
PREFERRED OPTION REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE:	August 2018
TOPIC NAME:	Natural Environment Topic: Heritage Items and Protected Trees
SCOPE DESCRIPTION:	To identify the extent to which the operative District Plan gives effect to both the Resource Management Act (RMA) and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), and aligns with best practice advocated by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage NZPT) and what amendments are necessary to align provisions with current best practice in the protection and management of heritage items and protected trees in the Selwyn District.
TOPIC LEAD:	Andrew Mactier
PREPARED BY:	Boffa Miskell Ltd (Claire Kelly and Stephanie Styles)

Executive Summary

<i>Heritage Items</i>	
<i>Issue(s)</i>	<p>The key issues regarding heritage items are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The use of a quantitative points system which is open to legal challenge on the basis of potential inconsistency.• The two-tier ranking system of scheduled heritage items.• The current objectives and policies are largely reliant on discussion in the Plan to understand the context in which they apply.• The current provisions may not be fully effective at providing for the extent of protection anticipated by the Act.• There are no definitions for key terms such as 'addition', 'alteration', 'demolition', 'maintenance' or 'removal' within the operative SDP.• The Plan does not address heritage settings, heritage areas, archaeological sites, historic heritage landscapes and the interiors of heritage items.
<i>Preferred Option</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amend the criteria for assessment of heritage items to align with those applied to the Christchurch Plan.• Identify and assess heritage items in accordance with the amended criteria, including consideration of the setting of the heritage item.• Have one schedule in the District Plan and one set of rules that apply to all listed items.• Amend the plan objectives, policies and rules to ensure that they reflect best practice.• Include a general policy on archaeological sites but do not identify or address this matter at a rule level.• Review of the definitions that apply to heritage to ensure they align with statutory direction and are clear on the extent of an activity.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the schedule to align with the advice to be provided by Dr McEwan following her technical assessments of heritage items.
DPC Decision	<p><i>“That the Committee notes the report.”</i></p> <p><i>“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Options for ‘Heritage Items and Protected Trees’ (Parts A & B) for further development and engagement.”</i></p> <p><i>“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”</i></p> <p><i>“Following public consultation, the Committee request a report that includes current owners’ willingness to work with Council on new heritage items and trees being listed, and those that are against, and that the Council prioritises working with the willing”.</i></p>
Protected Trees	
Issue(s)	<p>The key issues regarding protected trees are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current assessment methodology used to identify and list trees for protection in the operative SDP does not reflect current best practice. The use of Categories A and B appears in the definitions and rules but is not explained in the policies.
Preferred Option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess trees using the STEM criteria. Apply the same regime to trees on public and private land. Amend the objectives and policies to ensure that they provide sufficient direction and clarity (in the absence of explanatory material) and align with the RMA and CRPS intentions regarding amenity. Amend the content of all rules to ensure that they align with best practice wording, are simplified to remove the two categories in the current provisions, and apply appropriate activity status for activities. Continue to include consideration of relevant values for any subdivision consents involving land that contains a protected tree. The rules approach to Harts Arboretum be tailored specifically to the unique values and circumstances of the arboretum. Amend the schedule of protected trees in accordance with the technical assessment undertaken by Treetech. Ensure that protected trees are correctly located in the Council’s GIS and on the planning maps.
DPC Decision	<p><i>“That the Committee notes the report.”</i></p> <p><i>“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Options for ‘Heritage Items and Protected Trees’ (Parts A & B) for further development and engagement.”</i></p> <p><i>“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”</i></p> <p><i>“Following public consultation, the Committee request a report that includes current owners’ willingness to work with Council on new heritage items and trees being listed, and those that are against, and that the Council prioritises working with the willing”.</i></p>

Introduction

This report provides a summary of the key issues identified in the *Heritage Items and Protected Trees – Planning Assessment*¹ that are related to heritage items and protected trees. The Planning Assessment was informed by technical advice. This summary should be read in conjunction with the full Baseline Report, which is attached as **Appendix 1**.

Dr Ann McEwan of Heritage Consultancy Services provided specialist advice on heritage matters and assessed each heritage item listed in the operative Plan and the nominated additional items, using updated criteria (as used in the recent Christchurch Replacement District Plan process).

Treetech provided arboricultural technical assessment and advice with regard to the Protected Trees in Selwyn District Council, for the purposes of the District Plan Review. Treetech used STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method), which was developed by Ron Flook in 1996 and is a standardized and nationally recognised method of evaluating trees. They assessed the trees currently listed in the operative Plan and those subsequently nominated.

The review of Heritage Items and Protected Trees seeks to determine what approach should be carried forward into a proposed District Plan, and what amendments are necessary to align provisions with current best practice. In particular, it has been identified that there is a need to ensure alignment with both the Resource Management Act (RMA) and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).

It is also acknowledged that this report is the first step in identifying the historic heritage values of the District and determining how these should be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and the value of protected trees to the District. It is recommended that additional assessment would enhance understanding of these issues and the robustness of the protection afforded by the District Plan including:

- Engaging with Nga Rūnanga to ensure integration and alignment of this topic with the Cultural Sites topic.
- Economic analysis of the impact/costs of controls over a property for landowners and the benefits of protection for the community and district.

There is significant overlap between this workstream and the review of Sites and Areas of Significance to Mana Whenua being undertaken by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd. The scope of this report excludes consideration of sites of cultural significance.

This report is split into two parts:

Part A: Heritage Items

Part B: Protected Trees

¹ Heritage Items and Protected Trees – Planning Assessment prepared by Boffa Miskell, 20th March 2018.

PART A: HERITAGE ITEMS

1.0 Summary of Heritage Items Issues

The key resource management issues with regards to Heritage Items include:

- the use of a quantitative points system because it can be open to legal challenge for inconsistency and perceptions (or sometimes reality) of ‘double-dipping’, there was often insufficient research undertaken to support the scoring process and the resulting evaluation sheets provided little guidance in the consenting process and it rated architectural qualities over other heritage values.
- SDC does not hold complete or extensive record for some heritage items listed in the operative SDP.
- The operative SDP has a two-tier ranking system of scheduled items, even though this is not immediately apparent. The operative Selwyn District Plan has one schedule of heritage items, but within the rules there is differentiation between Category 1 historic places listed by Heritage NZPT and all other listed items.
- The objectives and policies within the current SDP are largely reliant on surrounding discussion in the Plan (i.e. the preceding issues discussion, strategy, and associated explanations and reasons) to understand the context in which they apply.
- The current provisions may not be fully effective at providing for the extent of protection anticipated by the Act.
- There are no definitions for terms such as ‘addition’, ‘alteration’, ‘demolition’, ‘maintenance’ or ‘removal’ within the operative SDP.
- The operative SDP does not address several matters including heritage settings, heritage areas, archaeological sites, historic heritage landscapes and the interiors of heritage items.

2.0 Statement of Operative District Plan approach

The operative Selwyn District Plan contains a range of provisions that provide for the management and protection of historic heritage. Due to the split of the plan between Township and Rural Volumes the provisions are located within several parts of the plan. The key provisions are contained in the objectives, policies and rules, together with the schedules of heritage items contained in the Appendices to each volume. A copy of the relevant provisions is contained in Appendix 1 of the Heritage Items and Protected Trees – Planning Assessment.

