



# *Hastings District Council*

*Civic Administration Building  
Lyndon Road East, Hastings*

*Phone: (06) 871 5000*

*Fax: (06) 871 5100*

*WWW.hastingsdc.govt.nz*

---

## OPEN A G E N D A

---

### COUNCIL MEETING

#### Draft Keirunga Garden Tree Management Plan

Meeting Date: **Thursday, 30 May 2019**

Time: **9.00am**

Venue: **Council Chamber  
Ground Floor  
Civic Administration Building  
Lyndon Road East  
Hastings**

<b>Council Members</b>	Chair: Mayor Hazlehurst Councillors Barber, Dixon, Harvey, Heaps, Kerr, Lawson, Lyons, Nixon, O'Keefe, Poulain, Redstone, Schollum, Travers and Watkins
<b>Officer Responsible</b>	Chief Executive – Mr N Bickle
<b>Council Secretary</b>	Mrs C Hunt (Extn 5634)



# **HASTINGS DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **COUNCIL MEETING**

**THURSDAY, 30 MAY 2019**

**VENUE:** Council Chamber  
Ground Floor  
Civic Administration Building  
Lyndon Road East  
Hastings

**TIME:** 9.00am

## **A G E N D A**

**1. Prayer**

**2. Apologies & Leave of Absence**

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

**3. Seal Register**

**4. Conflict of Interest**

Members need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as a Member of the Council and any private or other external interest they might have. This note is provided as a reminder to Members to scan the agenda and assess their own private interests and identify where they may have a pecuniary or other conflict of interest, or where there may be perceptions of conflict of interest.

If a Member feels they do have a conflict of interest, they should publicly declare that at the start of the relevant item of business and withdraw from participating in the meeting. If a Member thinks they may have a conflict of interest, they can seek advice from the General Counsel or the Democratic Support Manager (preferably before the meeting).

It is noted that while Members can seek advice and discuss these matters, the final decision as to whether a conflict exists rests with the member.

**5. Confirmation of Minutes**

Minutes of the Council Meeting held Thursday 2 May 2019, including minutes while the public were excluded.

*(Previously circulated)*

- |           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>6.</b> | <b>Draft Keirunga Tree Management Plan</b> | <b>5</b> |
| <b>7.</b> | <b>Additional Business Items</b>           |          |
| <b>8.</b> | <b>Extraordinary Business Items</b>        |          |

**REPORT TO: COUNCIL**

**MEETING DATE: THURSDAY 30 MAY 2019**

**FROM: PARKS LANDSCAPE AND PROJECTS OFFICER  
BART LESLIE  
PARKS AND PROPERTY SERVICES MANAGER  
COLIN HOSFORD**

**SUBJECT: DRAFT KEIRUNGA TREE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

---

## **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to obtain a decision from the Council on the draft Keirunga Gardens Tree Management Plan for future landscaping of the Arthur's Path gully area within Keirunga Gardens.
- 1.2 This proposal arises from the need to manage tree health and safety as well as tree replacement in the Arthur's Path gully within Keirunga Gardens.
- 1.3 The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as prescribed by Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses. Good quality means infrastructure, services and performance that are efficient and effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances.
- 1.4 The objective of this decision relevant to the purpose of Local Government is to ensure that Council is meeting its duty of care when managing the tree stock in Arthur's Path gully in Keirunga Gardens.
- 1.5 This report concludes by recommending that Council adopts any of the four options.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Arthur's Path walk in Keirunga Gardens is an area of Recreation Reserve which was donated to the community by George Nelson. The area contains a large number of trees many of which were planted by George Nelson himself.
- 2.2 The majority of mature trees in this area have had little or no formative pruning since they were planted 80 odd years and have received only a reactive maintenance approach to limb and tree failure.
- 2.3 In the last five years there have been a number of tree removals, particularly as a result of autumn-winter storm events, that are presenting gaps in the tree canopy. Officers identified this pattern of failure and engaged the services of Chris Ryan, a respected and experienced local nurseryman to assist in recommending tree replacement options. In the first instance, Mr Ryan recommended a selection of replacement trees to officers that could enhance and compliment the Keirunga Gardens environment.

- 2.4 At the same time as the tree failures were occurring, officers were also increasingly fielding calls from some neighbouring property owners, concerned over the risk posed by limb failure of large trees overhanging their property boundaries. Incidents of limb failure and property damage were reported and requests to fell trees were raised with Council.
- 2.5 The initial aim of engaging Mr Ryan's services was to produce a palette of appropriate tree species that would be appropriate to replace lost trees, especially those close to the neighbouring properties. Officers wanted to select trees that would avoid the cross boundary issues already faced with large trees located too close to property boundaries.
- 2.6 After investigations into the age and condition of the tree stock in Arthur's Path and initial discussions on what the tree replacement list might contain. It was suggested that Council might also consider a bolder vision for the future of trees in Arthur's Path. A draft landscape plan was produced as an initial discussion point. This was presented to the Landmarks Advisory Group and the vision was supported as a draft proposal to be consulted upon with the wider community.
- 2.7 A public meeting, attended by approximately 100 people, was held at the Havelock North Community Centre on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018. Positive support led officers to complete the draft plan in readiness for public consultation.
- 2.8 The draft plan was opened to public submissions on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2019. After a number of time extensions were requested by the public, the submission period closed on 12 April 2019.
- 2.9 A more complete timeline recording historical issues affecting the trees in Arthur's Path in Keirunga Gardens is included as **Attachment 1**.

### 3.0 CURRENT SITUATION

- 3.1 The Draft Keirunga Tree Management Plan has drawn significant public interest with 210 individual or collective submissions being made. Council now needs to consider both the written and verbal submissions to make a decision on tree management in the Arthur's Path gully in Keirunga Gardens.

### 4.0 OPTIONS

- 4.1 There are four options for Council to consider;
- **Option 1** – Status Quo – leave trees to nature and maintain for public safety only
  - **Option 2** – Adopt the draft plan as consulted upon
  - **Option 3** – Adopt one of the alternative plans
  - **Option 4** – Commence the formulation of a new community led tree management plan

### 5.0 SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT

- 5.1 The level of expenditure included in the draft tree management plan is not of a level to trigger any of Council's financial significance thresholds. The level of interest in the draft plan has signalled that the care and retention of Keirunga

Garden's tree stock is of significant concern to the community. While the issue may not trigger any significance thresholds, it is noted that the concept of felling numerous trees with historic significance is a matter of importance to many in the community.

- 5.2 In terms of consultation, the concept of a new Keirunga Gardens Tree Management plan was first presented to the Landmarks Advisory Group on 6 December 2017. The group also walked Arthur's Path with Mr Ryan and heard his account of issues of concern in the wooded area and potential long term solutions. The Group endorsed his vision to be taken to the wider community for consultation.
- 5.3 The concept of a new landscape plan was presented to a well-advertised community meeting held at the Havelock North Community Centre in October 2018. Approximately 180 neighbouring households were delivered an invitational flyer, public notices were inserted in HB Today local as well as a wider notice on Council's social website and social media.
- 5.4 After the positive momentum of the public meeting, attendees and local residents were invited to attend a guided walkover with Mr Ryan to discuss the draft tree management plan. Approximately 35 people attended the walk and talk sessions.
- 5.5 The draft plan was then publicly advertised as a consultation document and submissions called for.
- 5.6 During this time an independent peer review of the draft tree plan was also completed and this document was made publicly available to assist community in making submissions. Due to the timing of the peer review, and with requests from the public for more time to consider the peer review and to make more informed submissions, officers extended the submission period to close 12<sup>th</sup> April 2019
- 5.7 Officers suggest that the level of interest and number of submissions show that the engagement with the community has been thorough.

