



Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan

Plan Change 08

**Summary of Submissions received by Marlborough District
Council**

December 2009

Table of Contents

Section Reference	Section Description	Page
GC	General Comment	1
Maps	Volume Three Planning Maps	1
V2/App A/Heritage Trees	Volume 2 Appendix A Heritage Trees	2
	Alphabetical index of Submitters (by surname) for Plan Change 08	5
	Numerical index of Submitters for Plan Change 08	6

Submission Summary - Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan - Plan Change 08 Heritage Tree Update - By Section

GC - General Comment

John and Judy Hellstrom - Submitter #: 8 Submission Point : 13

This submission contends that possibly the oldest and grandest tree in Marlborough has been left of the list for heritage tree protection, being the big Rimu of Howden's Bush.

This submission makes a case for protection of this ancient and grand Rimu, which is located at grid reference 2609853E 6011796N - approximately 50m off the Queen Charlotte Track.

The submitter believes that tree to be 1000-2000 years old and being very significant historically. The submitters also states that the tree is currently suffering damage and that it requires protection from further damage.

The submitters request that the circumference area of the tree canopy be protected, or at least its root mound be protected to prevent further damage occurring. The submitter believes that the listing of the tree is possibly the only option available at this point to save the tree from irrevocable harm, and that some form of root mound protection, even fencing, would protect the essential part of the trees life support system from further damage.

Relief sought: That the Rimu of Howden's Bush be protected.

Maps - Volume 3 Planning Maps

B R and G C Smith - Submitter #: 6 Submission Point : 10

Planning Map Notation/Heritage Tree Number: 71

The submitter supports this part of the Plan Change, however requests that amendments be made to the Planning Maps to improve the accuracy of map page 57/58.

Relief sought: That map page 57/58 be amended to show the correct location of the tree number 71 (Kauri) within the boundary of 8 Taranaki Street, Picton.

Penelope Carl - Submitter #: 9 Submission Point : 14

That the Planning Maps relating to 10 and 12 Newgate Street are incorrect, being map page 58. The Heritage Schedule lists two tulip trees as being located on 10 Newgate Street (Planning Map Notation tree number 90, however Map Page 58 shows these trees as being located at 12 Newgate Street.

Further, 12 Newgate Street has one large Michaela Tree and one large Alder Tree onsite.

Relief sought: That the Planning Maps be amended to show the correct information.

Peter and Barbara Rocco - Submitter #: 12 Submission Point : 19

In addition, the submitter states that there is a fine Micro tree located on the road reserve on the Teriyaki Street frontage and believes it should also be noted in the Plan as it is a fine mature specimen.

Relief sought: Include the Micro Tree located on the Teriyaki Street road frontage within the Heritage Schedule.

Peter Bugler - Submitter #: 3 Submission Point : 7

The submitter details that, as shown on the Planning Map, the Pin Oak is correctly identified as Tree #89, however trees numbered 90A and 90B are incorrectly identified and incorrectly positioned.

The submitter also states that there are three trees located at 12 Newgate Street that should be considered for registration.

Relief sought: The inaccuracies with 10 and 12 Newgate Street as provided on the Heritage Schedule and associated Planning Maps be amended.

Robert Hutchinson - Submitter #: 1 Submission Point : 16

Amendments are requested to be made to all of the Planning Maps that are subject to amendment because the Planning Maps (as notified) include text and symbols intended to assist the reader in understanding the proposed map changes. It was not intended that these symbols or the additional map text be reproduced within the final version of the Planning Maps.

Relief sought: That the additional map text and symbols, used to illustrate proposed changes to the Planning Maps, be removed prior to final Plan map production.

V2/AppA/Heritage Trees - Volume 2/Appendix A/Heritage Trees

Ally Gibbons - Submitter #: 2 Submission Point : 6

The submitter would like to inform Council that no Kahikatea Tree is located onsite.

Relief sought: The submitter requests that the Kahikatea Tree be removed from the Heritage Schedule as it does not exist.

B R and G C Smith - Submitter #: 6 Submission Point : 11

Planning Map Notation/Heritage Tree Number: 73

The submitter supports the inclusion of heritage tree number 73 within the Plan Change.

Relief sought: Support the Plan Change.

B R and G C Smith - Submitter #: 6 Submission Point : 9

Planning Map Notation/Heritage Tree Number: 72

The submitter supports this part of the Plan Change, however requests that amendments be made to the Heritage Schedule and associated Planning Maps. The heritage schedule and associated map page protects only one Rimu Tree, however the Rimu Trees on this property exist in a group of three, which are all of the same age.

Relief sought: Support the Plan Change, but protect all three of the Rimu Trees located at 8 Taranaki Street, Picton, not just the one.

David and Lynda Williamson - Submitter #: 11 Submission Point : 15

The submitter is strongly opposed to the inclusion of Planning Notation tree number 65, which is located on their property. As the owners of the property, they have experienced property damage as a result of falling tree limbs, and believe the whole tree is in a questionable state.

They object to the trees inclusion within the Heritage Schedule as they do not want to apply and pay for Resource Consents for regular maintenance of the tree, which they believe will be necessary in order to protect the main power line to the house.

The submitter states they have no intention of cutting the tree down, unless it becomes dangerous.

Relief sought: The removal of Planning Notation tree number 65 from the Heritage Tree Update Plan Change, and associated Planning Map (map page 58).