The relevant objectives can be summarised as covering:

- Recognition and protection of sites and buildings with heritage values.
- Fostering partnerships between landowners, Tāngata whenua, community groups and the Council.

The policies cover:

- Recording information on the heritage values of sites and buildings.
- Management of heritage values through a variety of provisions.
- Assistance to owners of heritage items through funds.
- Periodic review of values of sites listed and assessment of additional places.

These objectives and policies collectively support the inclusion in the Operative District Plan of 156 heritage items currently listed within schedules to the plan, and a number of associated rules.

The rules can be summarised as:

- Permitted activity status for the maintenance of any listed heritage building, structure or site (with maintenance defined and constrained within the rules rather than within the definitions section).
- Restricted discretionary activity status for works not covered by maintenance.
- Discretionary activity status for removal or demolition of any listed heritage building or structure except where it has a “Category I” listing with Heritage NZPT.
- Non-complying activity status for removal or demolition of any listed heritage building or structure that has a “Category I” listing with Heritage NZPT.

There are a range of definitions within the operative Plan that have relevance to heritage items, including ‘archaeological site’ and ‘historic heritage’. There are currently no definitions for terms such as ‘addition’, ‘alteration’, ‘demolition’, ‘maintenance’ or ‘removal’, and these need to be developed and included.

The sites and buildings listed in Appendices 3 and 5 to the operative Selwyn District Plan, are those the Council considered worthy of protection for their heritage values at the time of the development of the current district plan. These are listed in the plan and shown on the planning maps.

The values of these sites and buildings were assessed using a process and set of criteria outlined in a report entitled “A Review of Heritage Assessment Methods, January 2000”. The report was prepared by Brent Nahkies (Heritage Services Ltd), and provided a thorough analysis of the context in which the heritage assessment criteria were developed. However, as these criteria were developed in 2000, and they predate the 2003 amendments to the RMA that elevated the protection of historic heritage to a section 6 matter of national importance. They also predate the criteria set out in the CRPS.

3.0 Summary of relevant statutory and/or policy context and other background information

3.1 Resource Management Act (RMA)

The primary statutory obligation in relation to historic heritage comes from Section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), which requires the Council to protect historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. It is also noted that for completeness, there is a direct relationship between historic heritage and section 6(e) of the Act which also includes as a matter of national importance “*the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga*”.

In addition, section 31 of the RMA requires the Council to manage the effects of land uses and development in relation to historic heritage values and section 74 of the Act requires that when preparing or changing a district plan, a territorial authority shall have regard to any relevant entry on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero required by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

3.2 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010

The objectives in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) closely reflect the Council's obligations under s6 of the RMA. The NZCPS recognises the need to balance protection with enabling people to undertake land uses and development for economic, cultural and social reasons. However, activities need to be appropriately located and managed.

The NZCPS requires the protection of historic heritage in the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development and includes a list of requirements in Policy 17.

3.3 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

Chapter 13 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) sets out the issues, objectives and policies that apply to Historic Heritage. The objectives seek that significant historic heritage is identified and protected whilst recognising the importance of enabling the repair, reconstruction, seismic strengthening, and on-going conservation and maintenance of historic heritage. The policies set the direction for protection and include a set of matters and principles on which to base criteria to identify and assess the significance of historic heritage.

Of particular relevance is Policy 13.3.1 which includes matters on which to base criteria to assess the significance of historic heritage as follows:

To recognise and provide for the protection of the historic and cultural heritage resource of the region from inappropriate subdivision, use and development by:

1. *identifying and assessing the significance of the historic and cultural heritage resource according to criteria based on the following matters:*
 - (a) *Historic*
 - (b) *Cultural*
 - (c) *Architectural*
 - (d) *Archaeological*
 - (e) *Technological*
 - (f) *Scientific*
 - (g) *Social*
 - (h) *Spiritual*
 - (i) *Traditional*
 - (j) *Contextual*
 - (k) *Aesthetic*
2. *working with Ngāi Tahu to identify items, places or areas of historic heritage significance to them.*
3. *having regard to any relevant entry in the Historic Places Register in the process of identifying and assessing the historic heritage resource.*
4. *considering historic heritage items, places or areas of significance or importance to communities in the process of identifying and assessing the historic heritage resource.*

5. *recognising that knowledge about some historic heritage may be culturally sensitive and support protection of those areas through the maintenance of silent files held by local authorities.*

The CRPS sets out requirements for the District Plan including the recognition and protection of significant historic heritage items.

3.4 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act

The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA) has the purpose of promoting the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand. This Act establishes Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage NZPT) which has a range of functions in providing for the purpose of the Act.

Heritage NZPT has primarily an advocacy role in relation to the protection of heritage items. The only potential area of statutory overlap between the Council and Heritage NZPT is in terms of Heritage NZPT's regulatory role as a heritage protection agency and in issuing archaeological authorities for pre-1900 sites.

3.5 Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan

The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 (IMP) identifies the importance of Ngāi Tahu cultural heritage values. This is initially identified within section 5.4 Papatūānuku which includes objective (8) stating Ngāi Tahu cultural heritage values, including wāhi tapu and other sites of significance, are protected from damage, modification or destruction as a result of land use. The policies within this section identify the potential for effects on cultural heritage values, including:

- Risk of damage to sites of significance from earthworks (policies P11.1-11.6).
- Risk of impacts on sites and areas of cultural significance from development and construction of transport infrastructure (policies P16.4-16.6).

Section 5.8 Ngā Tūtohu Whenua addresses issues associated with Ngāi Tahu cultural heritage: sites, places, resources, traditions, knowledge, and landscapes of importance to Ngāi Tahu. As noted above, there is overlap between the heritage items, sites and areas addressed in this work stream and sites, places and landscapes of cultural significance, and this can be seen in the holistic approach taken in section 5.8 of the IMP. Particular policies of relevance are:

- Investigate the use of Heritage Alert Layers and Heritage Risk Models as mechanisms to integrate information from the Ngāi Tahu Cultural Mapping Project into central and local government planning processes.
- Protection of sites identified as wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga (CL3.9).

Matters of cultural significance and sites of cultural significance are being addressed through a separate district plan review workstream being undertaken by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd for the Council. There will need to be a process of consideration and integration between the two workstreams.

4.0 Summary of alternative management responses – Other Districts

In reviewing the operative District Plan provisions, consideration has been given to other comparable district plans including the Ashburton District Plan, Waimakariri District Plan, Hurunui District Plan, Christchurch District Plan, the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan and the Proposed Dunedin District Plan. Generally, the approaches in the other District Plans are relatively similar to those within the SDP.

All of the plans provide for a low level of change (and associated impact on heritage values) as a permitted activity. This is generally restricted to repairs and maintenance with the extent of change limited by definition or through specific standards. Some of the plans provide for works as a controlled activity, but this is only in very limited situations (particularly relating to earthquake strengthening and the like).

Most of the plans place the majority of activities as restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. This enables assessment of impacts on values (assuming the matters of discretion are appropriately worded) and the ability to decline an application where the appropriate protection of heritage values would not be achieved. This generally applies to alterations and additions, partial demolition, subdivision, and activities within settings.

In all cases, the most stringent activity status is applied to demolition of heritage items and in some cases, this also is applied to relocation. Generally, this is a non-complying activity status (with the prohibited activity status applied in the Queenstown Lakes District being a more extreme approach).