## **6.0 ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS (INCLUDING FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS)**

- 6.1 The draft plan drew 210 submissions. The vast majority of submissions are opposed to the draft plan concept especially in regard to felling the oak trees. Only 5 submitters support the draft plan.
- 6.2 Officers have analysed the submissions and identified the general issues of concern to each submitter. **Attachment 2** contains the Summary of Submissions and issues of concern raised.
- 6.3 The Issues raised are listed below under the following headings;
  - 1 **Retain the Trees** – leave the oaks, fell only as necessary for health and safety, replace at end of life, retain woodland character (raised by **181** submitters)
  - 2 **Outside Scope of Plan** – wider Keirunga Gardens issues (raised by **2** submitters)

- 3 **Improve tree and park maintenance** – keep trees healthy, remove weed species, irrigation, under plantings, replace lost trees, improve tracks (raised by **90** submitters)
  - 4 **Remove dangerous Trees** – improve safety signage and warnings (raised by **51** submitters)
  - 5 **Extend timeframe for tree removal and replacement** – slow the removal process (raised by **3** submitters)
  - 6 **Modify the planting palette** – include other undercover and tree species (raised by **2** submitters)
  - 7 **Supports Richie Hill Plan** (raised by **12** submitters)
  - 8 **Supports Draft Plan** (raised by **3** submitters)
  - 9 **Supports Arborlab Plan** (raised by **14** submitters)
  - 10 **Miscellaneous requests** – alternate funding options, rodent control, QR codes on (raised by **3** submitters)
  - 11 **Supports David Cranwell's Plan** (raised by **3** submitters)
- 6.4 The following sections discuss and assess the issues raised by the submitters.
- 6.5 **Retain the oaks**
- 6.6 While the submissions raise numerous issues, it is clear that the vast majority of submitters do not support the adoption of a concept that will see the rapid removal of the oak trees. It is also clear that most submitters treasure the existing woodland and want it retained and enhanced.
- 6.7 The level of concern is also reflected in the fact that the community of its own volition has committed to the preparation of alternative tree assessments and plans from other respected arborists or similarly qualified and knowledgeable persons.
- 6.8 The Arborlab peer review report, which in itself suggests a more restrained approach than the draft plan, has drawn support. But similarly so has the Richie Hill report which is largely tree protection and maintenance focussed.
- 6.9 This reports seeks to address the need to either adopt the draft plan as consulted upon, or consider other management options that more closely reflect the wider community's aspirations. By deciding to not pursue the tree removal aims of the draft plan, Council will not need to commit to the funding stream necessary to carry out the work. As a first step this is an obvious benefit to the ratepayer.
- 6.10 **Improve Park Maintenance and Remove Dangerous Trees**
- 6.11 Following close behind calls to save the trees, the next biggest concern submitted is the call for improved maintenance, including the removal of dangerous trees. Some of the submitters have been very strong in their criticism of Council's past record of tree and park management at Keirunga Gardens.
- 6.12 Officers note that the treatment of the historical two oak trees, near Kopanga Road residences, including their subsequent removal has incensed some



submitters and called into question Council's actions in terms of the Reserves Act, the Keirunga Gardens Management Plan, the Resource Management Act and Council's own Tree Removal Policy.

- 6.13 It is fair to say that officers agree the process that led to the work carried out on the two trees was poorly managed and has led to an unsatisfactory outcome. On investigation it was revealed that our maintenance contractor's staff had given ambiguous advice on tree care that led to an external arborist undertaking poor quality work. In trying to rectify the situation Council then heavily pollarded the trees in order to retain the oaks while meeting the requests for making the neighbouring property safe. After discussions with the directly affected neighbours the majority felt the pollarded trees should be felled and the area replanted with new trees, but further away from the property boundaries.
- 6.14 While the various parties have been spoken to in regard to the tree trimming actions, the outcome is regrettable and no other tree work has been permitted in Keirunga Gardens unless there has been a clear danger to the public.
- 6.15 Notwithstanding the pollarding incident, there is a strong call by submitters to improve all tree and park maintenance. The key issue of concern is that Keirunga Gardens should be regarded as a heritage site and given a higher level of maintenance.
- 6.16 While there is plenty of scope to improve all manner of maintenance, such actions will require Council allocating additional resources. The current LTP has allocated a modest additional spend on natural areas. However, to meet some of the submitters' calls for more intensive additional expert arborist assessments, and a much higher level of annual maintenance, significant additional budget would be required. Before committing to an enhanced regime of care, Council would need to be aware that the calls for similar levels of service will resound across other parks. The calls for additional funds would therefore need to be balanced against other competing Council priorities.
- 6.17 **Outside the scope of Plan**
- 6.18 Two submissions have sought remedies that are not related to the consultation draft. Firstly there is a call for more facilities in Flaxmere. This request is recognised, but it not a matter for debate with regard to Keirunga Gardens.
- 6.19 A second submission requested that the neighbouring Prebenson land be acquired to extend the reserve. This land was not part of the draft plan though Council may wish to consider this as part of a wider Keirunga Gardens reserve management plan review.
- 6.20 **Miscellaneous Issues**
- 6.21 A variety of miscellaneous issues have been raised by submitters. They include;
- Rodent control
  - QR codes on trees
  - Interpretation boards
  - Extending timeframes for tree removals,

- Modification of the planting palette; and
- Improvements to boundary fences.

The issues raised are a collection of good ideas that officers believe can be either worked on under current budgets or fed into a collaborative process to create a reviewed wider park management plan. Officers believe they are all acceptable requests.

## 6.22 **Consideration of other plans**

6.23 All of the other submitted plans recommend an alternative way forward. They all have areas of overlapping agreement and some differing approaches. However, all agree that most if not all of the oaks should be retained and should be managed at a higher level of service than currently occurs.

6.24 An assessment of the alternative plans is more thoroughly discussed in section 6.28 below.

6.25 Assessment of the four options;

### 6.26 ***Option 1 Status Quo – leave trees to nature and maintain for public safety only***

6.26.1 The Arthur's Path area of Keirunga Gardens has been looked after as a low maintenance parkland for decades. Typically tree maintenance has only been reactive and this usually occurs after adverse weather events or as safety issues are identified. This has been the cheapest option for rate payers as it has necessitated modest expenditure.

6.26.2 During the formulation of the last LTP, officers advised that there is growing community expectation for higher levels of service in our natural area reserves and Council allocated a modest amount of extra funds to help improve the condition of all the district's natural areas. This has allowed for the provision of a natural areas' response team who allocate more time spraying and the control of weed tree species.

6.26.3 By adopting Option 1, Council would essentially reject the wider direction of the draft tree plan and would signal that Keirunga Gardens will be maintained at its current lower service level, reflective of its basic woodland values. This option will meet with the vast majority of submitters who seek to retain the trees as they are, but it would not meet the also numerous calls for an improved higher level of care across trees and wider landscape.

### 6.27 ***Option 2 – Adopt the draft plan as consulted upon***

6.27.1 The draft plan is arguably a radical vision that would undoubtedly transform the Arthur's Path area. Its vision is one of a variety of species giving a variety of colour, food source and a new landscape dynamic. This vision however does not align kindly with the wider community's vision and their desire to retain the tree heritage values of Keirunga Gardens.

6.27.2 The draft tree management plan has signalled the need for additional expenditure. It has been estimated it would cost \$200,000 over three years. Part of the rationale for a short term programme was based on the likely costs savings achieved through carrying out larger tranches of tree removal to reduce costs and reduce damage to new plantings. If Council was supportive of the

vision espoused in the plan, this timeframe could be lengthened to help reduce annual costs while retaining the greater vision as a long term project.

6.27.3 However, the large majority of submissions reject the approach presented in the draft consultation document. There are numerous questions raised on the need to such a radical approach. The plan was formulated as a vehicle to engage the community and offer a vision of what the gully landscape could look like in the future. While it struck an early supportive chord, it is now clear the majority of wider community do not share this new vision, but wish to retain the current tree palette, while seeking Council and perhaps the Community, to fund enhance general tree and parkland care and maintenance.

