



**I give notice that
a Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee Meeting will be held
on:**

Date:	Tuesday, 4 September 2018
Time:	10.00am
Location:	Council Chamber 107 Heuheu Street Taupō

AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson Cr Barry Hickling
Deputy Chairperson Cr John Williamson

Members Cr John Boddy
Cr Anna Park
Mayor David Trewavas
Cr Maggie Stewart

Quorum 3

Gareth Green
Chief Executive Officer

Order Of Business

1	Apologies	
2	Conflicts of Interest	
3	Confirmation of Minutes	
3.1	Fences, Roading, Reserves & Dogs Committee Meeting - 3 July 2018.....	3
4	Reports	
4.1	Taupō District Council Traffic Control Device Updates.....	4
4.2	Bollards Outside Number 33 Norman Smith Street	8
4.3	Lake Terrace Parking Restriction	11
4.4	Tree Removal Request - Kinloch Golf Course.....	14
4.5	Tree removal at Kinloch refuse transfer station	17
4.6	Annual Dog Control Report for 2017/18	20
5	Confidential Business	
	Nil	

3.1 FENCES, ROADING, RESERVES & DOGS COMMITTEE MEETING - 3 JULY 2018

Author: Shainey James, Democratic Services Officer

Authorised by: Tina Jakes, Head of Democracy, Governance and Venues

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the minutes of the Fences, Roding, Reserves & Dogs Committee meeting held on Tuesday 3 July 2018 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Fences, Roding, Reserves & Dogs Committee Meeting Minutes - 3 July 2018 [⇒](#)

4.1 TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE UPDATES**Author:** Vincent Wang, Engineering Officer**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations**PURPOSE**

To update the Taupō District Council traffic controls or prohibitions on roads or public spaces, in accordance with the Taupō District Council Traffic Bylaw 2014.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Taupō District Council traffic controls may be updated from time to time with new controls or prohibitions.

RECOMMENDATION(S) PART 1

That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves and Dogs Committee revokes part 1, 1.1 and 1.2 of resolution FRD201805/05 made by Fences, Roothing, Reserves and Dogs Committee on 22 May 2018 in relation to the following traffic controls and/or prohibitions on roads and/or public spaces in the Taupō district:

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1.	1.	1.
1.1 One (1) 12m long loading zone marking and sign.	1.1 The parking space outside the public toilet will be utilised efficiently.	1.1 Turangi town centre parking, outside the public toilet.
1.2 One (1) mobility parking space marking and sign.	1.2 To provide access for mobility users when using public toilet.	1.2 Along Te Rangitautahanga Road, outside Mustard Seed Café.

RECOMMENDATION(S) PART 2

That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee approves that, pursuant to the Taupō District Council Traffic Bylaw 2014, Council imposes the following traffic controls and/or prohibitions on roads and/or public spaces in the Taupō district:

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
2.	2.	2.
2.1 One (1) mobility parking space markings and sign.	2.1 To provide convenient parking space for mobility users when using public toilet.	2.1 Turangi town centre parking, next to the public toilet entrance.
2.2 One (1) remove existing angle parking and mark with yellow no parking marking..	2.2 To provide access for mobility users.	2.2 Turangi town centre public parking.
3. One (1) Mobility parking sign and marking	To provide additional mobility user facilities	Roberts Street outside number 32
4. One (1) GIVEWAY sign and marking	To improve road safety at intersection	Intersection of Victoria Street and Hyde Avenue

BACKGROUND

Council must make a resolution whenever a sign or marking on the road is recommended or recommended to be changed, and as a consequence controls or prohibits the use of a road or public space.

The Taupō District Council Traffic Control Device Register (the Register) sets out all the signs and markings which control and prohibit the use of a road or public space in the Taupō district.

OPTIONS

The two options before the Committee are:

- 1) Accept the recommendation to amend and update the controls or;
- 2) Not accept the recommendation to amend and update the controls.

It is recommended that Council accepts the recommendation to update and amend the controls.

CONSIDERATIONS

Revoke the following signs and markings;

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1.	1.	1.
1.1 One (1) 12m long loading zone marking and sign.	1.1 The parking space outside the public toilet will be utilised efficiently.	1.1 Turangi town centre parking, outside the public toilet.
1.2 One (1) mobility parking space marking and sign.	1.2 To provide access for mobility users when using public toilet.	1.2 Along Te Rangitautahanga Road, outside Mustard Seed Café.

