



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

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Tuesday, 2 July 2019</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>10.00am</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Council Chamber 107 Heuheu Street Taupō</b>

# **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

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Conflicts of Interest</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes</b>	
3.1	Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee Meeting - 16 April 2019.....	3
<b>4</b>	<b>Reports</b>	
4.1	Request to Remove Trees on Scott Drive, Taupo .....	4
4.2	Request to Remove Trees at Besley Park, Taupo .....	8
4.3	Request for Removal of Tree at 1/36 Lakewood Drive, Taupo .....	12
4.4	Request for Removal of Trees at 93 Hinemoa Avenue, Taupo .....	15
4.5	Request for removal of trees on Kenrigg Reserve, Kinloch.....	18
4.6	Taupo District Council Traffic Control Device Updates.....	22
4.7	Taupo District Council Traffic Control Device Updates .....	27
<b>5</b>	<b>Confidential Business</b>	
	Nil	

**3.1 FENCES, ROADING, RESERVES & DOGS COMMITTEE MEETING - 16 APRIL 2019**

**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 16 April 2019 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Fences, Roding, Reserves & Dogs Committee Meeting Minutes - 16 April 2019

**4.1 REQUEST TO REMOVE TREES ON SCOTT DRIVE, TAUPŌ**

**Author:** Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation

**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

**PURPOSE**

To consider a request to remove trees on Scott Drive, Taupō.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The first request to this committee in April 2019 was declined, however the customer was able to re-request the tree removal on Scott Drive if they undertook some consultation with the property owners in Scott Drive due to the loss of amenity. The customer has done this and attached is the list of residents in support of the tree removal.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee directs officers to remove the trees outside 1 and 3 Scott Drive, Taupō.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposal has been before the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee at a prior meeting 16 April 2019, refer item number 4.5 and the following resolutions were made: That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee declines the removal of the two trees outside 3 Scott Drive, Taupō, resolution number FRD201904/08.

As a result of the above decision, the owner of 3 Scott Drive has canvassed the neighbours in Scott Drive to seek their support for the removal of the Claret Ash trees outside numbers 1 and 3 Scott Drive and also consider the removal of similar trees on the lower half of Scott Drive.

**DISCUSSION**

The committee decided to decline the request for removal of the two trees outside 3 Scott Drive, Taupō but agreed that it was open to the owner of the property to re-submit their request, however there needed to be consultation with others in the street due to the loss of amenity value. An email was received by the property owner on 28 May 2019 seeking the committee to re-consider the tree removal along with an attached list of property owners in support, see attachment 1.



Trees on Scott Drive between 1 and 3 Scott Drive

The email content includes the following;

“The Claret Ash trees that are the subject of this request, whilst being beautiful trees, are not the type of trees that should have been planted on a roadside berm adjacent to and close by houses. These are invasive trees in their quest to search for water. The root system is very large and due to the hard pan of pumice on which they sit have encouraged the trees to spread their shallow roots far and wide. Already they have caused extreme damage to the sewer system resulting in this being replaced during mid-2018. Additionally, their roots are invading the stormwater system causing severe damage to the roadside gutters, lifting the pavements to a dangerous trip level. The roots are travelling towards the houses causing damage to the drive ways, gardens and the fear is that they will eventually cause damage to the foundations of the houses.

By removing these trees now will solve a lot of angst against the further damage they undoubtedly will cause. The damage being caused now will no doubt affect the saleability and value of these properties.

None of the committee members that sit on the FRRoD committee have spent any time acquainting themselves with this issue by visiting the area and seeing for themselves the damage being caused. Simply saying that these trees are healthy and safe does not “cut the mustard” since the health of the trees is not in question, it is the safety of the street that we are endeavouring to secure for future years. Being proactive with street maintenance must surely rate high on the Councils health and safety requirements. Simply grinding the footpath is only putting a band aid on the problem and will not overcome the issues.”

**OPTIONS**

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Remove the trees outside 1 and 3 Scott Drive.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulfilling customer request</li> <li>• Potentially futureproofing stormwater and other infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not complying with council policy</li> <li>• Loss of amenity value</li> </ul>

Option 2. Decline to remove the trees

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complies with council policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsatisfied customer</li> </ul>

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaving amenity value</li> <li>• No cost to Council</li> </ul> |  |
|---|--|

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 to remove the trees on Scott Drive.