Some of the plans reviewed are very complex and this makes interpretation and application more difficult, especially for landowners who are unlikely to be familiar with district plan terminology and layout. The more simplistic plan approaches are considered more readable and easy to interpret and apply.

5.0 Best practice

5.1 Heritage Provisions

A key document in establishing best practice for district plan approaches to managing Historic Heritage is the guidance developed by Heritage NZPT². Despite its age this guidance is still generally accepted by those working in the heritage field as being relevant and appropriate in relation to district plans and is used by many councils in the development of plan provisions.

The guidance provides discussion and background on matters relating to historic heritage values and commentary around the role of district plans in protecting heritage. The guidance also includes a set of model provisions to guide the content of district plans, which are relatively complex. We are

² Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage, Guide No. 3, District Plans, 3 August 2007.

aware that some Councils have used these directly, some have modified them and others have chosen not to use these other than for background guidance.

In terms of best practice, it is important to understand the effects of activities on identified heritage values. Typically, for example, the demolition or total removal of a heritage item will have the potential for a very significant adverse effect on the protection of identified historic heritage values. In the extreme, those important values may be lost entirely. Very minor repairs or alterations, on the other hand may have comparably much less consequence for the values that are recognised, and accordingly, the related level of control over such activities may be justifiably much less in ensuring appropriate protection is achieved. However, it is important that the Council consider social, cultural and economic wellbeing when determining the appropriate management of historic buildings, by enabling appropriate repair, rebuilding, upgrading, seismic strengthening and adaptive re-use of historic buildings and their surrounds as required by Policy 13.3.4 in the CRPS.

It is also essential that the schedule of listed heritage items is correct in applying the location (street address, legal site description etc) as inaccuracies within the schedule can create a situation where there is ambiguity around the intentions for listing and protection (which can lead to questions of whether an item is listed or not). The heritage items also need to be identified on the planning maps and it is essential that this is done accurately and clearly identify the location of items. Common practice is to use a notation shaped like a building and to place this precisely on the part of the site where the item is located. Past experiences of notations being inaccurately located on planning maps have led to confusion and problems with ensuring protection is achieved. Commonly the notation also includes a code or reference e.g. H123. This code links to the schedule within the District Plan which identifies the item and confirms its location.

5.2 Heritage Criteria

The definition of historic heritage in the Resource Management Act sets the basis for criteria and this is further defined by Policy 13.3.1 of the CRPS. There is however no fixed best practice list of criteria used either across the country or within Canterbury. A variety of approaches to heritage criteria have been taken by territorial authorities throughout New Zealand. In some cases, the criteria are included in the district plan text (often in policies or appendices), in other cases they sit outside of the plan in a different document (as is the case for Selwyn). For clarity, transparency and ease of reference, the inclusion of criteria within the plan is preferable.

Over the last 15 years, the use of a quantitative points system has been shown to be highly problematic; partly because it is open to legal challenge for inconsistency and perceptions (or sometimes reality) of 'double-dipping', and partly because there was often insufficient research undertaken to support the scoring process and the resulting evaluation sheets provided little guidance in the consenting process. The methodology adopted by SDC in 2000 has several features that are problematic and out of step with contemporary best practice, especially in the use of terminology used to describe values.

In second generation district plans, which have been developed post-2003, there has been a noticeable shift to an evidence-based qualitative assessment regime for determining the significance of heritage items, and thus whether their inclusion in district plan schedules is warranted. Typically, best practice heritage assessment frameworks now follow the lead provided by the definition of historic heritage resources in the RMA and focus identification and assessment methodologies on the stated qualities of historic heritage resources.

Based on consideration of the current criteria, the RMA and CRPS requirements, comparable district plans and knowledge of the application of criteria generally around New Zealand, adoption of the criteria used in the Christchurch District Plan ('the Christchurch criteria') is recommended. The Christchurch criteria have been well tested through the Christchurch Replacement Plan process, they are consistent with the matters specified in the CRPS, and adoption of these criteria would provide for some cross-border consistency. It is also understood that Heritage New Zealand are supportive of this approach. On this basis, the Proposed Plan will include both the assessment criteria, **and** an associated policy which sets out the threshold for listing a heritage item in the Plan³. Furthermore, all assessment will be undertaken by a qualified heritage expert.

6.0 Other matters

There are a range of other matters which have been considered as part of the Baseline Assessment.

RECORDS OF ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE ITEMS

Selwyn District Council currently holds records for the items listed in the operative District Plan, however the records are not extensive for some items. These records need to be updated and the listed items assessed against the revised criteria to confirm (or otherwise) that they meet the significance threshold to be listed in the District Plan and protected through the plan provisions.

It is recommended that the records prepared using the template to apply the criteria should be held outside the District Plan and should not be statutory documents in their own right. This would enable the background information to be readily amended if more information comes to hand over time (albeit that the significance of the item identified cannot change without a Schedule One process and would remain static at the time the District Plan becomes operative). The records would form the basis of preparing a schedule (list) within the Plan that identified what items are protected.

SCHEDULING OF HERITAGE ITEMS

Territorial authorities take a variety of approaches to the structure of their heritage schedules; some providing two or more rankings with different rules targeted to each rank, whereas others consider a unitary schedule to provide the best protection for a community's valued heritage resources. Given that, in a resource management context, identification and assessment of historic heritage resources is specifically intended to provide for the protection of such resources via a regulatory framework of

³ In line with the approach in Policy 9.3.2.2.1 of the Christchurch District Plan.

objectives, policies and rules, the choice of a unitary schedule or different tiers of heritage items is an important one.

The operative Selwyn District Plan has one schedule of heritage items, but within the rules there is differentiation between Category 1 historic places listed by Heritage NZPT and all other listed items. Demolition is discretionary for all scheduled heritage items, unless they are Category 1 historic places in which case demolition is a non-complying activity. This means the Plan has in effect a two-tier ranking system of scheduled items, even though this is not immediately apparent.

It is recommended that there be a single tier of significant heritage items with one schedule in the District Plan and one set of rules that apply to all listed items. This option is simple and streamlined, making it easier for all users to understand. It aligns with s6 of the RMA and the CRPS, which does not differentiate between degrees of significance. This ranks all items that meet or exceed the significance threshold equally and avoids speculation around the degree of significance that an item achieves. A single, unified schedule also signals that all heritage items meeting the criteria for heritage significance are equally valuable to and valued by the Selwyn community. This option allows for a simplified approach to the rules (a simplified and streamlined approach is a goal for the District Plan review), with one set of standards applying to all items. This preferred approach was discussed with and endorsed by the Selwyn District Council District Plan Committee on 26 July 2017, and has been integrated into the process used to review the listed heritage items.

OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND RULES

The objectives and policies within the current SDP are largely reliant on surrounding discussion in the Plan (i.e. the preceding issues discussion, strategy, and associated explanations and reasons) to understand the context in which they apply. The recommendations in relation to objectives and policies are simply to review the current objectives and policies to ensure that they provide sufficient direction and clarity (in the absence of explanatory material) and give effect to the RMA and CRPS. One specific addition to the policies is that there should be the inclusion of the criteria and methodology/threshold for assessment of significance and listing in the Plan, within the policy framework.