The controls require updating to incorporate the following new signs and markings

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
2.	2.	2.
2.1 One (1) mobility parking space markings and sign.	2.1 To provide convenient parking space for mobility users when using public toilet.	2.1 Turangi town centre parking, next to the public toilet entrance.
2.2 One (1) remove existing angle parking and mark with yellow no parking marking.	2.2 To provide access for mobility users.	2.2 Turangi town centre public parking.
3. One (1) Mobility parking sign and marking	To provide additional mobility user facilities	Roberts Street outside number 32
4. One (1) GIVEWAY sign and marking	To improve road safety at intersection	Intersection of Victoria Street and Hyde Avenue

1. The Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee approved under resolution FRD201805/05 the removal of the bus stop on Te Rangitautahanga Road outside the Turangi public toilets at which time it was proposed that the bus stop be replaced with a loading zone. It is proposed to revoke resolution FRD201805/05.

2.

- 1) The owner of Mustard Seed café suggested that the mobility parking space will be more convenient at the back of the toilet block (i.e. on the town centre carpark side and not the Te Rangitautahanga Rd side) to allow for easier access to the toilet entrance. It is considered that this suggestion is most appropriate therefore we are proposing that the mobility parking space be placed at the back next to the toilet entrance.

- 2) One angle parking space is to be removed and marked with no parking yellow marking, so mobility users can use the formed let-down to access the toilet and the carparks.
3. Council has received a request to consider an additional mobility space on Roberts Street between Ruapehu Street and Lake Terrace. Two options were developed and taken to the Access Taupō group for comment. A new mobility parking space has been proposed after investigation.
4. A resident living at Windsor Street has enquired that a GIVE WAY control device should be installed at Victoria Street due to more sections of land have been developed in the subdivision between Windsor Street and Tauhara Ridge Drive.

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of maintenance to the Register does not change and is met within current budgets.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The proposal has been evaluated with regard to the Traffic Bylaw 2014, the Land Transport Act 1998 and the associated Rules. Prescribed signs need to be installed in order to be enforceable by our compliance officers.

Policy Implications

There are no policy implications associated with this report.

Risks

There are no risks associated with this report except not having prescribed signs installed.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision. The transportation team have consulted with key stakeholders including compliance team and received feedback as follows:

1. Prior to 22 May 2018 meeting staff sent proposed plans to the Mustard Seed café owner and having received no response before that meeting, staff assumed the proposal was accepted. The owner subsequently advised that he had intended to attend the May meeting but did not know the meeting date although staff had advised this in previous correspondence.
2. The revised proposed plan has been sent to Mustard Seed café owner and he advised on 17 August 2018 that he is happy with the new proposal.
3. Both Taupō Access Group and the Coffee Club are in support of this proposal.
4. The standard of Manual of Traffic Signs and Markings (MOTSAM) show that a GIVEWAY control is warranted to be installed at the Victoria Street and Hyde Avenue intersection based on the traffic control results.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media is required.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that Council imposes the traffic controls and prohibitions detailed in the report. Staff will then update the Traffic Control Device Register in accordance with the resolution.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Turangi Mobility Parking Space Signs and Markings Plan v2 [⇒](#)
2. Proposed Disabled Parking at Roberts Street [⇒](#)
3. Proposed GIVEWAY Control at Victoria Street and Hyde Avenue Intersection [⇒](#)

4.2 BOLLARDS OUTSIDE NUMBER 33 NORMAN SMITH STREET

Author: Vincent Wang, Engineering Officer
Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to enable discussion and make a decision on the application for installation of bollards at berm outside number 33 Norman Smith Street, Taupō, for the purpose of preventing vehicles from using and parking on the berm.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The resident at number 33 Norman Smith Street, Taupō, has complained about visitors from their neighbourhood using and parking on the berm, due to insufficient parking area outside their property (refer Attachment 1). This is restricting access to the property and obscuring visibility for the residents of 33 Norman Smith Street when exiting their driveway. Therefore, bollards have been requested to be installed in order to prevent vehicles from parking on the berm.

The neighbour at number 41 Norman Smith Street, Taupō has asked for continued access to the berm, as he requires access to reverse vehicle onto the road due to there being insufficient manoeuvring area inside his property, unless the garage is available and then reversing can be done onto the driveway and prior accessing the road (refer Attachment 2).