**CONSIDERATIONS****Alignment with Council's Vision**

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Charming; Vibrant; Quality; and Value.

**Financial Considerations**

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$1000.00.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently unbudgeted.

**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).

**Policy Implications**

There are no known policy implications.

**Māori Engagement**

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti ō Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti ō Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

**Risks**

The only risk is that infrastructure will continue to be impacted especially if the larger trees are not removed.

**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 required.

#### **CONCLUSION**

While the first request was declined the customer was able to re-request the tree removal on Scott Drive if they undertook consultation with the others in Scott Drive due to the loss of amenity value. The customer has done this and attached is the list of residents in support of the tree removal.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Support for the removal of trees on Scott Drive
2. Proposed trees for removal - Scott Drive

**4.2 REQUEST TO REMOVE TREES AT BESLEY PARK, TAUPO**

**Author:** Ariel Jeffcoat, Parks Project Management Cadet

**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

**PURPOSE**

To decide on the request to remove three trees on the Besley Park Council Reserve.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The residents at 2 Besley Place have requested that Council remove two trees that drop leaves onto their property and another which hangs over their property. This request is in direct contradiction of the existing Taupō District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 where healthy trees are not to be removed unless they are causing severe hardship.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee approves the removal tree number 2 (the middle tree); and declines to remove trees number 1 and 3 Besley Park, Taupō as outlined in the attached map.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

The resident at 2 Besley Place has requested that Council remove two trees that drop leaves onto their property and another which hangs over their property.

This request is in direct contradiction of the existing Taupō District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which states in Policy 3.2: Removal of Healthy Trees; "Healthy trees on council land will be retained, and their removal will be the exception. Instances where the council may consider removal of the 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\*, 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".

\*Note: trees which drop debris or inhibit are not considered to be causing hardship (3.2).

Removal of Unhealthy Trees (3.1); "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 in particularly poor form and provides limited amenity value".

**DISCUSSION**

The residents at 2 Besley place have requested that 3 trees be removed that affect their property. All trees are Banksia species and are over 30 years old ranging from 5.5m to 11.2m.

Tree Number 1: The residents have asked for this tree to be removed as it drops leaves and pinecones onto their property, this does not comply with council policy 3.2 which states that there will be no removal of healthy trees unless severe hardship is being experienced or they are impacting other community assets and infrastructure. The arborist has identified that this tree is in excellent health and while it could use a prune there is no need to remove it.

It is not recommended that Council remove this tree.

Tree Number 2: The residents have asked for this tree to be removed as it drops leaves and pinecones onto their property, this does not comply with council policy 3.2 which states that there will be no removal of healthy trees unless severe hardship is being experienced or they are impacting other community assets and infrastructure. However, while the arborists found the tree to be in good health, they have recommended that this tree be removed as soon as possible due to cracking off at the base of the tree, making it dangerous. There is the possibility to replace this tree with a native specimen, however we do not wish to replace the tree.

It is recommended that Council do remove this tree.



Tree Number 3: The residents have asked for this tree to be removed as it drops leaves and pinecones onto their property, this does not comply with council policy 3.2 which states that there will be no removal of healthy trees unless severe hardship is being experienced or they are impacting other community assets and infrastructure. This tree is relatively healthy, though showing signs of stress from overcrowding. The arborist does not suggest that it is removed, and signs of stress would be mediated with the removal of the second tree.

It is not recommended that Council remove this tree

It is therefore recommended to not remove trees 1 and 3 and remove tree 2.

Based on this information there are three options:

- Carry out arborist suggested work
- Decline the customer's request to remove trees

## OPTIONS

### Analysis of Options

Option 1. Carry out arborist suggested work

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with Council Policy</li> <li>• Improve amenity value and health of existing trees</li> <li>• Addresses some of the customer's request</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of removal of tree</li> <li>• Does not meet all of the customers concerns</li> </ul>

Option 2. Decline the customer's request to remove trees

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with Council Policy</li> <li>• Remains amenity value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaves a dangerous tree intact</li> </ul>

Option 3. Remove all Trees

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customer gets what they want</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not comply with council policy</li> <li>• Cost to council</li> <li>• Removes amenity value</li> </ul>

### Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is to carry out the arborist suggested work.