The general approach to rules in the current SDP is reasonably consistent with other reviewed plans and generally provides an appropriate level of differentiation between the scale of activity and potential risk to heritage values. It is considered that the simple approach taken in the operative SDP should be continued to maintain continuity, avoid unnecessary complication and to provide a robust approach to the protection of heritage values. Proposed changes to the rules are intended to seek to improve clarity, increase protection where necessary and align with current best practice approaches.

SETTINGS

The Selwyn District Plan schedule of heritage items simply lists the item (building, structure, etc.) but the protection afforded to the item does not include the setting in which the item is located. This is considered by Dr McEwan (the Council's heritage expert for the District Plan review) to be contrary

to the RMA and CRPS's definition of historic heritage (which specifically includes "*and surroundings*") and the requirement for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. This has been identified by Dr McEwan as a particular weakness in the operative plan. Many district plans do identify and manage the setting in which the heritage item is located. In some cases, this extends to cover the whole legal parcel (usually those heritage items associated with smaller, urban properties) and in other cases it is limited to a defined area (garden, immediate curtilage, etc for large rural properties).

The preferred option is to include identification of settings for each heritage item and this preferred approach was endorsed by the Selwyn District Council District Plan Committee on 26 July 2017. This has been integrated into the process that has been commenced to review the existing listed heritage items.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

The RMA definition of Historic Heritage includes archaeological sites. The CRPS also does reference archaeological sites but primarily in terms of Maori values and appears to defer to Heritage NZPT for consideration of these areas. The current SDP includes text that states that some archaeological sites from the New Zealand Archaeological Association site recording scheme are included in 'Appendices 3 and 5' of the SDP. However, the two appendices for heritage items do not clearly identify what items on the list are archaeological sites⁴. Any earthworks affecting an archaeological site require an archaeological authority from Heritage NZPT irrespective of what is in the District Plan.

No review of archaeological sites has been commissioned by Council as part of this workstream. Dr McEwan has identified in the heritage assessments if a site has or is likely to have (due to its age) archaeological values but has not done a comprehensive review of archaeological values. It is recommended that the Council include a policy to support a future project to assess archaeological sites more widely and manage activities affecting these if necessary, together with a note that an archaeological authority is required from Heritage NZPT if a pre-1900 site is being affected. It is also noted that a range of archaeological sites are likely to be identified through (and managed by) the cultural values workstream being undertaken separately from this work.

HISTORIC HERITAGE LANDSCAPES/AREAS

Policy 13.3.3 of the CRPS specifically deals with historic cultural and historic heritage landscapes. The policy sets out the matters to be considered, and requires territorial authorities to "include objectives, policies or methods to manage the effects of subdivision, use and development on cultural and heritage landscapes", in district plans. The current SDP does not include any identified historic heritage landscapes. No review of heritage landscapes has been commissioned by Council as part of this workstream. It is recommended that the Council include a policy to support a future project to identify heritage landscapes/areas and manage activities within these.

⁴ With only one item mentioned as being an archaeological site - Rakaia Huts Moa Hunter Site (part of Wāhi Taonga management area).

SUBDIVISION

Heritage NZPT recommends that district plans include 'explicit subdivision rules that are specific to scheduled heritage items and regulate this activity as a discretionary or non-complying activity'. Because of the close and often inherent relationship between subdivision and the use of land, subdivision of land containing a heritage item can impact on heritage values by enabling inappropriate activity close to a heritage item or within a heritage setting. Alternatively, it may have no impact if it is a large property and the heritage item and setting are well removed from any change occurring as a result of subdivision. Council should continue to include consideration of heritage values in respect of any subdivision consents involving land that contains a heritage item or heritage setting.

INTERIORS

Territorial authorities take a variety of positions on the protection of the interior of built heritage items, often providing rules for only the exterior of such resources, but sometimes itemising special internal features or including the totality of the item in the schedule for protection. The operative SDP does not explicitly state whether interiors are protected or not, but neither do the rules specifically exclude them. Dr McEwan has not assessed any interiors and therefore Council holds no information that explicitly establishes heritage values of internal fabric.

It is understood from Council staff that current practice is to include interior fabric as part of a heritage item unless it is clearly not of heritage value (requiring either evidence or expert opinion, although often determined by Council staff). Under this approach, consents have been required where alterations relate to the interior of some listed heritage items. Given the lack of assessment it is not recommended that the current informal approach continue, but that internal fabric be excluded from consideration.

ECONOMICS

A common matter of contention for historic heritage values is the opinion that protection of heritage for the benefit of the community comes at an individual's cost. An alternative view is that some owners place a non-monetary value on the heritage item (such as a passion for heritage values) which may help to balance out monetary costs such as maintenance. Another balancing matter is the access to funding to assist in protecting, maintaining and repairing historic heritage buildings or items, and which becomes accessible once an item is formally listed as being significant. This may assist in reducing some of the additional costs that may occur in keeping a heritage item maintained. Specialist economic advice on this issue should be sought as has been done by some other councils (Christchurch, Auckland). It is also noted that s32 of the RMA will require the Council to consider, amongst other matters, the economic impact of the threshold for listing heritage items in the District Plan and how far to go in controlling the repair, upgrading, strengthening and modern use of heritage items.

7.0 Technical Analysis

The heritage item schedules in the operative Selwyn District Plan contain:

- A total of 156 listed items.
- A spread of locations across both rural and urban areas including all the settlements.
- A range of types of items including residential, community and commercial buildings, memorials, bridges, military items and a tunnel.

The Council has commissioned Dr Ann McEwan to provide specialist technical heritage advice. Dr McEwan has undertaken the following:

- A review of the current schedules of heritage items in the operative District Plan, with each item assessed against the revised criteria to confirm and document heritage values.
- Development of a district wide Historic Thematic Overview report (prepared by John Wilson). This report aided, alongside Dr McEwan's research, in the identification of additional heritage items to be considered for inclusion, subject to assessment to determine whether their heritage values are such that they warrant insertion in the District Plan.
- Assessment of heritage items nominated by the public. The Council initiated a public nomination process to help identify additional heritage items and those nominated have been assessed against the revised assessment criteria to determine whether their heritage values are such that they warrant inclusion in the District Plan.

The technical analysis undertaken by Dr McEwan in assessing the existing and potential heritage items against the criteria has resulted in recommendations for a schedule of heritage items. This includes the retention of many current listings, some deletions from the existing schedule and some additions. Refer to **Appendix 2** for the heritage item schedule.

8.0 Summary of Options to address Issues

8.1 Option 1: Status Quo.

This option would involve a continuation of the current approach whereby the Plan retains simple objectives and policies, criteria, rules and schedules.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issues: This option would not address the issues identified above in relation to giving effect to higher order documents and best practice, nor would it reflect the CRPS criteria.

Risks: The Plan would not follow best practice or give full effect to the RMA/CRPS and given the issues identified above, may attract many submissions in opposition to this approach.

Budget or Time Implications: None as no work would be required. However, it may be that a significant number of concerns and issues are raised through submissions. This could lead to protracted hearing times and even appeals to the Environment Court with subsequent time and cost implications.

Stakeholder and Community Interests: Heritage NZPT, landowners of heritage items and community interest groups.

Recommendation: This option is not recommended as it does not give full effect to the RMA or the CRPS and neither would it reflect current best practice. As such, the Council would not be meeting its statutory obligations.

8.2 Option 2: Adopt the technical advice and revise the plan provisions

This option would see the adoption of the technical assessment of heritage items by Dr McEwan and revision of the criteria, objectives, policies, rules and schedule.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issues: This option would directly address the issues identified above and would update the plan provisions to better reflect best practice approaches to manage heritage values.