### 6.28 ***Option 3 - Adopt one of the alternative plans***

6.28.1 The public submission process has led to the formulation of three new tree plans that have to varying degrees entered into the feedback process.

6.28.2 **The Arborlab Plan** was commissioned by Council as a peer review of the draft plan. Council made it publicly accessible to enable the community to better consider the draft plan's content and to allow a different perspective or approach to considering the best outcomes the trees in Arthur's Path.

6.28.3 To summarise, the Arborlab Plan does not support the consulted upon Draft Plan. It does not support the recommended radical approach of major tree removal and replanting with a range of different trees over a short time frame.

6.28.4 The Arborlab report recommends that fewer oak trees need to be removed, weed species trees should be removed, existing species should be planted, improved arborist care and maintenance is needed and the change process should be gradual.

6.28.5 The Arborlab report recommendations would reduce expenditure on felling costs but would require additional expenditure on an increased level of service in the care and maintenance of the park and the trees.

6.28.6 **The Richie Hill Plan** has been submitted as a critique of the Draft Plan and the Arborlab report, and as an alternative approach for Council to consider.

6.28.7 In summary, it rejects the findings and challenges the credentials of both the Draft Plan and Arborlab report.

6.28.8 It recommends that;

- the oaks should stay, though subject to some necessary removals
- a new plan should be developed with knowledgeable community input
- some of the weed trees species should be removed
- there is a need for improved arborist care
- improve maintenance
- improved public consultation; and
- the adoption of a revised planting plan and tree management policies.

6.28.9 Essentially it recommends that Council should not proceed with any removals without first setting up a new tree committee or group to work on formulating a new plan and appropriate tree management policies for Council to follow.

- 6.28.10 The adoption of the Richie Hill plan would initially reduce expenditure on felling costs but would require additional expenditure on an increased level of service in the care and maintenance of the trees and the reserve.
- 6.28.11 **The David Cranwell Plan** has been received as a submission but has also drawn support from other submitters.
- 6.28.12 As a starting point David Cranwell's recommended Plan for the Arthur's Path exotic woodland area seeks to firstly ensure that no trees are felled but also seeks the following goals;
- carrying out of rigorous scientific investigation into the health of the trees
  - tree retention through professional arborist management
  - the area be restored and enhanced, including weed eradication
  - the development of walkway extensions
  - the ongoing use of local arborists with local expertise, the need for appropriate storm water management
  - the removal of poor trees
  - the need for a proper community inclusive action plan for weed control, arborist work and planting
  - culturing of community support for a shared Council – Community approach and the installation of history panels to respect the heritage of the area.
- 6.28.13 The David Cranwell Plan would also initially reduce expenditure on felling costs but would require additional expenditure on an increased level of service in the care and maintenance of weed species and the trees.
- 6.28.14 Collectively all of the alternative plans attract some level of support above that of the draft plan that was released for consultation. While it would be easy to support one of the more popular approaches, it should be noted that these reports have not been openly included in wider consultation and therefore there is a risk that by picking one plan over the others, other members of community or even current submitters, may feel marginalised and isolated from the decision making process.
- 6.28.15 On this basis it would seem prudent to not pick an individual plan from the four choices but rather look to commence a process that brings all parties and plans together to create a more widely accepted solution. It is also important to note that the likely costs of the alternate plans are unknown so Council should be wary of being tempted to picking a plan without knowing the financial implications on the ratepayer.
- 6.29 ***Option 4 – Commence the formulation of a new community led tree management plan***
- 6.29.1 As discussed above, bulk of the submissions and the alternative tree management plans all suggest not progressing with the draft plan and to varying degrees recommend that an alternative approach could be adopted to achieve a sustainable and community supported solution.
- 6.29.2 The Arborlab peer review recommends saving the oaks and includes other recommended actions including;
- Slow removal of less significant trees

- Removal of weed species trees for the good of the wider woodland.
  - Increase in general maintenance
  - arborist interventions on number of trees
  - Review of replacement tree list to select correct trees for location
- 6.29.3 Similarly, the Richie Hill report seeks to provide an assessment that would protect and preserve the woodland and historic values of Keirunga Gardens. Key recommendations of this plan include;
- Protection of the high amenity landscape values of the woodland area
  - Storm water management
  - Arborist interventions including removal and reductions on a number of trees
  - Need for a clear strategy on tree management with sound policies for working on and around trees
  - Public consultation
  - Pest weed destruction
  - Accessing community funding streams
  - Get experts together to form a committee group
  - Review the Reserve Management Plan
- 6.29.4 Similarly David Cranwell's recommended Plan for the Arthur's Path exotic woodland area seeks to firstly ensure that no trees are felled but also seeks the follows goals;
- Rigorous scientific investigation into the health of the trees
  - Tree retention through professional arborist management
  - The area be restored and enhanced, including weed eradication
  - Walkway extensions
  - local arborists with local expertise
  - Storm water management
  - Removal of poor trees
  - Need for a proper community inclusive action plan for weed control, arborist work and planting
  - Get community support as a Council – Community approach
  - History panels to respect the heritage of the area
- 6.29.5 The Draft Plan also includes goals and objectives that sit comfortably with many of the alternate plan's aims including the removal of unsafe trees, improving tree quality, monitoring tree health and the selection of appropriate replacement trees.
- 6.29.6 There are a number of common threads among the alternative plans that include recommended ways of preserving and enhancing Keirunga Gardens as a historic site and community asset. It is noted that the Keirunga Gardens Reserve Management Plan is now ten years old and could be considered as a priority for review. It is also timely that with the 2021-31 Long Term Plan (LTP) review just over the horizon. If a review was seen as priority, any new actions recommended by the community for Keirunga Gardens, could be included in the LTP mix of actions and priorities.
- 6.29.7 As discussed in the Option 3 assessments above, all of the alternatives come with recommended additional care which will come at an increased

cost. These financial implications would need to be considered alongside Council's other competing demands.

- 6.29.8 By commencing a Community – Council partnership process, a considered and widely accepted development plan could be formulated over the next twelve months that draws on local expertise, accesses alternate resources and funding streams, while protecting the heritage integrity of Keirunga Gardens as a whole.
- 6.29.9 It is clear from the interest in the draft tree management plan that there is community support in developing a refreshed vision for Keirunga Gardens. This would include the treescape, paths, heritage items and the refreshed built facilities on site. If it is Council's desire, officers will look to prioritise the Keirunga Gardens Reserve Management Plan programme to start the review process.
- 6.29.10 By reprioritising work streams, the process can start later this year and seek to harness the momentum of those submitters who have shown a clear desire to be part of and contribute to a solution. A group of community minded leaders can be brought together to start the dialogue and form the nebulous of a steering group that can be key stakeholders on the reviewed plan.
- 6.29.11 Assuming Council agrees to undertake the review of the Reserve Management Plan, officers' note that it will take time to complete the review process. However, with the stakeholder group's guidance, and the valuable input suggested in the submissions and alternative plans, fundamental core actions such as weed management can commence immediately utilising the existing maintenance budget. Once the plan is reviewed and costed, it can be included in the draft 2021-31 LTP for consideration alongside other Council priorities.