## CONSIDERATIONS

### **Alignment with Council's Vision**

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Quality; and Value.

### **Financial Considerations**

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$1000, but work depends size/location/need for traffic management or not etc

If removal is recommended, the costs will have to be assessed depending on the amount of work to be undertaken.

### Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently unbudgeted. The work will be catered for by existing operational 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 public services. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

## Policy Implications

Following only the arborist report work complies with the Tree and Vegetation Policy.

## Māori Engagement

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti ō Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti ō Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

## Risks

There are no known risks if the vegetation is retained; and the removal of the dead tree complies with the Policy so there are no risks. However if the option to remove all trees is chosen then there is the risk of not complying with council policy and council must explain themselves.

## 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 required. The decision will be related directly to the resident.

## CONCLUSION

There are no compelling reasons to remove all the trees, and this does not comply with Council Policy. However there is reason to remove the second tree which poses danger if it were to fail. It is therefore suggested that the dangerous tree be removed, while the other two be left.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Arborist Report 1
2. Arborist Report 2
3. Arborist Report 3
4. Tree Map

**4.3 REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF TREE AT 1/36 LAKEWOOD DRIVE, TAUPO****Author:** Ariel Jeffcoat, Parks Project Management Cadet**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations**PURPOSE**

To decide on whether or not to remove the tree at 1/36 Lakewood Drive.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The resident of 1/36 Lakewood Drive has requested that Council remove the Lombardy Poplar outside of her residence. This tree is causing an adverse impact on infrastructure and thus the removal of this healthy tree complies with the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee approves the removal of the Lombardy Poplar outside 1/36 Lakewood Drive, Taupō.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

The resident of 1/36 Lakewood Drive has requested that Council remove the Lombardy Poplar outside of her residence.

**DISCUSSION**

The resident of 1/36 Lakewood Drive has requested that Council remove the Lombardy Poplar outside of her residence.

This tree is a 7m tall Lombardy Poplar and has been assessed by an arborist who has found that it is in excellent health. This tree is significantly adversely impacting infrastructure as its roots are lifting the footpath. The arborist has noted this is the wrong species of tree for a street tree and we will continue to have problems with it raising the footpath. There is also water and wastewater services under the footpath which may become at risk if the issue is not resolved. Due to its negative impact of infrastructure, removal of the tree complies with the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which allows the removal of a healthy tree if "other community assets are impacted by trees or vegetation" this includes infrastructure.

It is recommended that Council remove this tree.

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

**OPTIONS**Analysis of Options

## Option 1. Remove the tree

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complies with council policy</li> <li>Improves infrastructure</li> <li>Fulfils customers request</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost to Council</li> </ul>

## Option 2. Decline to remove the tree

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not comply with Council policy</li> <li>Does not remove risk</li> </ul>

	• Does not fulfil customer request.
--	-------------------------------------

Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is for Council to remove the tree.

## CONSIDERATIONS

### Alignment with Council's Vision

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Quality; and Value.

### Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$1000.

However the final cost is dependent on the scope of works/time/labour etc.

### Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is unbudgeted for. The work will be catered for by existing operational 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).

### Policy Implications

Following the arborists report complies with the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014.

### Māori Engagement

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti o Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

### Risks

There are no known risks associated with the removal of the tree. However if the tree is not removed there is a risk to the infrastructure and public safety.

## 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 required. The resident will be notified of the result.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is recommended based on the arborist report that Council accept the request to remove the tree at 1/36 Lakewood Drive as it poses a threat to infrastructure and public health. This decision complies with council policy.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Arborist Report
2. Footpath Damage

**4.4 REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF TREES AT 93 HINEMOA AVENUE, TAUPO****Author:** Ariel Jeffcoat, Parks Project Management Cadet**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations**PURPOSE**

To decide on whether or not to remove the trees at 93 Hinemoa Avenue.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The resident of 93 Hinemoa Avenue has requested that Council remove the two Prunus trees outside of her residence. This tree is causing an adverse impact on infrastructure and thus the removal of this healthy tree complies with the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the Fences, Roothing, Reserves & Dogs Committee approves the removal of two Prunus trees outside 93 Hinemoa Avenue, Taupo.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

The resident of 93 Hinemoa Ave has requested that Council remove the two Prunus trees outside of her residence.