Risks: This option may mean that resource consents are required for a wider range of activities to ensure that protection is achieved. Consequently, landowners may oppose the provisions and the decisions on the provisions could be appealed to the Environment Court. However, this risk can be mitigated through engagement with landowners.

Budget or Time Implications: Need to engage with landowners to ensure an understanding of the process, statutory drivers and the implications of the provisions.

Stakeholder and Community Interests: Heritage NZPT, landowners of heritage items and community interest groups.

Recommendation: This option is recommended as it is an effective and efficient approach that sets a robust policy framework for heritage items and a contemporary approach to rules. It also gives effect to the RMA and the CRPS and ensures that adverse effects of activities are appropriately managed.

9.0 Preferred Option for further engagement

The changes recommended in relation to heritage items as part of the drafting phase for this work stream are:

- Amend the criteria for assessment of heritage items to align with those applied to the Christchurch Plan.
- That identification and assessment of historic heritage resources for inclusion in the district plan be undertaken in accordance with the criteria, and be recorded using the standard record form discussed above. That the records prepared using the record form be held outside the District Plan and should not be statutory documents in their own right.
- That there be a single tier of significant heritage items with one schedule in the District Plan and one set of rules that apply to all listed items, as endorsed by the Selwyn District Council District Plan Committee on 26 July 2017.

- Review the objectives and policies to ensure that they provide sufficient direction and clarity (in the absence of explanatory material) and fulfil the Council’s obligations under the RMA and CRPS. Include the headings of the criteria in a policy (and the full criteria list in the appendix that contains the schedule of heritage items). Include policies to support future projects to investigate heritage landscapes/areas and archaeological sites.
- Review the content of all rules to ensure that they reflect best practice and are the “most appropriate”, including:
 - Review the standards that limit repair and maintenance to ensure that these are appropriately constrained and consider how/whether to include works relating to earthquake strengthening and the like.
 - Review the matters of discretion for any restricted discretionary activities to ensure they provide sufficient scope, are clear and are targeted to achieving the necessary protection of heritage values.
 - Incorporate rules to deal with activities occurring within the settings of heritage items.
 - Apply non-complying activity status to demolition activities to improve protection and align with current best practice approaches.
 - Consider developing rules to incentivise adaptive reuse of heritage buildings for sensitive activities, following review of the alignment of this approach with other work streams.
 - Continue to include consideration of heritage values in respect of any subdivision consents involving land that contains a heritage item or heritage setting.
- Review of the definitions that apply to heritage to ensure they align with statutory direction and are clear on the extent of an activity.
- Amend the schedule to align with the advice to be provided by Dr McEwan following her technical assessments of heritage items (see Appendix 2 below).
- Obtain economic analysis to better understand the impact of heritage listing on the value of property and the ability for owners to continue to utilise their property. This will also inform the analysis required under s32 to determine the most appropriate provisions.

PART B: PROTECTED TREES

1.0 Summary of Protected Tree Issues

The key resource management issues with regards to Protected Trees include:

- The current assessment criteria and methodology used to identify and list trees for protection in the operative SDP do not reflect current best practice.
- The use of Categories A and B appears in the definitions and rules but is not explained in the policies.

2.0 Statement of Operative District Plan approach

The operative Selwyn District Plan contains a range of provisions that provide for protected trees. Due to the plan being split between Township and Rural Volumes the provisions are located within a number of parts of the Plan. The key provisions are contained in the objectives, policies and rules, together with the schedules of protected trees contained in the Appendices to each volume. A copy of the relevant provisions is contained in Appendix 1 of the Planning Assessment.

It is important to note that the current list of protected trees and the provisions that apply to these were the subject of Plan Change 18 to the operative District Plan. The Plan Change involved a review of the protected tree process and included developing the existing criteria by Walter Fielding-Cotterell to enable a comprehensive review of trees that were either previously identified and/or listed by the Council or those put forward through a process of public nominations. The plan change was publicly notified in April 2010 and a decision was made in August 2010. That decision approved the plan change with some modifications. Thus, the provisions currently applied in the district are more recently developed and adopted relative to many other parts of the operative plan.

Since 2010 best practice in evaluating significant trees has evolved and the approach taken has been continually refined by specialists. Specialist advisors to this review, Treotech Specialist Treecare Ltd (Treotech) advise that there are a number of weaknesses associated with Selwyn's current assessment methodology:

- It is not a nationally recognised system for evaluating a tree.
- It is not in line with current New Zealand best practice or arboricultural industry standards.
- There are no guidelines as to how the tree is to be assessed, which leads to subjectivity and differentiation between assessors, and can result in a tree being under or over scored:
- In some categories, it is possible for a tree to receive more than one score, hence a subjective decision must be made as to the weighting given to each criterion at the end of the scoring formula.
- There is no recorded rationale explaining the point scoring system.

The issues identified above would make it difficult to defend the current assessment criteria for protected trees, should it be legally challenged. This system is considered by specialists to be cumbersome, not robust and significantly outdated, such that its use is now discouraged. It is

recommended that these be replaced by the STEM evaluation approach. This will provide greater efficiency in aligning with national practice and with the approach recently approved in the CRDP.

The current provisions in the SDP are considered to be relatively effective at providing protection for trees determined to be significant to the District. Council staff and stakeholders have not identified any significant issues with interpretation or application of the rules or any particular inappropriate outcomes.

The objective and policies are comparable in intent to those used elsewhere and clearly articulate the intent to provide protection for trees. It is recommended that as part of the drafting phase for this work stream there be a simple review of the objectives and policies to ensure that they provide sufficient direction and clarity (in the absence of explanatory material in the Plan) and align with the RMA and CRPS intentions regarding amenity. Some updating of language could also be of benefit. It is recommended that the headings of the criteria be listed as part of a policy in relation to protected trees and the full criteria list be included in the appendix that contains the schedule of protected trees. Splitting the content up in this way will enable a more streamlined approach to the policy whilst continuing to provide clarity in the Plan on what criteria are applied.

The operative District Plan rules for protected trees generally give effect to the provisions of the RMA and CRPS in relation to amenity values. As identified above, a key area in which the SDP provisions differ from other plans is in the differentiation of trees into two categories (Category A and B trees) as noted above. This is not an approach that the other reviewed plans have taken. This approach does not appear to be necessary in protecting significant trees and it is recommended that the categories are removed and the rules simplified.

The breakdown of activity status in the current rules appears to provide an efficient set of provisions for activities and protection. Having the activity status for the removal of significant trees as a non-complying activity shows a clear intent for protection, which reflects the policy approach and acknowledges that once trees are removed their associated values are lost.

3.0 Summary of relevant statutory and/or policy context and other background information

3.1 Resource Management Act (RMA)

The basis for the identification and protection of trees within a district plan reflects several responsibilities and obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) including section 31, which sets out the functions of the Council to establish, implement, and review the objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district. Furthermore, trees contribute to a district's historic heritage values, so they have relevance in terms of section 6 (f) of the Act and where an identified tree has some particular biodiversity value it may be relevant under section 6 (c) of the Act. Section 7 is also relevant as protected trees can contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values, and the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.