Mark Baxter - Submitter #: 5 Submission Point : 8

The submitter advises that the tree located at 94 Wellington Street, Picton, has been poisoned and is scheduled for removal.

Relief sought: The submitter asks that the tree be removed from the Heritage Register.

New Zealand Police (Derek Coffey) - Submitter #: 7 Submission Point : 12

The New Zealand Police strongly oppose the protection of Planning Map Notation tree number 56 within the Plan, as the site is designated for Police purposes and the protection of the tree would effect the current and future operation of the site for emergency and police purposes. The New Zealand Police also consider the tree not to be a significant tree suitable for inclusion in the Plan as a heritage tree.

Relief sought: Oppose the protection of Planning Map Notation tree number 56 within the Plan.

Peter and Barbara Rocco - Submitter #: 12 Submission Point : 17

This submission is a late submission.

The submitter advises the heritage tree number 78 - the Lancewood, recently blew over in a storm and no longer exists. However, a number of Lancewood seedlings have emerged within the area.

Relief sought: It is inferred that the submitter would like the tree removed from the heritage schedule.

Peter and Barbara Rocco - Submitter #: 12 Submission Point : 18

The submitter states that the area in which the heritage tree was located, was actually on the road reserve and not on private property at 11 Broadway, Piston (as stated on the heritage schedule).

Relief sought: The submitter infers that the heritage schedule should be updated to differentiate the location of trees on private land at 11 Broadway, in contrast to the Road Reserve adjoining this property.

Robert Hutchinson - Submitter #: 1 Submission Point : 2

Planning Map Notation/Heritage Tree # 63 associated with Te Mara, Double Bay:

The submitter states that the Kahikatea Tree that the Heritage Schedule identifies as being located and protected at Te Mara, within Double Bay, is incorrect and no such tree is located on this property.

Relief sought: That Planning Map Notation/Heritage Tree listing 63 is deleted from the Heritage Schedule.

Robert Hutchinson - Submitter #: 1 Submission Point : 5

Planning Map Notation/Heritage Tree # 89 and #90 associated with 10 Newgate Street, Picton:

The submitter states that the Heritage Schedule listing for 10 Newgate Street is inaccurate, as it shows there is two tulip tree worthy for protection at 10 Newgate Street, and there is only one that meets criteria for protection under the Plan. As a consequence of this, there is a mapping area within the Planning Maps.

An amended map was appended to the submission.

Relief sought: To amend the schedule and associated Planning maps to remove reference to the existence of multiple tulip trees being protected.

Robert Hutchinson - Submitter #: 1 Submission Point : 4

The submitter requests an amendment be made to the preamble of the Heritage Tree Register, to provide clarity to Plan users.

Relief sought: For the following additional text to be added under the heading 'Heritage Trees' contained in Appendix A of the Plan: 'Note - Where multiple trees of the same species are located on the same allotment, they are annotated using alphabetical numbering on the corresponding Planning Maps'.

Robert Hutchinson - Submitter #: 1 Submission Point : 3

Planning Map Notation/Heritage Tree #74 and #76 associated with 11 Broadway, Picton:

The submitter states that the Heritage Register Plan text inaccurately states that tree numbers 74 and 76 are located at 11 Broadway Street, Picton, whereas they are actually located on the Council Road Reserve adjoining these allotments.

An amended map was appended to the submission.

Relief sought: The submitter requests that the Heritage Tree Register is amended to state that trees numbered 74 and 76 are located on Council Road Reserve, and that the associated Planning Maps be amended to use upper case font to delineate there listing.

Alphabetical index of Submitters (by surname) for Plan Change 08

PartNo	Submitter	Address
5	Baxter - Mark	94 Wellington Street Picton 7220
3	Bugler - Peter	10 Newgate Street Picton 7220
9	Carl - Penelope	PO Box 1749 Double Bay NSW 1360 Australia
2	Gibbons - Ally	258 New Renwick Road RD 2 Blenheim 7272
8	Hellstrom - John and Judy	Endeavour Inlet Private Bag 391 Picton 7250
1	Hutchinson - Robert	C/O MDC PO Box 443 Blenheim 7240
7	New Zealand Poilce (Derek Coffey)	C/0 Police Station St John Street Nelson 7010
12	Rocco - Peter and Barbara	11 Broadway Picton
6	Smith - B R and G C	8 Taranaki Street Picton 7220
11	Williamson - David and Lynda	27 Devon Street Picton

Numerical index of Submitters for Plan Change 08

PartNo	Submitter	Address
1	Hutchinson - Robert	C/O MDC PO Box 443 Blenheim 7240
2	Gibbons - Ally	258 New Renwick Road RD 2 Blenheim 7272
3	Bugler - Peter	10 Newgate Street Picton 7220
5	Baxter - Mark	94 Wellington Street Picton 7220
6	Smith - B R and G C	8 Taranaki Street Picton 7220
7	New Zealand Poilce (Derek Coffey)	C/O Police Station St John Street Nelson 7010
8	Hellstrom - John and Judy	Endeavour Inlet Private Bag 391 Picton 7250
9	Carl - Penelope	PO Box 1749 Double Bay NSW 1360 Australia
11	Williamson - David and Lynda	27 Devon Street Picton
12	Rocco - Peter and Barbara	11 Broadway Picton

Amendments	

\\mca...O:\Admin\K-Q\M135\15\08\PC08-HeritageTrees-SubmissionsSummary.doc Saved 07/12/2009 16:00:00