**DISCUSSION**

The resident of 93 Hinemoa Ave has requested that Council remove the two Prunus trees outside of her residence.

Both trees are 5m tall Prunus species trees which according to the arborist reports are causing an adverse effect on the footpath and the residents property.

Tree 1: Is of moderate health, however is it has damaged the footpath and is raising edges on the property. As this tree is causing damage to infrastructure and the residents property, the arborist has recommended removal of this tree. This removal complies with the Council's Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 as it is causing damage to infrastructure.

It is recommended to Council that the tree is removed.

Tree 2: Is of moderate health, however is it has damaged the footpath, and while it hasn't damaged the property yet, it is showing signs of movement towards the property. As this tree is causing damage to infrastructure the arborist has recommended removal of this tree. This removal complies with the Council's Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 as it is causing damage to infrastructure.

It is recommended to Council that the tree is removed.

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

**OPTIONS**Analysis of Options

Option 1. Accept request for removal of trees

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complies with council policy</li> <li>• Improves infrastructure</li> <li>• Fulfils customers request</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost to Council</li> </ul>

## Option 2. Decline request for removal of trees

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not comply with Council policy</li> <li>Does not remove risk</li> <li>Does not fulfil customer request.</li> </ul>

Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is to accept the request to remove the trees.

**CONSIDERATIONS****Alignment with Council's Vision**

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Quality; and Value.

**Financial Considerations**

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$1000-\$2000

However the final cost is dependent on the scope of works/time/labour etc.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is unbudgeted for. The work will be catered for by existing operational 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).

**Policy Implications**

Following the arborists report complies with the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014.

**Māori Engagement**

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti ō Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti ō Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

**Risks**

There are no known risks associated with the removal of the tree. However if the tree is not removed there is a risk to the infrastructure and public safety.

**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 required. The resident will be notified of the result.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is recommended based on the arborist report that Council accept the request to remove the trees at 93 Hinemoa Ave as it poses a threat to infrastructure and public health. This decision complies with council policy.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Arborist Report
2. Tree Map
3. Lifted Footpath

**4.5 REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF TREES ON KENRIGG RESERVE, KINLOCH**

**Author:** Ariel Jeffcoat, Parks Project Management Cadet

**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

**PURPOSE**

To decide on the request to remove trees on Kenrigg Reserve (East) opposite 7 Antonia Place, Kinloch.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The residents of 7 Antonia Place have requested that Council remove six trees which border their property on the Kenrigg Reserve and drop leaves. This request is in direct contradiction to the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which state that healthy trees are not to be removed unless they are causing severe hardship.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Fences, Roading, Reserves & Dogs Committee approves the removal of the self-seeding Prunus and declines the request to remove the five remaining trees on Kenrigg Reserve adjacent to 7 Antonia Place, Kinloch.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

The resident at 7 Antonia Place has requested that Council remove six trees which drop needles and leaves onto their property and house.

This request is in direct contradiction of the existing Taupō District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which states in Policy 3.2: Removal of Healthy Trees; "Healthy trees on council land will be retained, and their removal will be the exception. Instances where the council may consider removal of the 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\*, 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".

\*Note: trees which drop debris or inhibit are not considered to be causing hardship (3.2).

Council carried out work approximately three years ago to remove a limb of one of the trees which was of concern.

**DISCUSSION**

The residents at 7 Antonia Place, Kinloch have asked to have six trees in the Kenrigg reserve which lay in close proximity to their property removed.

Tree 1: The arborist has assessed the tree closest to their boundary. This tree is a 20+ year old, 9m tall Ash tree. The arborist has reported that the tree is in excellent health. We have received contradictory advice from the consulting arborist on the suggested treatment of the Ash tree. Both reports identify the Ash as being in excellent health. However the initial recommendation was to carry out formative pruning; and the second recommendation was to remove the tree completely.

Removal of a healthy tree which is not interfering with infrastructure, management of the reserve or causing significant problems is not catered for under current policy. Consequently, given the contradicting recommendations from the arborist and assessing them against policy; officers do not recommend removal of this tree, and recommend carrying out formative pruning to ensure that the tree does not encroach over the neighbouring residential boundary.

It is not recommended that Council remove this tree.