3.2 The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)

In terms of the local planning framework, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement CRPS does not provide any specific directions (policies or methods) in relation to protected trees or any specific policy support for the method of protecting trees of local significance. The CRPS does touch on issues of amenity and the quality of the environment generally within a number of objectives and policies. While the CRPS does not include any criteria to identify trees of significance (nor require a district to identify or protect such trees), recognition and protection of trees within a district assists in recognising or giving effect to these broader CRPS provisions.

3.3 Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP)

The elements of protected trees that relate to historic heritage values are covered in part in the sections of the IMP that address heritage and may overlap with cultural. Beyond these values, another key element of the IMP relates to issues of indigenous biodiversity values and mahinga kai which are addressed in section 5.5 of the IMP; Tāne Mahuta. There are some trees on the protected tree schedule that are indigenous species (Kowhai, Cabbage Trees) and may have cultural and biodiversity values.

4.0 Summary of alternative management responses – Other Districts

In reviewing the operative District Plan provisions, consideration has been given to other comparable district plans including the Ashburton District Plan, Waimakariri District Plan, Hurunui District Plan, Christchurch District Plan, the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan and the Proposed Dunedin District Plan. Generally, the approaches in the reviewed District Plans have a strong level of alignment with similar terminology and criteria used for identification of trees that contribute to the district, as well as the way in which information is displayed in the schedule or list of trees.

The rules are also similar, with all plans providing for a range of permitted activities according to specified standards. The standards themselves are similar with most relating to the degree of pruning of branches, the separation for earthworks or structures and provision for works to occur in emergency situations. The degree of complexity of these rules differs across plans with some including a high level of detail.

All of the approaches reviewed provide recognition of significant trees and a set of provisions that enable consideration of activities affecting the values of the trees at some level. Given that there is no established comprehensive approach to best practice for methods relating to protected trees, all of these approaches appear to provide a level of protection.

5.0 Best practice

5.1 Protected Tree Provisions

There is no established or comprehensive best practice approach that is consistently applied for provisions/methods applying to protected trees, either across the country or within Canterbury.

Instead a variety of approaches to protecting significant trees have been taken by territorial authorities throughout New Zealand.

5.2 Protected Tree Evaluation Criteria

Protected trees in the Selwyn District Plan (and most other district plans) are assessed against evaluation criteria. The purpose of these criteria is to form a consistent basis of assessment of significance. Where a tree reaches an appropriate threshold (as determined by an arboricultural specialist), it is deemed to be of sufficient significance that it should be protected through provisions in the District Plan (noting that an analysis under s32 of the RMA will also be required to determine if it is appropriate to list the trees). The importance of adopting a standardised and nationally recognised methodology for evaluating trees has long been seen as a necessity by many within the New Zealand arboricultural industry.

The 'Standard Tree Evaluation Method' (STEM) approach as composed by Ron Flook is the most commonly used evaluation method around New Zealand. Initially based upon the British 'Helliwell System', this method was later modified by the Royal New Zealand Institute of Horticulture. Following many years of collaboration and development with various stakeholder groups in New Zealand, this tree evaluation method was first published in September 1996. The method was peer reviewed during all 6 draft stages, prior to release and adoption within the New Zealand arboricultural industry. It quickly became the most widespread method of evaluating heritage and notable trees for district plans around the country.

The benefits of using this system include:

- It is widely used throughout New Zealand and is seen as a consistent evaluation method.
- It is recognised by the NZ Environment Court system as consistent and appropriate.
- The criteria used for tree evaluation is robust and scored by quantitative means rather than qualitative means.
- It is endorsed by the New Zealand Arboricultural Association and the Royal New Zealand Institute of Horticulture.
- The threshold scoring is set by Local Authorities and thus provides the ability to set appropriate quantitative standards for the district⁵.
- It is uncomplicated by formulae or calculations which other systems use and which can lead to complications or a lack of integrity.

Overall, this tree evaluation method is well-regarded throughout the New Zealand arboricultural industry and adopted by many Local Authorities.

In 2015, Treotech was commissioned to undertake the assessment of Heritage and Notable Trees within Christchurch City, using the 'Christchurch Tree Evaluation Method' (CTEM) system (aka. STEM+) as part of the review of the Christchurch Replacement District Plan. The CTEM system was composed

⁵ This is relevant to ensure that the criteria are appropriately applied in a local context e.g. different species have different growth rates in hotter / colder climates.

by Mr Shane Moohan (Christchurch City Council Arborist) in 2014, and was specifically created for Christchurch City Council's Proposed Assessment Methodology for Significant Trees, as part of the Christchurch Replacement District Plan Review. The Christchurch City Council's decision to adopt CTEM, as a modified version of STEM proved to be a contentious and highly political issue.

On the basis of consideration of the current criteria, the RMA, comparable district plans and knowledge of the application of criteria generally around New Zealand, adoption of the STEM criteria (unmodified) is recommended. This approach is accepted nationally as being appropriate and has been recommended by the specialists working on this review (Treotech), who have had direct experience with STEM, and variations of it, in plan review processes.

6.0 Technical Analysis

The protected tree schedule in the operative Selwyn District Plan contains:

- A total of 104 listed items, with each item on the list representing a tree or group of trees,
- A spread of locations across both rural and urban areas including most of the settlements.
- A range of species of trees of varying sizes, evergreen and deciduous, and in varying condition.
- Two of the items on the list (T74 and T75) represent the two parts of Harts Arboretum at Coleridge (the upper and lower areas of the arboretum) with each area including a number of trees.

The Council commissioned Treotech to review the trees listed in the current tree schedules as part of this workstream. This involved a specialist arboriculturist visiting each tree or group of trees to assess them against the STEM evaluation criteria and following best practice approaches as set out above. As part of this process a cross check was made to ensure that the trees are accurately located as current records. The Council did not commission investigation into any additional trees or a comprehensive review of the trees within the district. The Council also did not specifically call for nominations of additional trees, however some have been nominated and assessed by Treotech.

The technical analysis undertaken by Treotech in assessing the existing and potential trees against the criteria has resulted in recommendations for a schedule of protected trees. This includes the retention of many current listings, some additions (via nominations), and some deletions from the existing schedule. Refer to **Appendix 3** for the protected tree schedule.

7.0 Summary of Options to address Issues

7.1 Option 1: Status Quo.

This option would involve a continuation of the current approach whereby the Plan retains the current approach to protected trees with objectives, policies, rules and schedules.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issues: This option would not address the issues identified above, especially in relation to reconsidering the dated criteria and assessment methodology.

Risks: The Plan would not follow best practice and given the issues identified above, may attract submissions in opposition to this approach.

Budget or Time Implications: None as no work would be required. However, it may be that concerns and issues are raised through submissions. This could lead to protracted hearing times and even appeals to the Environment Court with subsequent time and cost implications.

Stakeholder and Community Interests: landowners of protected trees and community interest groups.

Recommendation: This option is not recommended as it does not give full effect to the RMA or CRPS and neither would it reflect current best practice. As such, the Council would not be meeting its statutory obligations.

7.2 Option 2: Adopt the technical advice and revise the plan provisions

This option would see the adoption of the technical assessment of protected trees by Treotech and replacement of the criteria, and updating of the objectives, policies, rules and schedule.

