

## **Feedback from consultation brochures June 2012**

### **Heritage buildings and places. June 2012**

#### **NZ Historic Places Trust**

There are few archaeological sites listed on the Inventory of Protected features. NZHPT supports an initiative by the Council to list significant arch sites for protection in the district plan. NZHPT are happy to assist with this. .

NZHPT enclosed an up to date list of NZHPT registered buildings in the District and encouraged the council to update its inventory accordingly including adding the one property not listed in the Council inventory (Southfork). NZHPT would like the council to focus on adding arch sites as the current inventory is reasonably extensive in terms of built heritage. Other local heritage groups may propose further additions. NZHPT would be interested to receive information on any buildings the council may consider for inclusion in the inventory as some of these may be worthy of registration.

NZHPT thinks it is essential to identify the values of the heritage landscapes so Council staff can properly assess the effects of activities on these areas and clarify the important values for applicants. Identification of values should focus on interrelationship between features and individual features. NZHPT's discussions paper on heritage landscapes may assist.

Supportive of putting assessment criteria in rural zone for earthworks and suggest putting provisions regarding heritage landscapes in the subdivision rules too

The 900ha Mt Aurum recreation reserve that Bullendale lies within may be appropriate as a heritage landscape rather than including Bullendale in the Inventory of protected features. Alternatively this could be included as an extension to the adjacent Skippers heritage landscape.

### **Heritage trees. June 2012**

#### **GF Ritchie & GW Blathwayt**

No concern about having to get an arborists report but does have concern about having to get a resource consent due to the cost of the consent. The consent process should be by negotiation between the owners of the property and the Council.

If a tree is not appropriate for a high density area it should not be identified as a heritage tree. This should be the subject of a discussion between the owner and the Council.

If there is a heritage tree on a property whose responsibility is it if the tree falls or branches fall and damage property or risk life?

If a tree is in the middle of a lawn or garden is protection of it appropriate given that work in proximity of the tree requires a resource consent.

Regarding maintenance of hedges a discussion should take place between an arbourist and council.

If additional trees are to be added to the list of heritage trees a discussion should take place between the council and the property owner. It is not a decision for the council to decide unilaterally.

#### **Bruce Johnston**

As caretakers of 3 heritage trees we appreciated the recent offer of pruning and maintenance funding. We took advantage of this and the trees look much better and are now more balanced.

The trees shed a huge amount of foliage in March every year which requires much effort to rake up and dispose of. Any assistance with this cost would be appreciated.

Regarding the rules about work within 5m or the dripline there have been roading and paths constructed pretty close with no sign of damage to the trees. So the current rules seem to work OK.

Regarding dead or dying trees I believe consent should still be required for removal.

### **R & EM Heywood**

We live in Lower Shotover Road and have a roadside hawthorn hedge and one planted by us.

We want to reiterate our original submission that appropriate pruning should be permitted without requiring a resource consent.

It is important that the extent of pruning allows for maintenance of healthy hedgerows and to provide adequate visibility to safely pull out onto the road.

Some older hedgerows have been neglected and need substantial pruning to get them under control. The proposed wording should be more general and practical such as "maintenance pruning of hedgerows may be undertaken without resource consent in order to provide good visibility of oncoming traffic and ensure the long term well being of the plants."

### **Gordon Bailey**

- Dead or near dead heritage trees, should be able to be signed off by a Qualified and Council recognised arborist that they are dead and no consent needed.
- Roots - the best scenario is a horses for course one but I am not sure how you would develop a rule around it as drip line doesn't work for trees such as Poplar and often for large trees like Sequoia 5m doesn't actually make the drip line so is clearly too small. However something is better than nothing, so what about say 5m or 2m out from the drip line whatever is the larger.
- Hedges should be allowed to be pruned as a hedge with no consent required after all that's what a hedge is for.

### **Nat Craig**

1. Consent should remain a requirement to remove a dead, dying or unsafe tree. Only requiring an arborist report could leave the process open to abuse.

2. A 5 metre control area from the base of a heritage tree is adequate. While different species have differing root systems, most species can be safely managed with a 5 metre control radius. This has been shown to be the case with existing heritage trees provided they are professionally managed by arborists. Damage is usually done when inexperienced work is carried out near root systems. Rather than extending the control distance it would be preferable to have work near the root systems supervised by an arborist. Extending a control area beyond 5 metres could also be claimed as onerous by some property owners who may seek compensation from council for loss of development opportunity, if it was shown that alternatives were adequate.

3. The pruning percentage does need review as 10% appears too little.

Heritage Landscapes. June 2012

### **Russell Hamilton on behalf of Soho Properties Ltd**

Wilding trees are of a major concern and Mt Soho is carrying out a comprehensive eradication programme. Trees on others land, esp. Crown land, provide a seed source which impacts on adjacent landowners. He requests a rule for all landholders, including the Crown to remove wilding trees to be inserted in the district plan.

### **R Hewitt Heritage Maori sites**

No recognition of maori history in the QLDC libraries or offices. And no recognition in Wanaka. He wants local artefacts to come back to the area. They could be put on display in the Wanak Library or DOC office. Concerned that Maori sites are being destroyed. . He asks why pre excavation has not been required by the Council when development applications are approved in areas where there are likely to be archaeological deposits. He wonders if the runanga are given long enough to comment on resource consent applications. Officers at QLDC should read the Nga

Tahu iwei management plans and develop an action plan in consultation and agreement with Ngai Tahu through Te Ao Marama and KTKO Ltd.