Tree 2: This is a self-seeded 6m tall Prunus species which is in excellent health. However the arborist does recommend removal of the tree due to it being a weed species. As it is a weed species, removal of the tree is not in contradiction of the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014.

It is recommended that Council remove this tree.

Tree 3: This is a 5.5m tall Rowan tree in excellent health. The arborist report recommends not to remove the tree and to clean up the dead wood. Removing this tree would be in direct contradiction of the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which states in Policy 3.2: Removal of Healthy Trees; "Healthy trees on council land will be retained, and their removal will be the exception".

It is not recommended that Council remove this tree.

Tree 4: This is a 5.5m tall Rowan tree in excellent health. The arborist report recommends not to remove the tree and to clean up the dead wood and rubbing branches. Removing this tree would be in direct contradiction of the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which states in Policy 3.2: Removal of Healthy Trees; "Healthy trees on council land will be retained, and their removal will be the exception".

It is not recommended that Council remove this tree.

Tree 5: This is a 4m tall Rowan in good health which is suppressed by the Ash. The arborist report recommends not to remove the tree and to clean up the dead wood base structures. Removing this tree would be in direct contradiction of the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which states in Policy 3.2: Removal of Healthy Trees; "Healthy trees on council land will be retained, and their removal will be the exception".

It is not recommended that Council remove this tree.

Tree 6: This is a 12m tall Larch tree in excellent health. The arborist report recommends not to remove the tree and suggests a crown lift only. Removing this tree would be in direct contradiction of the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014 which states in Policy 3.2: Removal of Healthy Trees; "Healthy trees on council land will be retained, and their removal will be the exception".

It is not recommended that Council remove this tree.

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

## OPTIONS

### Analysis of Options

1. Decline customers request to remove trees
2. Remove all requested trees
3. Remove arborist suggested trees only

Option 1. Decline request to remove trees

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complies with council policies</li> <li>• Maintains amenity value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customer dissatisfied</li> </ul>

Option 2. Remove the requested trees

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulfils customer request</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of amenity value</li> <li>• Contradicts council policy</li> <li>• Cost to council</li> </ul>

Option 3. Remove arborist suggested trees only

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves amenity value by removing weed species and reducing clumping of trees</li> <li>• Complies with council policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost to council</li> <li>• Only partially fulfils customer request</li> </ul>

Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is to option is to remove only the arborist suggested tree.

**CONSIDERATIONS****Alignment with Council's Vision**

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Quality; and Value.

**Financial Considerations**

The financial impact of the request is estimated to be \$1000, but this figure changes depending on size/location/ need for traffic management etc.

Pruning costs will be covered by existing operation 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 public services.

**Policy Implications**

Following the recommendation follows the Tree and Vegetation Policy 2014, and thus is in line with policy.

**Māori Engagement**

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti o Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

**Risks**

There are no known risks if vegetation is retained.

**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 required. The decision will be related directly to the resident.

**CONCLUSION**

There are no compelling reasons to remove all the trees, furthermore, removing the trees would be in direct contradiction to Council Policy. It is suggested to only remove tree 2 as recommended and carry out arborist suggested pruning and maintenance.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Arborist Report 1
2. Arborist report 2
3. Tree Map

#### 4.6 TAUPO DISTRICT COUNCIL TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE UPDATES

**Author:** Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation

**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.

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1. Two (2) bus stop signs relocated on Kiddle Drive.	There is a safety concern where the bus stops due to the location of the sign, which is close to the intersection and a blind corner.	Kiddle Drive, near to Invergarry Road intersection
2. 12 metres of 'No Stopping At All Times' marking removal (broken yellow lines).	To allow buses to stop along Kiddle Drive.	Kiddle Drive, near to Invergarry Road intersection
3. One (1) bus stop sign removal	Due to the proximity of the bus stop to the refuge island and creating a visibility of the island when the bus stops.	Kiddle Drive, near to Birch street intersection.
4. 132 metres long 'No Stopping At All Times' (broken yellow lines) markings to be installed.	To stop vehicles parking along the widened seal and hindering visibility for vehicles exiting the school and hall.	On Tirohanga Road, outside the school and hall.
5. 985 metres of 'No Overtaking' 100mm continuous double yellow line markings to be installed.	To stop vehicles passing in between the two right turn bays.	On Poihipi Road, between Acacia Bay and Scoria Road.
6. 40 metres of 'No Overtaking' 100mm continuous yellow line marking to be installed.	To stop vehicles passing near to right turn bays.	On Poihipi Road, between Acacia Bay and Scoria Road.
7. 92 metres of 'No Overtaking' advanced markings 100mm 3x7 yellow line marking to be installed.	To stop vehicles passing near to right turn bays.	On Poihipi Road, between Acacia Bay and Scoria Road.
8. Removal of 3 x angle parking spaces.	To install refuge island.	Spa Road, near to Oruanui Street intersection.
9. 14 metres of 'No Stopping At All Times' (broken yellow lines) markings to be installed.	To stop vehicles not parking too close to the refuge island.	Spa Road, near to Oruanui Street intersection.
10 Install P60 (60 min)	To provide customer parking for	26 Parking spaces on Roberts