This option includes specific consideration of Harts Arboretum. This area is of special value and merits continued protection. It is recommended that instead of being treated as a group (as it is currently) in the way that other groups are approached, it be considered as an area of significant trees (rather than an individual or group), with provisions based around a management plan approach.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issues: This option would directly address the issues identified above and would update the plan provisions to better reflect best practice approaches to manage heritage values. The proposed approach to managing Harts Arboretum will recognise that these two areas of trees have very different values from other groups of trees and that there may be a need to manage the large areas of land differently. Tailored rules to recognise the values would be beneficial for the protection of the trees and for the ongoing management of the land.

Risks: The Plan would have limited risks as it does not fundamentally change the approach to protected trees but makes the information on which the schedule is based more robust.

Budget or Time Implications: Need to engage with landowners to ensure an understanding of the process, statutory drivers and the implications of the provisions.

Stakeholder and Community Interests: landowners of protected trees and community interest groups.

Recommendation: This option is recommended as it is an effective and efficient approach that provides a contemporary approach to criteria and rules. It also gives effect to the RMA and the CRPS and ensures that adverse effects of activities are appropriately managed.

8.0 Preferred Option for further engagement

The changes recommended in relation to protected trees as part of the drafting phase for this work stream are:

- Replace the criteria for assessment of protected trees listed in the Plan with the STEM criteria.
- Review the objectives and policies to ensure that they provide sufficient direction and clarity (in the absence of explanatory material) and align with the RMA and CRPS intentions regarding amenity. Include the criteria within a policy (as headings) and within appendices for the relevant chapter (as a full list). Incorporate consideration within the policies of evaluation in relation to cultural values, including consideration of the list of Taonga species in Schedule 97 of the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act and engagement with mana whenua.
- Review the content of all rules to ensure that they align with best practice wording, are simplified to remove the two categories in the current provisions, and apply appropriate status to activities.
- Include rules for Harts Arboretum to be tailored specifically to the unique values of the arboretum and enable a management plan approach to this unique situation.
- Continue to include consideration of relevant values for any subdivision consents involving land that contains a protected tree.
- Amend the schedule of protected trees in accordance with the technical assessment undertaken by Treetech (see Appendix 3 below). As part of this process, ensure that the mapping of protected trees is reviewed and that these are correctly located in the Council's GIS and on the planning maps.
- Obtain economic analysis to better understand the impact of protected tree listing on the value of property and the ability for owners to continue to utilise their property. This will inform an analysis of the appropriateness of listing any trees as required by s32 of the RMA.

Appendix 1: Baseline Report “Natural Environment Topic: Heritage Items and Protected Trees”

Appendix 2: Heritage Items Schedule

Table 1: Currently Scheduled Heritage Items to be Retained

Table 2: Currently Scheduled Heritage Items to be Deleted

Table 3: Nominated Heritage Items

Schedule of Heritage Items

INSERT WHEN IN PDF

Appendix 3: Protected Trees Schedule

Table 1: Existing District Plan Schedule – all trees to be retained except as specified

Table 2: Nominated Trees

Table 1: Existing District Plan Schedule – all trees to be retained except as specified.

Tree No.	Name / Species	Location	Legal Description	Zone	Map No.	Evaluation Score	Tree Category	Reason for deletion
T01	Strawberry Tree /Arbutus unedo	Presbyterian Church, Lee Street, Southbridge	Lot 1 DP 74959	Liv 1	131	44	B	
T02	Copper Beech /Fagus sylvatica purpurea	45 High Street, Southbridge	PT RS 5861	Liv 1	131	34	B	
T03	English Oak /Quercus robur	45 High Street, Southbridge	PT RS 5861	Liv 1	131	38	B	
T04	Wellingtonia / Sequoiadendron giganteum	67 High Street, Southbridge	LOT 1 DP 49280	Liv 1	131	52	B	
T05	Pin Oak /Quercus palustris	St John Street, Southbridge	PT LOT 19 DP 712	Bus 2	132	34	B	
T06	English Oak /Quercus robur	Broad Street, Southbridge	LOT 1 DP 373810	Liv 1	132	32	B	
T07	Wellingtonia / Sequoiadendron giganteum	St John Street, Southbridge	PT RS 4477	Bus 2	4, 132	40	B	
T09	Common Lime /Tilia x vulgaris	Southbridge School, Hastings Street, Southbridge	LOT 1 DP 80498	Liv 1	4, 131	30	B	
T10	Chinese Poplar /Populus yunnanensis	Southbridge School, Hastings Street, Southbridge	LOT 2 DP 18297	Liv 1	4, 131	34	B	Tree felled
T11	Walnut /Juglans regia	Children's playground, High Street, Southbridge	PT RS 3344,4041	Bus 1	4, 131	32	B	
T12	Golden Ash /Fraxinus excelsior 'jaspidea'	Leeston Park, Leeston	LOT 4 DP 1221	Liv 1	4, 129	36	B	
T13	Pin Oak /Quercus palustris	Leeston Park, Leeston	LOT 6 DP 1221	Liv 1	4, 129	46	B	Tree felled

T14	Common Lime / <i>Tilia x vulgaris</i>	Leeston Park, Leeston	PT LOT 2 DP 1221	Liv 1	4, 129	38	B	
T15	Indian Cedar / <i>Cedrus deodara</i>	St David's Methodist Church, High Street, Leeston	LOT 1 DP 62985	Bus 1	4, 127	48	B	
T16	Indian Cedar / <i>Cedrus deodara</i>	St David's Methodist Church, High Street, Leeston	LOT 1 DP 62985	Bus 1	4, 127	40	B	
T17	Wellingtonia / <i>Sequoiadendron giganteum</i>	Springfield Church, SH 73, Springfield	PT RS 20516	Outer Plains	21, 52	58	B	
T18	Monterey Pine /<i>Pinus radiata</i>	Porter's Pass, 500m from SH 73	RS 33889	High Country	25	48	B	Tree felled
T19	Red Oak / <i>Quercus rubra</i>	All Saints Garrison Church, Burnham	PT RES 1160	Outer Plains	13	48	B	
T20	Red Oak / <i>Quercus rubra</i>	East Corner of Buckleys Rd, Queens Dr	PT RES 1160	Outer Plains	13	54	B	
T21	Monterey Cypress / <i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	64	A	
T22	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	48	B	
T23	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	56	B	
T24	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	56	B	
T25	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	56	B	
T26	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	56	B	
T27	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	56	B	
T28	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	All Saints Churchyard, Springs Road, Prebbleton	PT LOT 2 DP 27568	Liv 1	14, 122	56	B	
T29	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i>	Kirwee Monument, Kirwee	PT Coal Tramway Reserve	Outer Plains	4, 84	30	B	

