed by an arborist or that the rule be included as a discretionary activity.	Allow the inclusion of emergency removal work in the permitted activity format recommended in the WDC submission	Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X123	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	a	Supported in that bamboo is a pest plant. However this is not seen as an issue for the NPT in that bamboo is a grass species and not classified as a tree.		Yes	Yes
037	Northpower	PC129-X123	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	n	Definitions of dripline and trimming would be useful for interpretation of the rules depending on how the definition is worded and what it includes		Yes	Yes

Original Submission No.	Original Submitter	No.	Further Submitter	Support/Oppose	Section(s)	Reasons	Relief	Wish to be heard?	Joint hearing?
034	Department of Conservation	PC129-X124	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	b	Kauri disback is a significant risk to the biodiversity of Northland and New Zealand as a whole. Protection Mechanism are supported in general.	The policy would need recognise the practical needs where kauri specimen trees are located within packs	Yes	Yes
034	Department of Conservation	PC129-X124	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Oppose	c	The intent of these additional rules can be covered through an additional clause in the permitted activity for both Public and Notable Trees. The permitted activity would need to allow for certain works to take place within the "kauri hygiene zone". For public trees in the road reserve or maintained parks will not be achievable. A radius of three times the drip line impact on general park work and maintenance.	Opposed as a discretionary activity but intent is supported. Include an additional clause in the permitted activities.	Yes	Yes
034	Department of Conservation	PC129-X124	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Oppose	d	Supported as it will reduce issues over works being carried out on properties next to notable trees where the tree is not		Yes	Yes
027	landowners Coalition Inc	PC129-X125	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Oppose	g	The STEM method is well established and supported by WDC infrastructure as the preferred method of tree assessment.		Yes	Yes
039	NZTA	PC129-X126	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support in part	b		Allowed within the amendment to recognise the activity wording amendments sought in WDC infrastructure submission	Yes	Yes
039	NZTA	PC129-X126	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Oppose	c	The intent of the submission point is supported, however believe this is too permissive to have no control at all over road reserve trees. As road reserve trees within the state highway network are excluded this policy only affects trees within road reserve administered by WDC and therefore the WDC roading department and other network utilities.		Yes	Yes
015	Transpower	PC129-X127	Whangarei District Council Infrastructure	Support	e	WDC Support the submission point to better clarify the works to be undertaken on public trees. It is agreed that the inclusion of "Damage to" is difficult to interpret.	Allowed, with the amendment to wording within the permitted activity wording amendments sought in WDC infrastructure submission.	Yes	Yes
N/A	N/A	N/A	Nash A	N/A	N/A	Concerned about tree 294, potential for liability for her mother if branches fall onto cars especially given that the main trunk appears rather rotten. Brothers would be happy to trim it or the family would pay for an arborist to trim it.		N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	MacDonald R and C	N/A	N/A	Would like to see tree 212 maintained regularly. The Branches overhanging the roof cause blockage to spouting and a black fungi on the roof. The Branches overhanging the drive have hit caravan and truck when driving in and out. The company who mow the lawn surrounding the tree need to clear weeds that are growing around of the base of the tree.		N/A	N/A