## **7.0 PREFERRED OPTION/S AND REASONS**

- 7.1 Officers note that the draft tree management plan has attracted a great deal of public interest. This has led to the submitting of quality documents that have gained much public comment. Officers are clearly cognisant of the fact that the bulk of the submissions are clearly not supportive of the draft plan and its suggested vision for Keirunga Gardens.
- 7.2 As a general observation, it is also clear that the additional reports and submissions of those experts and those with arboriculture knowledge and experience agree on many areas for improvement, but they also have criticisms of some of the alternative plan approaches.
- 7.3 On this basis the over 200 submissions disagreeing with some of the more radical suggestions in the draft plan can be allowed. Furthermore, it would seem that the submissions of P Turley and others supporting the report of Richie Hill (Paper Street Tree Company), and the plan put forward by David Cranwell, offer an opportunity for collaborative Council and Community response, to move forward with a shared vision for Keirunga Gardens going into the next 100 years. It should also be noted that a number of the goals and objectives the draft plan also shared by the other plans. While the issue

has been very emotive, officers believe the shared areas and with areas of compromise, a joined up approach can be achieved.

- 7.4 While the submitted reports carry a lot of worthwhile detail, the cost to instigate is unknown but on initial review, is likely to be significant. In addition to ensure an open and transparent process, these approaches also be consulted upon with the wider community.
- 7.5 By bringing forward a review of the Keirunga Gardens Reserve Management Plan, it would seem to be the logical vehicle for sharing all the plans and for formulating a community led new vision for all of Keirunga Gardens.
- 7.6 In the interim Council can push on with some of the recommended maintenance tasks within the existing budget. Any increase in the level of service over and above the current levels will need to be considered along with other community priorities in the next Annual Plan. Officers have time over the coming months to get estimates together for Council's consideration. In the drafting of the 2020/21 Annual Plan.
- 7.7 Officers are aware that Councillors are yet to hear from the submitters. This report has been made available to the submitters including those speaking. Those choosing to speak to their written submissions, also have the opportunity to comment on the contents of this report as well.
- 7.8 While officers have a preference for Option 4 - commencing the formulation of a community led tree management plan (via the Reserve Management Plan,) no specific option is recommended. This is to ensure that Councillors have the opportunity to hear all verbal submissions, before making their decision. This will also ensure that the consultation process is robust and that any further delays on moving forward on planning for Keirunga Gardens are avoided.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

- A) That the report of the Parks Landscape and Projects Officer titled "Draft Keirunga Tree Management Plan" dated 30/05/2019 be received.**
- B) That Council adopts either:**
- i) Option 1 Status Quo – leave trees to nature and maintain for public safety only, or**
  - ii) Option 2 - Adopt the draft plan as consulted upon**
  - iii) Option 3 - Adopt one of the alternative plans**
  - iv) Option 4 - Commence the formulation of a new community led tree management plan**

**Attachments:**

- |   |   |                    |
|---|---|--------------------|
| 1 | Consultation timeline                                     | CFM-17-24-3-19-274 |
| 2 | Feedback analysis on Keirunga Garden Tree Management Plan | CG-14-1-01306      |

Submission No. 1 - Rita Smith	CFM-17-24-3-19-57	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 2 - Karen Cooper	CFM-17-24-3-19-58	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 3 - Alison Hussey	CFM-17-24-3-19-59	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 4 - Ruth Vincent	CFM-17-24-3-19-60	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 5 - Rowan Christopher	CFM-17-24-3-19-61	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 6 - Ngaire Mules nee Bacon	CFM-17-24-3-19-62	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 7 - Mark Walwyn	CFM-17-24-3-19-63	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 8 - Esther Seymour	CFM-17-24-3-19-64	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 9 - Antony Matheson	CFM-17-24-3-19-65	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 10 - Raewyn Towers	CFM-17-24-3-19-66	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 11 - Kathleen Bazzard	CFM-17-24-3-19-67	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 12 - Martin Bothma	CFM-17-24-3-19-68	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 13 - Michael Watson	CFM-17-24-3-19-69	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 14 - Heather Shannon	CFM-17-24-3-19-70	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 15 - Kate Dacre	CFM-17-24-3-19-71	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 16 - Emma Black	CFM-17-24-3-19-72	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 17 - Bob Pearce	CFM-17-24-3-19-73	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 18 - Linda Calder	CFM-17-24-3-19-74	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 19 - Sue Lusher	CFM-17-24-3-19-75	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 20 - Alison Cunningham	CFM-17-24-3-19-76	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 21 - Margaret MacKenzie	CFM-17-24-3-19-77	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 22 - Jessica Noiseux	CFM-17-24-3-19-78	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 23 - Zarihana Pere	CFM-17-24-3-19-79	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 24 - Rachel Smith	CFM-17-24-3-19-80	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 25 - Michelle Evans	CFM-17-24-3-19-81	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 26 - Greg Porcer	CFM-17-24-3-19-82	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 27 - Louise Ward	CFM-17-24-3-19-83	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 28 - John Hoogenburg	CFM-17-24-3-19-84	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 29 - Amy Martin	CFM-17-24-3-19-85	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 30 - Liam Bradbury	CFM-17-24-3-19-86	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 31 - Joseph Caradus	CFM-17-24-3-19-87	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 32 - Michael McLean	CFM-17-24-3-19-88	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 33 - Douglas Helm	CFM-17-24-3-19-89	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 34 - Rebecca Tait	CFM-17-24-3-19-90	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 35 - Tanya Douglas	CFM-17-24-3-19-91	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 36 - Shanon Tait	CFM-17-24-3-19-93	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 37 - Rachel Sedger	CFM-17-24-3-19-94	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 38 - Fiona Francois	CFM-17-24-3-19-95	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 39 - Brad Collett	CFM-17-24-3-19-96	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 40 - Kayleigh Coxon	CFM-17-24-3-19-97	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 41 - Kate Hager	CFM-17-24-3-19-98	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 42 - Warwick Thomson	CFM-17-24-3-19-99	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 43 - Angie Alexander	CFM-17-24-3-19-100	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 44 - Alan Alexander	CFM-17-24-3-19-101	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 45 - Emma Robertson	CFM-17-24-3-19-102	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 46 - Ali Evers-Swindell	CFM-17-24-3-19-103	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 47 - Sajith Muraleedharan	CFM-17-24-3-19-104	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 48 - Bronwyn Fryer	CFM-17-24-3-19-105	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 49 - Gordon Hills	CFM-17-24-3-19-106	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 50 - Samantha Hellyer	CFM-17-24-3-19-107	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 51 - Jane Fisher	CFM-17-24-3-19-108	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 52 - Jessica Robin	CFM-17-24-3-19-109	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 53 - George Mackenzie	CFM-17-24-3-19-110	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 54 - Jo Halstead	CFM-17-24-3-19-111	Vol 1 of 2