parking restriction signs	Briscoes customers.	Street from Titiraupenga Street intersection to entrance to Briscoes yard.
11 Install P60 (60 minute) parking restriction signs	To provide customer parking for Briscoes customers.	9 parking spaces on Titiraupenga Street between Roberts Street and entrance to Briscoes yard.
12. Remove up to two parking spaces on Roberts St near Briscoes	To allow delivery trucks to easily exit the yard.	Roberts Street, outside 79 Roberts Street

## 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 Council 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

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

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1. Two (2) bus stop signs relocated on Kiddle Drive.	There is a safety concern where the bus stops due to the location of the sign, which is close to the intersection and a blind corner.	Kiddle Drive, near to Invergarry Road intersection
2. 12 metres of 'No Stopping At All Times' marking removal (broken yellow lines).	To allow buses to stop along Kiddle Drive.	Kiddle Drive, near to Invergarry Road intersection
3. One (1) bus stop sign removal	Due to the proximity of the bus stop to the refuge island and creating a visibility of the island when the bus stops.	Kiddle Drive, near to Birch street intersection.
4. 132 metres long 'No Stopping At All Times' (broken yellow lines) markings to be installed.	To stop vehicles parking along the widened seal and hindering visibility for vehicles exiting the school and hall.	On Tirohanga Road, outside the school and hall.
5. 985 metres of 'No Overtaking' 100mm continuous double yellow line markings to be installed.	To stop vehicles passing in between the two right turn bays.	On Poihipi Road, between Acacia Bay and Scoria Road.
6. 40 metres of 'No Overtaking' 100mm continuous yellow line marking to be installed.	To stop vehicles passing near to right turn bays.	On Poihipi Road, between Acacia Bay and Scoria Road.

7. 92 metres of 'No Overtaking' advanced markings 100mm 3x7 yellow line marking to be installed.	To stop vehicles passing near to right turn bays.	On Poihipi Road, between Acacia Bay and Scoria Road.
8. Removal of 3 x angle parking spaces.	To install refuge island.	Spa Road, near to Oruanui Street intersection.
9. 14 metres of 'No Stopping At All Times' (broken yellow lines) markings to be installed.	To stop vehicles not parking too close to the refuge island.	Spa Road, near to Oruanui Street intersection.
10. Install P60 (60 minute) parking restriction signs	To provide customer parking for Briscoes customers.	26 parking spaces on Roberts Street from Titiraupenga Street intersection to entrance to Briscoes yard.
11. Install P60 (60 minute) parking restriction signs	To provide customer parking for Briscoes customers.	9 parking spaces on Titiraupenga Street between Roberts Street and entrance to Briscoes yard.
12. Remove up to two parking spaces on Roberts St near Briscoes	To allow delivery trucks to easily exit the yard.	Roberts Street, outside 79 Roberts Street