This report has also discussed Council's current tool to undertake enforcement of berm encroachment and the existing status of the Road Encroachment Policy development to support the recommended option.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the Fences, Roading, Reserves & Dogs Committee declines the request for bollards to be installed on the berm outside number 33 Norman Smith Street, Taupō, and re-evaluates the situation after the proposed Road Encroachment Policy has been adopted.

BACKGROUND

There have been a wide range of requests from residents throughout the Taupō district to prevent parking on the berm outside their properties. In some of these instances, approval from the Council has been sought; in other instances it has not. To date, the Council officers have responded to these requests by assessing the individual situation and offering written confirmation, providing that the relevant criteria has been met. This criteria includes specification on the construction materials to be frangible, height allowances, and the location of the bollards.

Council officers receive approximately three requests per month from residents enquiring if they can place rocks, bollards or plant trees on their urban berms to prevent vehicles from parking on the berm that they maintain.

DISCUSSION

Residents from number 33 Norman Smith Street have complained about neighbours and their visitors driving and parking along the berm outside their property. However, the resident from number 41 Norman Smith Street said there was insufficient manoeuvring area inside his property so he has to reverse his vehicle out onto Norman Smith Street as a safety approach and uses this berm to do this safely.

The transportation team has been on site at number 41 Norman Smith Street, and found that there was a garage that could be utilised as turning space for this property. The width of this shared driveway between properties boundary is 6 metres and its formed carriageway is 4 metres, which complies with Council's district plan. This has been indicated on the plan as per attachment 2 of this report.

There is currently no clear direction on what the Council considers appropriate. Council has started developing a Road Encroachment Policy in order to describe the provisions for dealing with encroachments on the berm. A draft Road Encroachment Policy has been developed and discussed in a council workshop recently. This draft policy is proposed to be taken to Mangakino-Pouakani Representative Group, Kinloch

Representative Group and Turangi-Tongariro Community Board for review in the next stage, followed by public consultation in October 2018, and hearings and formal adoption in early 2019.

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Approve customer's request for installation of bollards outside number 33 Norman Smith Street

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop people parking on the berm in this area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual amenity of the street will be affected

Option 2 – Decline the customer's request for installation of bollards outside number 33 Norman Smith Street

Advantages	Disadvantages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No means to stop people parking on the berm that affects road safety in this area • Berm will be continuously damaged

Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is Option 2 since the proposed Road Encroachment Policy would provide council officers a consistent guideline to follow and make decisions.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The proposal for installation of bollards is estimated to be \$300 depending on the size of the berm. It would be funded and maintained by the applicant.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. The matter will enable the Council to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality performance of Council's regulatory functions. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

Policy Implications

In accordance with Council's current tools under which enforcement may be undertaken, installation of bollards and dealing with the issue of parking on berms are not covered by the *Traffic Bylaw 2014*.

Under the bylaw, enforcement can be undertaken under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) or the Land Transport Act 1998 (LTA). The downside for this is that enforcement is undertaken as prosecution through the District Court which is a drawn-out process for an offence such as parking in an inappropriate place. There are costs involved with filing an offence with the District Court plus administration time of council officers.

Prosecution under the LTA does provide the Council with the ability to issue infringements for parking offences. However, the LTA requires the Council to install signage prohibiting parking on berms. There are requirements on where the signage must be located, the minimum size of signs and the distance between two signs must occur (every 100m) which is not ideal as it could lead to sign pollution. Thus, enforcement under the LTA is not a feasible option.

The proposed Road Encroachment Policy would fill the gap among the Traffic Bylaw 2014, LGA and LTA in order to provide council officers a good practice to deal with such instances in the future.

Risks

There are no known risks although parking on berms will continue to damage berms.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

Compliance team has been advised of this request. They were not in favour of bollards being put on the berm outside this address.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media is required.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended to decline applicant's request since Council is currently developing the Road Encroachment Policy, which is expected to be adopted in early 2019. It is also suggested to defer any similar types of road encroachment requests during this period.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Service Request from number 33 Norman Smith Street [⇒](#)
2. Letter and photo from number 41 Norman Smith Street [⇒](#)
3. Proposed Bollards Location and Road Environment outside Number 33 Norman Smith Street [⇒](#)

4.3 LAKE TERRACE PARKING RESTRICTION

Author: Woinshet Hailesilassie, Engineering Officer - Transportation Strategy

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to get approval from the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee for a proposed parking restriction on Lake Terrace between Tui Street and Pataka Road, and opposite to Titiraupenga Street intersection.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee made a resolution on 5 December 2017 to trial parking restriction signs for three months along Lake Terrace, then to consult the affected residents and motel owners.