Submission No. 55 - Angela Bauerfeind	CFM-17-24-3-19-112	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 56 - Anne Davison	CFM-17-24-3-19-272	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 57 - Catherine Jauffret	CFM-17-24-3-19-113	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 58 - Sally Fagence	CFM-17-24-3-19-114	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 59 - Tracey Stansfield	CFM-17-24-3-19-115	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 60 - Lynnaire Nugent	CFM-17-24-3-19-116	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 61 - Bonnie Greene	CFM-17-24-3-19-117	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 62 - Kerrie Waby	CFM-17-24-3-19-118	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 63 - Josh Lynch	CFM-17-24-3-19-119	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 64 - Susan McCutcheon	CFM-17-24-3-19-120	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 65 - Mike Halliday	CFM-17-24-3-19-121	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 66 - Terry McGovern	CFM-17-24-3-19-122	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 67 - Stephanie McGovern	CFM-17-24-3-19-123	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 68 - David Allen	CFM-17-24-3-19-124	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 69 - Tina Small	CFM-17-24-3-19-125	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 70 - Shannyn Hansen	CFM-17-24-3-19-126	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 71 - John Cannon	CFM-17-24-3-19-127	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 72 - Natalie McClay	CFM-17-24-3-19-128	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 73 - Daniel Hewko	CFM-17-24-3-19-129	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 74 - Chrissy Harris	CFM-17-24-3-19-130	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 75 - Janet Wurts	CFM-17-24-3-19-131	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 76 - Kathryn Ingram	CFM-17-24-3-19-132	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 77 - Megan Young	CFM-17-24-3-19-133	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 78 - David Blackwell	CFM-17-24-3-19-134	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 79 - John Worden	CFM-17-24-3-19-135	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 80 - Nicola De Jesus	CFM-17-24-3-19-136	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 81 - Jenny Elliott	CFM-17-24-3-19-137	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 82 - Katharine White	CFM-17-24-3-19-138	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 83 - Rick Toner	CFM-17-24-3-19-139	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 84 - Chris Ryan	CFM-17-24-3-19-271	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 85 - Louise Beaumont	CFM-17-24-3-19-140	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 86 - Terrie Reddish	CFM-17-24-3-19-141	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 87 - Sylvia White	CFM-17-24-3-19-142	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 88 - Prue Lowry	CFM-17-24-3-19-143	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 89 - James Lowry	CFM-17-24-3-19-144	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 90 - Rose Wood	CFM-17-24-3-19-145	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 91 - Tatyana Gis	CFM-17-24-3-19-146	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 92 - Nigel Dawes	CFM-17-24-3-19-147	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 93 - Amanda Mickleson	CFM-17-24-3-19-148	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 94 - David Cranwell	CFM-17-24-3-19-54	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 95 - Amanda Mickleson	CFM-17-24-3-19-148	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 96 - Michelle Evans	CFM-17-24-3-19-149	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 97 - Alison Hussey	CFM-17-24-3-19-150	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 98 - No submission		Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 99 - Sue Boekhorst	CFM-17-24-3-19-151	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 100 - Johanna Bevin	CFM-17-24-3-19-152	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 101 - Andrew Norris	CFM-17-24-3-19-153	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 102 - Libby Warren	CFM-17-24-3-19-154	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 103 - Catherine Mintoft	CFM-17-24-3-19-155	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 104 - Stuart Perry	CFM-17-24-3-19-156	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 105 - Mark Holder	CFM-17-24-3-19-157	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 106 - Dale and Jenny Prebble	CFM-17-24-3-19-158	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 107 - Darryl Judd (109 combined)	CFM-17-24-3-19-159	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 108 - Patricia Frykberk	CFM-17-24-3-19-160	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 109 - Darryl Judd (combined with Submission No. 107)		Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 110 - Diane Sye	CFM-17-24-3-19-162	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 111 - Raewyn Towers	CFM-17-24-3-19-163	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 112 - Michael Newby	CFM-17-24-3-19-164	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 113 - Michael Nes	CFM-17-24-3-19-166	Vol 1 of 2

Submission No. 114 - Shanon Tait	CFM-17-24-3-19-167	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 115 - David Youngquest	CFM-17-24-3-19-168	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 116 - Mary MacKenzie	CFM-17-24-3-19-169	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 117 - Jane Mackersey	CFM-17-24-3-19-171	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 118 - David Trubridge	CFM-17-24-3-19-172	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 119 - Johnno Ormond	CFM-17-24-3-19-173	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 120 - Ruth Vincent	CFM-17-24-3-19-174	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 121 - Rachel Hudson	CFM-17-24-3-19-175	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 122 - Sue Stewart	CFM-17-24-3-19-176	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 123 - Stephen Brown	CFM-17-24-3-19-177	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 124 - Andrew Stent	CFM-17-24-3-19-178	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 125 - S Hudson	CFM-17-24-3-19-179	Vol 1 of 2
Submission No. 126 - HP	CFM-17-24-3-19-180	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 127 - Alan Franklin	CFM-17-24-3-19-181	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 128 - Alanda Rafferty	CFM-17-24-3-19-183	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 129 - Kylee Dunkerley	CFM-17-24-3-19-184	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 130 - Anita Kleinjan	CFM-17-24-3-19-185	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 131 - Ginny Redwood	CFM-17-24-3-19-186	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 132 - Adrian Cowie	CFM-17-24-3-19-187	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 133 - Anna Cana	CFM-17-24-3-19-188	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 134 - Dorothy Harrison	CFM-17-24-3-19-189	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 135 - Chris Ledword	CFM-17-24-3-19-190	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 136 - Robert Fuller	CFM-17-24-3-19-191	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 137 - David Head	CFM-17-24-3-19-194	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 138 - Linda Schwass	CFM-17-24-3-19-195	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 139 - Max Hurley	CFM-17-24-3-19-196	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 140 - Jane Hibbert	CFM-17-24-3-19-197	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 141 - Doug Bixley	CFM-17-24-3-19-198	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 142 - Bette Davis	CFM-17-24-3-19-199	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 143 - Bronwyn Watkins	CFM-17-24-3-19-200	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 144 - Shane Lagas	CFM-17-24-3-19-201	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 145 - Andy Horne	CFM-17-24-3-19-202	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 146 - Mike Head	CFM-17-24-3-19-203	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 147 - Ali Evers	CFM-17-24-3-19-204	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 148 - Kate Hurley	CFM-17-24-3-19-205	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 149 - Rod Searle	CFM-17-24-3-19-206	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 150 - Martin Davis	CFM-17-24-3-19-207	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 151 - Tracey Wilson	CFM-17-24-3-19-208	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 152 - Scott Hansen	CFM-17-24-3-19-209	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 153 - Clare Sambrook	CFM-17-24-3-19-210	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 154 - Penny Triandafilidis	CFM-17-24-3-19-211	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 155 - Monique Weir	CFM-17-24-3-19-212	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 156 - Miriam Sage	CFM-17-24-3-19-213	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 157 - Liam Bergstrom	CFM-17-24-3-19-214	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 158 - Nigel Dawes	CFM-17-24-3-19-215	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 159 - Elaine Prakash	CFM-17-24-3-19-216	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 160 - Ellen Looij	CFM-17-24-3-19-217	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 161 - Catherine Reeves	CFM-17-24-3-19-218	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 162 - Tim Dorward	CFM-17-24-3-19-219	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 163 - Rob Reeves	CFM-17-24-3-19-220	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 164 - John Stace	CFM-17-24-3-19-221	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 165 - Colin Shields	CFM-17-24-3-19-222	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 166 - Jessica Maxwell	CFM-17-24-3-19-223	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 167 - Jan Wilson	CFM-17-24-3-19-224	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 168 - Caroline Rees	CFM-17-24-3-19-225	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 169 - Ngaire Mules (nee Bacon)	CFM-17-24-3-19-226	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 170 - Roger Mulvay	CFM-17-24-3-19-227	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 171 - Peter Egerton	CFM-17-24-3-19-228	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 172 - Angela Cottingham	CFM-17-24-3-19-229	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 173 - Berry Small - Keirunga Garden Heritage	CFM-17-24-3-19-230	Vol 2 of 2

