

ATTACHMENTS

**Ordinary Taupō Reserves & Roading
Committee Meeting**

2 March 2023

Table of Contents

5.2	Removal of parking spaces on Taniwha Street for new bus stop	
	Attachment 1 Proposed bus stop location on Taniwha Street.....	3
5.3	Request for tree removal on the Kinloch Golf Course adjoining 84 Kinloch Road, Kinloch	
	Attachment 1 Arborists Assessment Kinloch Golf Course.....	4
5.4	Request to remove two trees from the berm adjoining 22 and 24 Irwin Place, Kinloch	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's Assessment 22 Irwin Place, Kinloch.....	8
5.5	Request to remove a tree from the berm outside 88 Lakewood Drive, Taupō	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's Assessment 88 Lakewood Drive, Taupo.....	12
5.6	Request to Remove Tree from berm adjoining 8 Muritai Street, Taupo	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's Assessment 6 Muritai Street, Taupo.....	17
5.7	Request for tree removals outside 36 Nisbet Terrace, Kinloch	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's assessment 36 Nisbet Terrace, Kinloch.....	21
5.8	Request for tree removal outside 122 Kinloch Road, Kinloch	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's Assessment 122 Kinloch Road, Kinloch.....	25
5.10	Taupō District Council Traffic Control Device Update	
	Attachment 1 NSAAT Lines - Monte Vista, Shepherd Road.....	28
	Attachment 2 NSAAT Lines - 11 Rokino Road.....	29
	Attachment 3 NSAAT Lines - 23 Hawai Street.....	30
	Attachment 4 NSAAT Lines - Waikato Street.....	31
	Attachment 5 Bus Coach Parking - Ferry Road.....	32
	Attachment 6 Mobility Park - Roberts Street Shared Space.....	33
	Attachment 7 Mobility Park - Ferry Road.....	35
	Attachment 8 Parking Time Restrictions – Roberts Street and Tuwharetoa Street.....	36
5.11	Approval of Wording for Sculpture Plaque - cnr of Roberts and Ruapehu streets	
	Attachment 1 Proposed wording for Sculpture Plaque - cnr Roberts and Ruapehu streets.....	37





- 3 **Values and Options Assessment**
- 3.1 Does the tree have formal protection e.g
District Plan, Reserves Act, Covenant Yes/No
- 3.2 Has the tree historic or other significance Yes/No
- 3.3 Can the tree be pruned to overcome
the current problem Yes/No
- 3.4 What is the frequency of trees on the street
1 per berm to 1 per 2-3 berms to the west
- 3.5 Are there mature trees in private gardens, parks or
Street berms adjoining this site Yes/No
- 3.6 How significant is the tree in the local landscape
- The trees have some significance on the landscape due to their size but there are other mature trees in the near vicinity of much better form, that haven't been topped in the way that the Douglas Firs have.
- 4 **Proposed Action**
- 4.1 What species of tree is a suitable replacement?
- Lower growing tree to encourage bird life while not repeating shade issues [eg. Kowhai]. Alternatively low growing deciduous species to provide autumn colour, while again not shading.
- 4.2 Do you recommend the removal of the tree Yes/No
- 4.3 Do you recommend the replacement of the tree Yes/No
- 4.4 Can work be safely completed near power lines
Or is Power Authority Consent required Yes/No
- 4.5 General comment:
- I believe in this case that the customer's complaint has merit, although difficult to suggest it relates to extreme hardship. The trees being a tall evergreen shelter belt right along the northern side of their property. The trees have been historically topped. The topping was evidently carried out years ago and the trees seem to have adapted and grown on they are still somewhat compromised. As the golf club also would be supportive of tree removal in my opinion in this case I believe it can be justified provided that replacement planting is carried out. There is not really any satisfactory pruning option that would provide a long-term resolution. Either deciduous species and / or low growing evergreen shrubs that will form a screen between the tee and the property

4.6 Photos taken? (attach photos) Yes/No

Parks Officer Name Adrian Lamont Date



Trees viewed from Golf tee



Location of Douglas Fir Shelter Belt

Appendix 1 – Council Tree Assessment Checklist (SR#: 2113317)

(Note: for provisions relating to notable and amenity trees and indigenous trees and vegetation within significant natural areas – refer to Taupō District Plan)

Location	22-24 Irwin Place, Kinloch
Tree Species	Silver birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) X 2
Girth	up to 0.3 metres
Height	up to 12 metres
Spread	up to 9 metres
Approximate age	≥25 years (est.)
Tree Health/Condition	(1 excellent – 5 very poor) <u>3-4</u>
Berm Width	4 metres

1 Roadway Damage Assessment

1.1	Footpath damage	Yes/No	N/A
1.2	Has the footpath been replaced	Yes/No	N/A
1.3	Kerb & channel damaged	Yes/ No	
1.4	Road pavement damage	Yes/ No	
1.5	Buried services damaged	Yes/ No	

2 Adjoining Property Impact Assessment

2.1	What side of the property is the tree on	North/ South /East/West
2.2	Is the tree over shading the property in winter	Yes/ No
2.3	Is the tree damaging the property	Yes/ No
2.4	Comment on tree damage	

None noted and none raised by customer. The issue raised mostly relates to asthma / allergy issues, which are often claimed to be associated with birch pollen.

2.5	Is the tree a danger to the property if it falls	Yes /No	
2.6	Do the adjoining owners want the tree removed	Yes/ No	(see below)
2.7	Is the tree encroaching on power lines	Yes/ No	
2.8	Is the tree adversely impacting on adjoining services, e.g. footpaths, roads, underground services	Yes/ No	
2.9	Is there erosion potential if the tree is removed	Yes/ No	