The feedback on this consultation was given to the Committee at the 3 July 2018 meeting including the proposal to extend the parking restriction further to Pataka Road, and to restrict the parking spaces opposite to the Titiraupenga Street intersection (the summary of feedback is attached to this report). The feedback indicated that the majority of residents support the parking restriction and requested this restriction to be permanent and extended further. With the ongoing issues with heavy trucks parking along the lake, the transportation team is proposing to impose full parking restriction between Tui Street and Pataka Road and opposite to the Titiraupenga Street intersection. The proposed parking restriction time will be similar to that already trialled, i.e. 180 minutes from 6pm to 8am Monday to Sunday.

The residents who objected the restriction are mainly owners from the Twin Peaks area. Considering the economic impact to their business due to the restriction, it is proposed to remove the parking restriction of 4 parking spaces outside the Twin Peaks motel.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee directs officers to implement the proposed parking restriction along Lake Terrace between Tui Street and Pataka Road and opposite to Titiraupenga Street intersection, for 180 minutes from 6pm to 8am Monday to Sunday, and remove 4 parking spaces from the initial trial restriction signs outside Twin Peaks motel.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has been before Council at a prior meeting 03 July 2018, refer item number FRD201807/08 and the following resolutions were made: That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee receives the update in relation to Lake Terrace Parking.

As a result of this meeting further investigation has been undertaken, the transportation team has engaged with affected residents and motel owners of the proposed parking restriction plan. Based on this engagement outcome a permanent parking restriction plan proposed.

DISCUSSION

The residents who support the restriction requested an extension to the parking restriction further along Lake Terrace. The residents who opposed the proposal are advised their concern by restricting the parking spaces the truck drivers will tend to park somewhere more convenient which ultimately affects their business.

By restricting the proposed parking spaces the issues may be transferred into another streets, i.e trucks may start using Northcroft Street or other nearby streets. Staff attempted to contact the owners of Suncourt motel but no response was received thus we have allowed parking spaces opposite to the golf course and the fire station.

Complaints are being received from residents that some truck drivers are parking longer hours at the restricted parking spaces. Due to the time of the restriction the compliance team has difficulties with enforcing the parking spaces. They advised that they will be considering some other options of enforcing these restrictions.

Residents who support the parking restriction advised that if the restriction can be for trucks only as there is no issues with the smaller vehicles.

Based on this information it is considered that there are two options.

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1. that the committee approves the proposed parking restriction

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lake view will not be obscured by parked heavy vehicles. No heavy vehicles engine noise in the early hours. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heavy vehicles will tend to use other nearby residential streets. Motels income will be affected if the truck drivers choosing convenient locations to park. May incur cost to council for enforcing the parking restriction

Option 2. that the committee decline the proposed parking restriction

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motel owners business will not be affected. Nearby residential streets will not be affected from heavy vehicles parking. No extra cost for enforcing the parking restriction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lake view will be obscured from heavy vehicles parking. The residents will be disturbed from heavy vehicles engine starting noise in the early hours.

Analysis Conclusion:

The majority of residents in the vicinity mentioned that the obstruction of the lake view due to the heavy vehicles parking along the lake front and the noise from the heavy vehicles in the early hours are major and ongoing issues. Based on these issues it is recommended that the committee to approve the proposed parking restriction.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be minimal and be done within existing budgets.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. The matter will enable the Council to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality local infrastructure. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

The proposal has been evaluated with regards to a range of legislation. The key legislation applicable to the proposal has been reviewed and the relevant matters for consideration are as follows:

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications

Risks

There are no known risks.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Further consultation carried out with the new proposed plan with the affected residents and motel owners. We received two feedbacks of those who supports the proposed plan. No objection of proposed plan received.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

There will be media release once the restriction adopted.