## Action Society

Submission No. 174 - Terry and Steph McGovern	CFM-17-24-3-19-231	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 175 - Lyn Fippard	CFM-17-24-3-19-232	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 176 - RT Moorhead	CFM-17-24-3-19-233	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 177 - Stuart and Jenny Sowersby	CFM-17-24-3-19-234	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 178 - Leigh and Grant Whitfield	CFM-17-24-3-19-235	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 179 - Shirley Lammas and Tony Corbett	CFM-17-24-3-19-236	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 180 - Andrew and Cheryl Whitworth	CFM-17-24-3-19-237	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 181 - Sophie Lankovsky	CFM-17-24-3-19-238	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 182 - Darryl Mitchell	CFM-17-24-3-19-239	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 183 - Marion and Keith Carey-Smith	CFM-17-24-3-19-240	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 184 - Keirunga Gardens Heritage Action Group	CFM-17-24-3-19-241	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 185 - Joe Leete	CFM-17-24-3-19-242	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 186 - Anne Crutchley	CFM-17-24-3-19-243	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 187 - Pat Turley	CFM-17-24-3-19-244	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 188 - Jenny Cumberbeach	CFM-17-24-3-19-245	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 189 - Leith Wilson	CFM-17-24-3-19-246	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 190 - Ian Wilson	CFM-17-24-3-19-247	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 191 - Nicky Manning	CFM-17-24-3-19-248	Vol 2 of 2
Submission Nos. 192 and 204 - Jean Hudson	CFM-17-24-3-19-249	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 193 - Brian Pattullo	CFM-17-24-3-19-250	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 194 - Rita and Barry Motley	CFM-17-24-3-19-251	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 195 - Ethne Ainge	CFM-17-24-3-19-252	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 196 - Kim Salamonson	CFM-17-24-3-19-253	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 197 - Paulette Johnston	CFM-17-24-3-19-254	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 198 - Harold Neal	CFM-17-24-3-19-257	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 199 - Kate Tweedie	CFM-17-24-3-19-258	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 200 - Darryl Mitchell	CFM-17-24-3-19-259	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 201 - Guy Wellwood	CFM-17-24-3-19-260	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 202 - Robin Sage	CFM-17-24-3-19-261	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 203 - Kate White, Lux Harvey, Juno and Siiva Harvey	CFM-17-24-3-19-262	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 204 - Jean Hudson (refer 192)		Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 205 - Michael Broadbent	CFM-17-24-3-19-264	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 206 - Guy Wellwood	CFM-17-24-3-19-265	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 207 - Susan and Darryl Judd	CFM-17-24-3-19-266	Vol 2 of 2
Submission 208 - Peter Marshall	CFM-17-24-3-19-268	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 209 - Yvonne James	CFM-17-24-3-19-269	Vol 2 of 2
Submission No. 210 - V Howles	CFM-17-24-3-19-270	Vol 2 of 2

CFM-17-24-3-19-274

**KEIRUNGA GARDENS TREE MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS****SEQUENCE OF EVENTS**

Event	Date	Detail information/notes:
Whole of tree failure near playground	Sept 2014	A large Oak tree failed near the playground. Tree was subsequently removed.
Neighbouring resident phoned Council	Nov 2014	Resident asked for large limbs to be pruned back to boundary as they are overhanging his property with specific focus on the house. Large branches overhanging dwelling.
Neighbouring resident requests site visit to discuss overhanging branches		Resident advises during a site visit to his property that his insurance company won't cover his property unless something is done to reduce the limbs over his dwelling. The two subject trees are 25m+ and are both 1-2m from boundary with large limbs directly over dwelling.
Neighbouring resident rings Council	July 2016	Report of concern over dead wood and long branches reaching across boundary over property. Council tree team reduces limbs along boundary.
Neighbouring resident contacts Council to voice concern over a number of large limb failures adjacent to his property	2017	Resident has voiced his concerns over the risk posed by the Oak trees nearest his property and has complained that the reduction work along his boundary has not pulled the extent of limbs back from the boundary as much as other areas.
Resident requests site visit with Jason Moule (Council Arborist) & Bart Leslie (HDC)	Jan 2017	Jason advised that some reduction work has already been carried out adjacent to resident's property. Resident not satisfied with amount of work done and wants more work done on the canopy to reduce height & shading on his new dwelling and swimming pool. Jason and Bart explain verbally while on site that legally the resident is within his rights to prune to the boundary, however this is not considered best practice and that any work carried out on Council trees is to be done by Council tree team or approved contractors.
Unsanctioned tree work carried out on trees adjacent to resident's property without any prior warning	2017	Discussion had with resident who states there must have been a misunderstanding
Chris Ryan rings Council	Feb 2017	Discussion on state of trees and the need for some long term tree management planning.

CFM-17-24-3-19-274

Event	Date	Detail information/notes:
Cyclone Cook - 2 whole of tree failures	April 2017	One Poplar failed near Tanner Str entrance, and one mature Oak tree midway up Arthur's Path. Both trees removed. Poplar unearths adjacent power transformer cutting power to the area. The Oak smashes an adjacent footbridge.
Neighbouring resident called Council	April 2017	Resident wanting to discuss the possibility of removing these Oak trees due to the storm bringing one down the previous weekend (Cyclone Cook).
Approx 150mm limb fails and lands on lawn at 9 Kopanga Road	May 2017	Failed limb is cleaned up by Council tree team
Whole of tree failure in Arthur's Path	2017	Large Oak tree failed onto two smaller Oaks below. Large tree removed and two trees below had broken branches removed.
Trees on Kopanga resident's boundary given reduction prune back to boundary as much as possible to balance risk and aesthetics	2017	Trees pruned back to boundary to attempt to balance risk from trees & aesthetics. Neither residents nor community entirely happy with result.
Proarbore carry out 50% reduction prune on two Oaks adjacent to 9b Kopanga Rd	Aug 2017	Proarbore carry out 50% reduction prune on two trees adjacent to 9b Kopanga with the intention to retain the trees while managing the risk posed by these two trees which are very close to the boundary (1-1.5m).
Neighbouring resident called regarding Oak tree reduction	Aug 2017	Resident enquired as to why the trees were pruned so heavily compared to others along the boundary. This is because these two trees were closest to the boundary with the dwelling at 9b Kopanga being closest to the boundary.
Neighbouring resident called regarding Oak tree reduction	Aug 2017	Resident enquired as to why the trees were pruned so heavily compared to others along the boundary. This is because these two trees were closest to the boundary with the dwelling at 9b Kopanga being closest to the boundary.
Meeting between Mayor, Colin Hosford & residents to discuss 50% reduction prune	Aug 2017	Decision is made to remove these two trees
Whole of tree failure in Arthur's Path	2018	Oak failed and was removed



CFM-17-24-3-19-274

Event	Date	Detail information/notes:
Whole of tree failure in Arthur's Path	Nov 2017	Large Oak tree failed onto adjacent Oak tree requiring both to be removed. Stumps were trimmed.
Initial Report to Landmarks	Dec 2017	Report to Landmarks Advisory Group on the Tree Management Plan.
Whole of tree failure in Arthur's Path	2018	Gum tree failed during storm
Whole of tree failure beside Homestead	2018	Large Melia tree beside Homestead failed during storm
Whole of tree failure in Arthur's Path	2018	Large gum tree near cemetery failed during storm requiring adjacent gum to be removed as it was deemed unsafe.
Richard Moorhead phones Council	Jan 2018	Concern over white paint marks on trees. White marks were to assist with tree survey at the outset of plan development.
Report to Landmarks on Keirunga Gardens and the recent history of tree failure.	Oct 2018	
Consultation meeting advertised	Oct 2018	Consultation meeting advertised in HB Today and Village Press, flyer to local residents around perimeter of KGs, Comms to HNth Business Assoc, posters in HNth library and HNth community centre.
Site visit with Chris Ryan, Landmarks Advisory Group, some Councillors associated with Landmarks.	Oct 2018	Site visit to look at Arthur's path area and allow Chris to present his view of what is happening with the trees
Public consultation meeting	Oct 2018	First public meeting for Chris Ryan to present his draft TMP. Request to have walk & talk tours through Arthur's Path to allow Chris to further explain his proposal.
Draft Keirunga Gardens Tree Management Plan put out for consultation and feedback	Nov 2018	
Peer review from Arborlab on draft TMP and risk assessment received	Jan 2019	
Arborlab Report received	Feb 2019	
Consultation extended 3 times closing 12 April 2019	April 2019	

CFM-17-24-3-19-274

Event	Date	Detail information/notes:
Report to Council to confirm a tree management plan	May 2019	

**Note:** Majority of tree failures occurring during storm events, particularly high wind & rain events where ground is soft with high wind loading.