- Item 1 and 2 followed a request from a concerned resident of the safety of the current bus stops, the bus stops near to the intersection of Invergarry Road are deemed to be too close to the corner which raises a safety concern for the bus operation and other road users. It was also subsequently identified that these are installed over 'No Stopping' lines which is not appropriate. To alleviate this issue, Taupō District Council is proposing to relocate the current bus stops location further north and removing 12 metres of 'No Stopping At All Times' (broken yellow lines) to accommodate the bus stop area as shown on the attached plan.
- Item 3 was raised by a resident who was concerned that the bus stop location was too close to the refuge island, which was creating a visibility issue of the island, and hindering visibility of pedestrians using the refuge island while the buses were stopped at the location. Council is proposing to remove the sign, which will also be discussed with the respective bus company.
- Item 4 followed Tirohanga Road seal widening whereby the transportation team identified that in the area of the school and hall, vehicles trying to park were creating safety issues by hindering visibility of vehicles trying to exit the hall and school.
- Items 5, 6 and 7 'No Overtaking' yellow markings are required as part of the right turn bays design, which prevents vehicles overtaking on right turn bays.
- Item 8 and 9 are to enable the installation of the proposed refuge island (on Spa Road near to Oruanui Street intersection), which requires removal of 3 angle parking spaces, and 14 metres long no stopping line markings to stop vehicles parking near the refuge island.
- Items 10, 11 and 12 relate to a request from Briscoes regarding parking outside their premises. The current parking is unrestricted, and parking spaces are taken up by long-term parking overflow from the adjacent parking areas making it difficult for customers to park as there is increased demand for all day parking in this area. The initial request was for P120 but to retain consistency with the rest of the parking in the street and CBD it was considered P60 to be recommended. This will provide a higher turnover for the parking spaces and customers to Briscoes.

### Alignment with Council's Vision

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Charming; Vibrant; Quality; and Value.



### **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.

### **Māori Engagement**

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti ō Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti ō Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

### **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.

1. Item 1 and 2; when council proposed to relocate the south bound sign close to the Christian School entrance, the school opposed the relocation advising that the proposal will affect the right turning when exiting from the school. After reviewing the situation the transportation team has proposed as

per attached plan and sent to the affected parties no objection received. Currently transportation team is advising the proposed plan to the buses company.

2. Item 3; currently transportation team is advising the proposed plan to the buses company.
3. Item 4; the marking has been installed as part of the Tirohanga rehabilitation work and no complaints/enquires have been received.
4. Item 5, 6 and 7; the marking has been installed as part of the Poihipi widening project and no complaints/enquires received.
5. Item 8 & 9 during the consultation process with affected parties, Access Taupō group opposed the refuge island proposal saying that refuge island is dangerous to use at the location and they are preferred pedestrian crossing lights. No objection received from other affected property owners. Currently transportation team is advising the emergency service providers.
6. Items 10 & 11 we have yet to advise Briscoes of the change in times from P120 to P60 and for item 12 we have yet to do a full review or consult regarding the removal of the two car-spaces. We have recently changed the angle of the parking spaces to 90 degrees to assist with the delivery vehicles being able to exit safely.

### **COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

No communication/media 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. Kiddle Drive Bus Stop Relocation Plan V2
2. Kiddle Drive Bus Stop Removal Plan
3. Tirohanga Road No Stopping Line Marking Plan
4. Spa Road Proposed Refuge Island Plan
5. Briscoes Parking Changes
6. Poihipi Road No overtaking marking plan

**4.7 TAUPO DISTRICT COUNCIL TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE UPDATES**

**Author:** Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation

**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)**

That, pursuant to the Taupō District Council Traffic Bylaw, Council imposes the following traffic controls and/or prohibitions on roads and/or public spaces in the Taupō District:

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1. STOP sign and marking	To improve road safety	Whangamata Road and Otake Road intersection
2. GIVEWAY sign and marking	To improve road safety	Whangamata Road and Waihora Road intersection
3. GIVEWAY sign and marking	To improve road safety	Whangamata Road and Puketapu Road intersection

**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 Council 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**

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

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1. STOP sign and marking	To improve road safety	Whangamata Road and Otake Road intersection
2. GIVEWAY sign and marking	To improve road safety	Whangamata Road and Waihora Road intersection
3. GIVEWAY sign and marking	To improve road safety	Whangamata Road and Puketapu Road intersection

Items 1, 2 and 3: The transportation team has recently undertaken an investigation and review of the visibility at each of these intersections (noted above) along Whangamata Road. Since Whangamata Road has been identified as a collector road, STOP or GIVEWAY signs should be installed at these uncontrolled intersections in accordance with MOSTAM guidelines.

### **Alignment with Council's Vision**

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Charming; Vibrant; Quality; and Value.

### **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.

### **Māori Engagement**

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti o Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

### **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 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 GIVEWAY and STOP signs at Otake Road, Waihora Road and Puketapu Road to Whangamata Road intersections