CONCLUSION

Based on the feedback received from the residents of the trial parking restriction, the majority of residents are in support of the parking restriction and considering the ongoing issues due to the heavy vehicles parking along the lake front. It is recommended that the committee approve the proposed parking restriction.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Lake Tce Parking restriction - Drawing 001v2 [⇒](#)
2. Proposed Lake Tce Parking restriction - Drawing 002v2 [⇒](#)
3. Lake Terrace Parking restriction consultation Responses Summary [⇒](#)

4.4 TREE REMOVAL REQUEST - KINLOCH GOLF COURSE

Author: Nathan Mourie, Senior Reserves Planner

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

To consider the request to remove trees from Kinloch Golf Course, Kinloch.

DISCUSSION

Council received a written request from Mr Richard Laming from 26 Lakemere Way, Kinloch asking that three trees on the golf course (Council land) be removed (attachment 1).

Mr Morrison's North-Eastern property boundary adjoins the Kinloch golf course. He is concerned that following the previous topping and then removal of a gum tree in the same location, the remaining trees have been exposed and have become unstable. Other exotic trees have also subsequently needed removal due to failing health with few of the original stand of trees left.

The canopy of one of the remaining macrocarpas encroaches quite a way over the boundary of Mr Laming's property and he considers it has the potential to cause damage to his property if it fails.



The remaining exotics in this location include macrocarpas, larch and other smaller self-set weed species. As other vegetation has been removed around these three remaining trees, it has been replaced with more suitable, lower growing native vegetation.

Given the previous disturbances to the existing trees and modifications to the area, it appears that it is only a matter of time before the remaining trees are in need of removal due to damage or poor health. The most straightforward and efficient solution is to remove the remaining exotic specimens with very limited future lifespans, and replant the area as one work project. This would preclude the need to keep revisiting the site in the future to mitigate the effects of other vegetation as it deteriorates.

The golf club have been approached for their opinion. They are saddened to potentially lose the macrocarpa, as they saw it being a nice feature of the course; but are not too worried about other vegetation which might be removed. They are keen to see a grove of trees planted to replace the macrocarpa and any other removed vegetation. The operations team have agreed to have a look on-site with the club and agree on replacement vegetation. In the long run this is likely to result in a better and more manageable situation.

Council's arborist has inspected the site and trees on numerous occasions over the preceding years and supports removal of the exotic vegetation and replanting with suitable native species. Mr Laming also supports the continued re-establishment of the area.

Council's Tree & Vegetation Policy 2014 allows for the removal of healthy trees in the following circumstances:

Policy 3.2 – Removal of Healthy Trees

Healthy trees on council land will be retained, and their removal will be the exception. Instances where council may consider removal of a healthy tree include:

- street redevelopment is to be implemented and options to retain the tree have been investigated and discounted,
- severe hardship is being experienced (trees which inhibit views or drop debris are not considered to be causing severe hardship),
- other community assets are impacted by trees or vegetation,
- the trees or vegetation are grown weeds and not intentionally planted, or
- the removal is part of a planned replacement programme.

Council may remove unhealthy trees under the following circumstances:

Policy 3.1 – Removal of Unhealthy Trees

A tree on council land may be removed by council staff where in the opinion of a qualified arborist the tree is:

- dead,
- dangerous,
- severely diseased, or
- particularly poor form and provides limited amenity value.

CONCLUSION

The trees in question do not appear to be causing any immediate danger to the adjacent property. However, one of the trees has the potential to cause moderate damage to the complainant's property and all of the trees are likely to continue deteriorating relatively quickly so that they may in the near future become unstable and dangerous. They are not high-quality specimen trees and their amenity and biodiversity contribution is relatively minor in this location; particularly compared to the potential replacement vegetation which would be planted if the trees were removed. Removing the identified trees and weed vegetation and replacing them with suitable native species is the preferred option of Council officers in this circumstance.

The approximate cost of removal is \$3,500 and suitable replacement trees, planting and ongoing maintenance would cost approximately \$500. This is likely to be able to be covered with operational budgets.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the Fences, Roading, Reserves & Dogs Committee approves the removal of the identified trees at Kinloch golf Course and their replacement with suitable native species in the same general location.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Tree Removal Request [↗](#)

4.5 TREE REMOVAL AT KINLOCH REFUSE TRANSFER STATION**Author:** Ken Buckley, Contracts Engineer**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations**PURPOSE**