**Dates for cyclones:**

Cyclone Debbie 23 March – 7 April 2017

Cyclone Hola 3-13 March 2018

Entry Id	Name	Strongly Agree-Strongly Disagree	Summary of submissions	Key Themes
1	Rita Smith	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More regular mowing of grass.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
2	Karen Cooper	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve tree maintenance
3	Alison Hussey	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve tree maintenance
4	Ruth Vincent	Agree	Remove dangerous trees. Extend timeframe for tree replacement. More regular maintenance. Wider species variety desirable	3- Remove dangerous trees, 5 - Extend timeframe for replacement,
5	Rowan Christopher	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove only dangerous trees	1 - Retain trees, 3 - Remove dangerous trees
6	Ngairé Mules (nee Bacon)	Disagree	Retain the Oaks. Modify proposed replacement species palette. Remove only dangerous trees.	1 - Retain trees, 3 - Remove dangerous trees, 6 - Modify replacement palette
7	Mark Walwyn	Agree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
8	Esther Seymour	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible.	1 - Retain trees
9	Antony Matheson	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
10	Raewyn Towers	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
11	Kathleen Bazzard	Strongly Agree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
12	Martin Bothma	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
13	Michael Watson	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
14	Heather Simon	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
15	Kate Dacre	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
16	Emma Black	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
17	Bob Pearce	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
18	Linda Calder	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
19	Sue Lusher	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees



20	Alison Cunningham	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
21	Margaret Mackenzie	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
22	Jessica Noiseux	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
23	Zarihana Pere	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3- remove dangerous trees
24	Rachel Smith	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, , 3 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
25	Michelle Evans	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3- remove dangerous trees
26	Greg Porcer	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
27	Louise Ward	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
28	John Hoogerbrug	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
29	Amy Martin	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
30	Liam Bradbury	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
31	Joseph Caradus	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
32	Michael Mclean	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
33	Douglas Helm	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
34	Rebecca Tait	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3- remove dangerous trees
35	Tanya Douglas	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
36	Shanon Tait	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
37	Rachel Sedger	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Install warning signs.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance,
38	Fiona Francois	Strongly Agree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
39	Brad Collett	Strongly Disagree	Retain as brny trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
40	Kayleigh Coxon	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees

41	Kate Hager	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees	1 - Retain trees
42	Warwick Thomson	Disagree	Extend timeframe for tree replacement to individual trees as required. More maintenance	2 - Improve park maintenance, 5 - Extend timeframe for replacement
43	Angie Alexander	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Request for better facilities & play areas for Flaxmere.	1 - Retain trees, 9 - Outside scope of draft plan (flaxmere request)
44	Alan Alexander	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible.	1 - Retain trees
45	Emma Robertson	Strongly Agree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
46	Ali Evers-Swindell	Strongly Disagree		1 - Retain trees
47	Sajith Muraleedharan	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
48	Bronwyn Fryer	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
49	Gordon Hills	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
50	Samantha Hellyer	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
51	Jane Fisher	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
52	Jessica Robin	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
53	George Mackenzie	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
54	Jo Halstead	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
55	Angela Bauerfeind	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
56	Anne Davison	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
57	Catherine Jauffret	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
58	Sally Fagence	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
59	Tracey Stansfield	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
60	Lynnaire Nugent	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Plant native groundcovers. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance
61	Bonnie Greene	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance
62	Kerrie Waby	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Support Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report

63	Josh Lynch	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Support Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
64	Susan McCutcheon	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
65	Mike Halliday	Strongly Agree	Supports Draft plan	5- Supports Draft plan
66	Terry McGovern	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Support Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
67	Stephanie McGovern	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Support Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
68	David Allen	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
69	Tina Small	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Support Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
70	Shannyn Hansen	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Support Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
71	John Cannon	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Supports Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
72	Natalie McClay	Strongly Disagree	Retain the trees. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
73	Daniel Hewko	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Selective removal of hazardous trees only	1 - Retain trees, 3- remove dangerous trees
74	Chrissy Harris	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
75	Janet Wurts	Neither Agree or Disagree	Increased tree species variety desirable. Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
76	Kathryn Ingram	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
77	Megan Young	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
78	David Blackwell	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
79	John Worden	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
80	Nicola De Jesus	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
81	Jenny Elliott	Agree	Supports draft plan but asks whether other experts could be brought in to help	5 - Supports draft plan (with expert assistance)
82	Katharine White	Strongly Disagree	Support Richie Hill Report. Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
83	Rick Toner	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance
84	Kate Tweedie	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
85	Louise Beaumont	Disagree	Suggests a heritage assessment of the Keirunga Gardens landscape be done.	1 - Retain trees (and undertake a heritage assessment)

86	Terrie Reddish	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
87	Sylvia White	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks.	1 - Retain trees
88	Prue Lowry	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
89	James Lowry	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
90	Rose Wood	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
91	Tatyana Gis	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible replace at end of life	1 - Retain trees
92	Nigel Dawes	Strongly Disagree	Retain the trees. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
93	Kate White	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks. Support Arborlab Report	1 - Retain trees, 6 - Supports Arborlab plan
94	David Cranwell	Strongly Disagree	Support Richie Hill Report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
95	Amanda Mickleson	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
96	Michelle Evans	Neither Agree or Disagree	Support Arborlab report	6 - Supports Arborlab plan
97	Alison Hussey	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance. Install irrigation system for new trees.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
99	Sue Boekhorst	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
100	Johanna Bevin	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
101	Andrew Norris	Strongly Disagree	Support an outcome between the Arborlab & Richie Hill Report	7 - Support Richie Hill Report, 6 - Supports Arborlab plan
102	Libby Warren	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab Report. Don't want native underplantings	9 - Supports Arborlab plan
103	Catherine Mintoft	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks. Support Richie Hill report.	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report
104	Stuart Perry	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab report. More maintenance	3 - Improve park maintenance, 6 - Supports Arborlab plan
105	Mark Holder	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab report	9 - Supports Arborlab plan
106	Dale and Jenny Prebble	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Caution proposed planting of Loquat & syzigium	1 - Retain trees, 6 - Modify planting palette
107	Darryl Judd	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
108	Patricia Frykberg	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 3 - Improve park maintenance
109	Darryl Judd		refer 107	
110	Diane Sye	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible.	1 - Retain trees



111	Raewyn Towers	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab report.	6 - Supports Arborlab plan
112	Michael Newby	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab report.	6 - Supports Arborlab plan
113	Michael Nes	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Extend timeframe for tree replacement	1 - Retain trees, 5 - Extend timeframe for replacement
114	Shanon tait	Strongly Agree	Support Arborlab report.	6 - Supports Arborlab plan
115	David Youngquest	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab report.	6 - Supports Arborlab plan
116	Mary MacKenzie	Strongly Disagree	Retain native trees. NB: No native trees proposed to be cut	1 - Retain trees
117	Jane Mackersey	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible.	1 - Retain trees
118	David Trubridge	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
119	Johnno Ormond	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab report.	6 - Supports Arborlab plan
120	Ruth Vincent for Landmarks Trust	Disagree	Support Arborlab report. Subject to amendments based on additional expertise. Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance, plant large trees	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 6 - Supports Arborlab plan (subject to additional expertise)
121	Rachel Hudson	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks. Buy back Prebensen property. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees, 9 - Outside scope of draft plan (prebenson purchase)
122	Sue Stewart	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
123	Stephen Brown	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks. Plant woodland plants like bluebells. Buy back Prebensen property	1 - Retain trees, 8 Miscellaneous (Modify planting palette) 9 - Outside scope of draft plan
124	Andrew Stent	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
125	S Hudson	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
126	H Petera	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
127	Alan Franklin	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
128	Alanda Rafferty	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
129	Kylee Dunderley	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
130	Anita Kleinjan	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
131	Ginny Redwood	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
132	Adrian Cowie	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2- Improve park maintenance

