

# **ATTACHMENTS**

## **Ordinary Taupō Reserves & Roding Committee Meeting**

**6 April 2023**

## Table of Contents

---

5.2	Request for tree removals outside 36 Nisbet Terrace, Kinloch	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's assessment 36 Nisbet Terrace, Kinloch .....	3
5.3	Request for tree removal on the Kinloch Golf Course adjoining 84 Kinloch Road, Kinloch	
	Attachment 1 Arborists Assessment Kinloch Golf Course.....	7
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.....	11
5.5	Request for tree removal outside 122 Kinloch Road, Kinloch	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's Assessment 122 Kinloch Road, Kinloch.....	15
5.6	Request to remove a tree from the berm outside 88 Lakewood Drive, Taupō	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's Assessment 88 Lakewood Drive, Taupo .....	18
5.7	Request to Remove Tree from berm adjoining 8 Muritai Street, Taupō	
	Attachment 1 Arborist's Assessment 6 Muritai Street, Taupo .....	23
5.9	Removal of parking spaces on Taniwha Street for new bus stop	
	Attachment 1 Proposed bus stop location on Taniwha Street.....	27
5.10	New Public Road Name - 15 Kaiapo Road	
	Attachment 1 15 Kaiapo Road Scheme Plan .....	28
5.11	Taupō District Council Traffic Control Device Update	
	Attachment 1 NSAAT Lines - Monte Vista, Shepherd Road .....	29
	Attachment 2 NSAAT Lines - 11 Rokino Road.....	30
	Attachment 3 NSAAT Lines - 23 Hawai Street .....	31
	Attachment 4 NSAAT Lines - Waikato Street .....	32
	Attachment 5 Ferry Road Coach Parking.....	33
	Attachment 6 Mobility Park - Roberts Street Shared Space.....	34
	Attachment 7 Mobility Park - Ferry Road.....	36
	Attachment 8 Parking Time Restrictions – Roberts Street and Tūwharetoa Street .....	37
5.12	Approval of Wording for Sculpture Plaque - cnr of Roberts and Ruapehu Streets	
	Attachment 1 Proposed wording for Sculpture Plaque - cnr Roberts and Ruapehu streets .....	38

**Appendix 1 – Council Tree Assessment Checklist (SR#: 2201246)**

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

Location	36 Nisbet Terrace, Kinloch
Tree Species	Silver birch ( <i>Betula pendula</i> ) and totara ( <i>Podocarpus totara</i> )
Girth	0.37 / 0.35 metres
Height	12.5 / 12metres
Spread	9 / 6 metres
Approximate age	≥30 years (est.)
Tree Health/Condition	(1 excellent – 5 very poor) <u>2</u>
Berm Width	5 metres

**1 Roadway Damage Assessment**

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

**2 Adjoining Property Impact Assessment**

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

The complaint was raised by the owner of No.33 Nisbet Terrace, diagonally across the road to the east. The trees would be unlikely to be having any significant impact on No.33, but may cast some shade late in the day.

No comment was provided from the owner of No.36, but the customer states they have made the complaint on their behalf. The trees (one deciduous, one evergreen) will cast shade directly onto No.36, being on the berm directly to the north of the property and reasonably tall. However it should be noted that there are several other large trees within the property itself immediately adjacent to the subject trees that would be contributing significantly to shade over the dwelling.

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



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

There are infrequent, widely spaced mature birches interspersed with small trees e.g. maple and cherry.

- 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 moderate to high significance as there are few surviving mature birch street trees (assuming they were the original planting here). The private properties also generally contain mature trees in well established gardens.

4 **Proposed Action**

4.1 What species of tree is a suitable replacement?

N/A

- 4.2 Do you recommend the removal of the tree **Yes/No** See below
- 4.3 Do you recommend the replacement of the tree **Yes/No** N/A
- 4.4 Can work be safely completed near power lines or is Power Authority Consent required **Yes/No** N/A

4.5 General comment:

The trees are good quality specimens providing character and amenity to the surroundings. The birch is likely to be a survivor of the street's original planting scheme and the totara may have been planted by a resident or be self-sown.

The trees appear to be having very little impact on the customer's property (no. 33), but will be casting substantial shade on no.36, along with trees within no.36 itself. Encroachment of the trees over the property boundary is minimal due to competition with mature trees within the property and located close to the boundary.

The customer suggested trimming the trees, but in my opinion there is no acceptable arboricultural technique that would provide any appreciable shade reduction to no.36, however regular minor crown reduction of the totara could be carried out to maintain it at approximately its current size.

In my opinion it will be necessary to discuss this matter with the owner of no.36 to determine the extent to which they are affected by the trees and to what extent trees within the property are responsible for the shade issue.

Note that clause 1.6 of the Tree and Vegetation Policy states that the preferred street tree density is 1 tree per berm. Of the two trees, on balance in my opinion the birch is the more appropriate to the location as it matches the other street trees, is a more appropriate size and form for the setting and, being deciduous, does not cast shade during winter.

- 4.6 Photos taken? (attach photos) **Yes/No** (see below)

Parks Officer Name Adrian Lamont Date 31/3/22

















































