The proposal is to remove an existing treeline at the Kinloch Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) to allow for site expansion and improved operations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Consideration for the removal of 6 eucalyptus trees and approximately 8-10 small mixed Pittosporum, Totara and Grisilinia trees/shrubs.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee approves removal of the treeline that runs parallel with the road boundary inside the Kinloch Refuse Transfer Station (RTS).
2. That the tree removal be off-set through replanting within the RTS boundary, noting that an extension of the boundary will allow for a substantial planting area which will provide a buffer zone between the RTS and private property. This is allowing for future development of the adjacent property as it is currently TDC owned. There is currently 360 metres between the RTS boundary and nearest residential property. There will be no requirement to discuss with private property owners.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

DISCUSSION

Expansions to the Kinloch RTS are being planned to support the future growth of the area. These expansions include the moving of recycling locations and an increased number of car parks. This will allow for the site to accommodate a larger number of vehicles, a faster turnaround time for people sorting their recycling and the capacity to hold a larger volume of recycled materials on site. With the success of the glass recycling arrangement at the Broadlands Road recycling centre the aim is to replicate this at Kinloch RTS. The glass and plastic recycling bins will be increased in size and removed from the public area into the operations area. This project will also minimise the possibility of interactions between the contractors vehicles and members of public as it will provide separation.

Based on this information it is considered that there are 2 options.

OPTIONSAnalysis of Options

Option 1. Allow for the removal of the treeline for this planned expansion works

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for the expansion works to be completed within the current operational area of the RTS • The most logical location for works to be completed • The most cost effective option give the existing platform can be utilised • Removed trees can be replaced in other areas of the RTS site with no impact on the operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Option 2. Do nothing

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extended delays in service delivery with the increase of population within the Kinloch district

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 is preferred. Remove the treeline to allow planned works to be completed. Plant new trees in new locations with the RTS to offset the removal

CONSIDERATIONSLong-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for under \$45,000.00.

Legal ConsiderationsLocal Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. The matter will enable the Council to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality local infrastructure. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications.

Risks

There are no known risks.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media is required.

CONCLUSION

The removal of the treeline will allow for the future proofing of the Kinloch RTS. The increased capacity the project will provide will allow the site to remain suitable for purpose for the foreseeable long term future. Planting new trees within the RTS site to offset the removal will allow an opportunity to replace exotics with appropriate native trees and shrubs.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Overview of Kinloch transfer station [⇒](#)
2. Kinloch RTS Trees for removal [⇒](#)

4.6 ANNUAL DOG CONTROL REPORT FOR 2017/18

Author: Ross McDonald, Compliance Team Supervisor

Authorised by: Brian Fox, Head of Regulatory and Risk

PURPOSE

To update the Committee on the publication of the Annual Dog Control Report 2017/18.

DISCUSSION

The Dog Control Act 1996 requires the Council, in respect of each financial year, to report on the administration of:

1. its dog control policy; and
2. its dog control practices.

The Report must include information relating to:

- the number of registered dogs in the district;
- the number of probationary owners and disqualified owners in the district;
- the number of dogs in the district classified as dangerous;
- the number of dogs in the district classified as menacing (whether by action or breed);
- the number of infringements issued;
- the number of dog related complaints received in the previous year and the nature of those complaints; and
- the number of prosecutions taken.

A copy of the Report has been published on the Council's website and a copy will be sent to the Department of Internal Affairs following its adoption as required by the Act.

The Report highlights a number of proactive actions and positive initiatives implemented by the Compliance Team over the previous financial year, including:

- Improving compliance rates by providing assistance and education to dog owners, as opposed to infringements alone;
- Regularly monitoring procedures around the care of dogs in custody, particularly around cleaning and maintaining the facility to minimise the introduction of illness and disease e.g. Parvovirus;
- Improving investigation practices to ensure a fair and measured enforcement approach which best serves the interests of the community;
- Proactive patrols of the District's reserves and open spaces;
- Promoting (in association with the DIA) a free neutering (de-sexing) campaign for menacing dogs, along with offering a discount for microchipping and registering menacing dogs not previously registered; and
- Providing presentations to community groups on safe dog handling procedures, along with traditional and social media campaigns to inform dog owners of their responsibilities.

CONCLUSION

The Compliance Team continue to work proactively to achieve the objectives of the Dog Control Act and ensure better provision for the care and control of dogs in order to minimise the risk of dogs causing a nuisance or injuring, endangering or causing stress to any person or animal.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the Fences, Roading, Reserves & Dogs Committee adopts the Annual Dog Control Report for

2017/2018.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Annual Dog Control Report 2017/18 [⇒](#)