133	Anna Cana	Strongly Disagree		1 - Retain trees
134	Dorothy Harrison	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
135	Chris Ledwood	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
136	Robert Fuller	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 3 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
137	David Head	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
138	Linda Schwass	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
139	Max Hurley	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
140	Jane Hibbert	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 3 - Improve park maintenance
141	Doug Bixley	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
142	Bette Davis	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 3 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - remove dangerous trees
143	Bronwyn Watkins	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
144	Shane Lagas	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
145	Andy Horne	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
146	Mike Head	Strongly Disagree	Leave the area alone	1 - Retain trees
147	Ali Evers	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
148	Kate Hurley	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
149	Rod Searle	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
150	Martin Davis	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
151	Tracey Wilson	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees
152	Scott Hansen	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
153	Clare Sambrook	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
154	Penny Triandafilidis	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
155	Monique Weir	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks	1 - Retain trees

156	Miriam Sage	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
157	Liam Bergstom	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
158	Nigel Dawes	Strongly Disagree	Supports both the Arborlab report & Richie Hill report	1 - Retain trees, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report, 6 - Supports Arborlab plan
159	Elaine Prakash	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
160	Ellen Looij	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
161	Catherine Reeves	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
162	Tim Dorward	Disagree	Retain as tiny trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
163	Rob Reeves	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
164	John Stace	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
165	Colin Shields	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
166	Jessica Maxwell	Strongly Disagree	Support Richie Hill report. Requests several associated actions as contained in full copy of submission attached. Issues include lack of maintenance, poor planning, too radical an approach to replanting	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - Supports Richie Hill Report
167	Jan Wilson	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
168	Caroline Rees	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only. Improve tracks.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees
169	Ngaire Mules (nee Bacon)	Neither Agree or Disagree	In response to Arborlab report - Retain as many trees as possible including Eucalyptus for bird food source.	1 - Retain trees
170	Roger Mulvay	Strongly Disagree	Support Arborlab report. Extend timeframe for tree replacement	6 - Supports Arborlab plan, 8 - Miscellaneous Issues (Extend timeframe for replacement)
171	Peter Egerton	Disagree	Retain the trees, Leave best self sown trees to develop. Reactive response.	1 - Retain trees
172	Angela Cottingham	Strongly Disagree	Retain the Oaks. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
173	Berry Small	Strongly Agree	Supports draft plan	5 - Supports Draft plan
174	Terry & Steph McGovern	Strongly Disagree	Seeks other more considered options	1 - Retain trees
175	Lyn Fippard	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Improve tracks. More large tree species. Support engaging independent Arborists. Investigate swimming pool drainage into Reserve. More maintenance. Groves of flowering and fruiting varieties desirable.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 8 - Miscellaneous Issues
176	Richard Moorhead	Agree	Retain the English woodland theme. Remove silver birch.	1 - Retain trees (woodland theme) 5 - Supports Draft Plan
177	Stuart & Jenny Sowersby	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees, 5 - Supports Draft plan

178	Leigh & Grant Whitfield	Agree	Need irrigation. Question whether upper track is required. Consider privacy. Consider rodents attracted to edible varieties. Manage weeds. Include QR codes. Consider plaques on trees.	5 - Supports Draft plan, 8 - Miscellaneous Issues,	
179	Shirley Lammas & Tony Corbett	Disagree	Retain existing woodland character. Extend timeframe for tree replacement. Consider privacy. Consider boundary fence with their property. Consider impact of tree removal on birdlife.	1 - Retain trees (woodland theme) 8 - Miscellaneous Issues (Extend timeframe for replacement), (Privacy and Boundary Fence)	
180	Andrew & Cheryl Whitworth	Agree	Irrigation required. Arboretum concept desirable. Recognise tree failure in last few years and the need to address this. Funding needs to be secured to support the plan.	5 - Supports Draft plan,	check Bart
181	Sophie Lankowsky	Agree	Arboretum concept desirable	5 - Supports Draft plan	
182	Darryl Mitchell	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove trees as they fail. Control weeds. More maintenance. Plant out the already clear areas.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees	
183	Marion & Keith Carey Smith	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Install warning signs. Control weeds. Extend timeframe for tree replacement. Remove dangerous trees only.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 3 - remove dangerous trees, 5 - Extend timeframe for replacement	
184	Keirunga Gardens Heritage Action Society	Agree	Recommend planting out open areas straight away. A wider variety of tree species is desirable. Do not believe that trimming the Oaks as per Arborlab report is a good long term decision.	5 - Supports Draft plan, 8 - Miscellaneous Issues	
185	Joe Leete	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Supports David Cranwell submission. More maintenance.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 7 - Supports D Cranwell Report	
186	Anne Crutchley	Agree	More maintenance.	2 - Improve park maintenance, 5 - Supports Draft plan	
187	Pat Turley	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance. Support Richie Hill report. Sponsorship for trees.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 4 - Support Richie Hill Report,	
188	Jenny Cumberbeach	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance. More native species. Retain natural character of existing tracks. Extend timeframe for tree replacement.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance, 5 Extend timeframe for replacement, 8- Miscellaneous Issues (extend timeframe)	
189	Leith Wilson	Strongly Agree	Supports draft plan. Retain exotic woodland character. Control weeds. Secure budget. Consider allergy impact of olive & acacia.	5- Supports Draft plan	
190	Ian Wilson	Strongly Agree	Supports draft plan. Retain exotic woodland character. Control weeds. Secure budget. Consider allergy impact of olive & acacia	5- Supports Draft plan	
191	Nicky Manning	Strongly Disagree	Extend the timeframe for tree replacement (10-15 years)	1 - Retain trees,	
192	Jean Hudson	Strongly Disagree	Improve track maintenance. Control weeds. Retain as many trees as possible. Retain English woodland character.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance	
193	Brian Patullo	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible.	1 - Retain trees	
194	Rita & Barry Motley	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. Remove dangerous trees only.	1 - Retain trees, 3 - remove dangerous trees	
195	Ethne Ainge	Strongly Agree	Retains trees	1 - Retain trees	
196	Kim Salamonson	Strongly Agree	Retain trees	1 - Retain trees	
197	Paulette Johnson	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees. What is the definition of useable life of a tree.	1 - Retain trees	



198	Harold Neal	Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible. More maintenance	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
199	Kate Tweedie	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
200	Darryl Mitchell		duplicate 102	
201	Guy Wellwood	Strongly Agree	More maintenance. Supports draft plan	2 - Improve park maintenance, 5 - Supports Draft plan
202	Robin Sage	Strongly Disagree	Supports Arborlab Report. More maintenance	2 - Improve park maintenance, 6 - Supports Arborlab plan
203	Kay White	Strongly Disagree	Retain as many trees as possible	1 - Retain trees
204	Jean Hudson	Strongly Disagree	Retain trees	1 - Retain trees
205	Michael Broadbent	Neither Agree or Disagree	Consider weed species and birdlife. Tracks need improving ("low impact path improvements"). Disagree with mass removal. Extend timeframe for tree replacement. Supports Arborlab report.	2 - Improve park maintenance, 8 Miscellaneous Issues ( Extend timeframe for replacement) 6- Supports Arborlab plan
206	Guy Wellwood	Strongly Agree		duplicate of 201
207	Darryl Judd	Neither Agree or Disagree		duplicate of 109
208	Peter Marshall	Strongly Disagree	Auger columns in feeder root zone and fill with media to promote healthy root growth. Retain as many trees as possible. Underplant with Renga lily. Create loop track.	1 - Retain trees, 2 - Improve park maintenance
209	Yvonne James	Strongly Disagree	Wants to know who the author's of the Chris report and their qualifications. Suggets talking to	1 - Retain trees, 8 Miscellaneous Issues ??? Bart
210	Vivienne Howles		Supports Arborlab Report. More maintenance. Improve tracks.	2 - Improve park maintenance, 6 - Supports Arborlab plan