T30	Common Ash /Fraxinus excelsior	Cnr Main South Road & Hororata Dunsandel Road, Dunsandel	Road Reserve	Outer Plains	7, 92	40	B	
T31	Western Yellow Pine/Pinus ponderosa	Sheffield Domain, Sheffield	RS 42314	Outer Plains	36, 53	42	B	
T32	Western Yellow Pine/Pinus ponderosa	Sheffield Domain, Sheffield	RS 42314	Outer Plains	36, 53	42	B	
T33	English Oaks (58)/Quercus robur	Tai Tapu School, School Road,Tai Tapu	LOT 2 DP 301911	Liv 1A	9, 125	40	B	
T34	Wellingtonia / Sequoiadendron giganteum	Darfield primary school, Ross Street, Darfield (Planted 1883)	PT RES 2551	Bus 1	17, 72	46	B	
T35	Wellingtonia / Sequoiadendron giganteum	Darfield primary school, Ross Street, Darfield (Planted 1883)	PT RES 2551	Bus 1	17, 72	46	B	
T36	English Oak /Quercus robur	Darfield War Memorial, Darfield	RS 40645	Bus 1	17,	34	B	
T37	English Oak /Quercus robur	Beethams and Leeston Roads, Doyleston	LOT 1 DP 30700	Outer Plains	4, 120	48	B	
T38	Tasmanian Blue Gum/ Eucalyptus globulus	Cnr Goulds & Lowes Roads, Rolleston	Road Reserve	Liv 1	13, 101	44	B	
T39	Necklace Poplar /Populus x deltoides	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	64	A	
T40	Wellingtonia / Sequoiadendron giganteum	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	70	A	
T41	Douglas Fir/ Psuedotsuga menziesii	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	64	A	
T42	Norway Spruce /Picea abies	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	64	A	
T43	Caucasian Fir /Abies nordmanniana	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	48	B	
T44	Western Hemlock Fir /Tsuga heterophylla	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	80	A	Tree dead standing
T45	Bhutan Pine /Pinus wallichiana	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	72	A	

T46	Monterey Cypress /Cupressus macrocarpa	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	72	A	
T47	Indian Cedar /Cedrus deodara	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	72	A	
T48	Common Lime /Tilia x vulgaris	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	52	B	
T49	Atlas cedar /Cedrus atlantica	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	64	A	
T50	Monterey Cypress /Cupressus macrocarpa	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 7925	Malvern Hills	16	104	A	
T51	Monterey Pine /Pinus radiata	Homebush Station, Homebush Road	PT Lot 1 DP 2898	Malvern Hills	16	60	A	
T52	Santa Lucia Fir/Abies bracteata	Adam's Estate, Adams Road, Greendale	PT RS 8795	Outer Plains	12	76	A	
T53	Blue Atlas Cedar/ Cedrus atlantica glauca	Adam's Estate, Adams Road, Greendale	PT RS 8795	Outer Plains	12	36	B	
T54	Wellingtonia/ Sequoiadendron giganteum	Cnr Fitz Place & Edward Street, Lincoln	PT RS 1532	Liv 1	14, 113	52	B	
T55	English Oak /Quercus robur	Cnr Leister Terrace & Edward Street, Lincoln	LOT 1 DP 57207	Liv 1	14, 113	40	B	
T56	English Oak /Quercus robur	On road reserve adjacent to the Liffey Reserve	Road Reserve	Liv 1	14, 113	48	B	
T57	English Oak /Quercus robur	Liffey Reserve, Leinster Terrace	RES 3761	Liv 1	14, 113	48	B	
T58	English Oak /Quercus robur	On road reserve adjacent to the Liffey Reserve	Road Reserve	Liv 1	14, 113	48	B	
T59	English Oak /Quercus robur	On road reserve adjacent to the Liffey Reserve	Road Reserve	Liv 1	14, 113	48	B	
T60	Tasmanian Blue Gum/Eucalyptus globulus	Liffey Reserve, Kildare Terrace	RS 39900	Liv 1	14, 113	36	B	
T61	English Ash /Fraxinus excelsior	Union Church Grounds, James Street, Lincoln	LOT 2 DP 83459	Liv 1	14, 110	60	A	

T62	Big Cone Pine / <i>Pinus coulteri</i>	Terrace Station	LOT 1 DP 400673	Outer Plains	11, 16	54	B	
T63	Manna Gum / <i>Eucalyptus viminalis</i>	Terrace Station	LOT 1 DP 400673	Outer Plains	11, 16	64	A	
T64	Not allocated							
T65	Not allocated							
T66	Algerian Oak / <i>Quercus canariensis</i>	Terrace Station	LOT 2 DP 400673	Outer Plains	11, 16	76	A	Tree failed during September 2013 gale
T67	White Ash/ <i>Eucalyptus fraxinoides</i>	Homestead shelter belt, Point Farm, Windwhistle	PT LOT 11 DP 3317	Malvern Hills	15	38	B	
T68	Wellingtonia/ <i>Sequoiadendron giganteum</i>	Homestead shelter belt, Point Farm, Windwhistle	PT LOT 11 DP 3317	Malvern Hills	15	39	B	
T69	Field Maple / <i>Acer campestre</i>	Homestead shelter belt, Point Farm, Windwhistle	PT LOT 11 DP 3317	Malvern Hills	15	70	A	
T70	Wellingtonia/ <i>Sequoiadendron giganteum</i>	Homestead shelter belt, Point Farm, Windwhistle	PT LOT 11 DP 3317	Malvern Hills	15	62	A	
T71	Western Yellow Pine/ <i>Pinus ponderosa</i>	Homestead shelter belt, Point Farm, Windwhistle	PT LOT 11 DP 3317	Malvern Hills	15	70	A	
T72	Manna Gum/ <i>Eucalyptus viminalis</i>	Rakaia Terrace Road, Te Pirita	PT LOT 1 DP 15130	Outer Plains	6	52	B	
T73	English Oak / <i>Quercus robur</i> (five trees)	Waihora Park Reserve	SECT 1 SO 18388	Outer Plains	9	36	B	Failed to reach threshold (little amenity and were simply lost in a much larger group of trees)
T74	See folder for tree descriptions	A. E. Hart Arboretum, Lake Coleridge. Upper site.	Lot 1 DP 78849	High Country	19, 51		A	
T75	See folder for tree descriptions	A. E. Hart Arboretum, Lake Coleridge. Lower site.	Lot 1 DP 80128	High Country	19, 51		A	

T76	Wellingtonia/ Sequoiadendron giganteum	Hororata Reserve, behind reflection lake	Res 1589	Outer Plains	16	58	B	
T77	Tasmanian Blue Gum/Eucalyptus globulus	Cnr Halkett and Sandy Knolls Roads	Road Reserve	Outer Plains	18	52	B	
T78	Walnut /Juglans regia	Nesslea, Greendale	Lot 1 DP 59582	Outer Plains	17	80	A	
T79	English Oak /Quercus robur	Gerald Street, Lincoln. Old Bartle property.	PT RS 2724	Bus 1	14, 113	32	B	
T80	English Oak /Quercus robur(21 trees)	River bank, Perymans Rd, Tai Tapu	Road Reserve	Inner Plains	9, 125	42	B	
T81	Tasmanian Blue Gum/Eucalyptus globulus	1197 Shands Road	Lot 1 DP 75442	Inner Plains	13	36	B	
T82	Native Trees Various	Catholic Church, 1981 Telegraph Road, Darfield	PT RS 25014	Liv 1	17, 72	46	B	Trees felled
T83	Monterey Pine /Pinus radiata	High Peak Road, end of Whitecliffs Valley Road.	Road Reserve	High Country	16	58	B	
T84	Blue Atlas Cedar / Cedrus atlantica	Beside Water race (opp Kirwee Tavern) Kirwee	PT Coal Tramway Reserve	Outer Plains	17, 84	36	B	
T85	Tasmanian Blue Gum/Eucalyptus globulus (21 trees)	Old County Depot, St John St, Southbridge	RES 4918	Bus 2	4, 132	44	B	
T86	Tasmanian Blue Gum/Eucalyptus globulus (multiple trees)	Hoskyns Road, between Courtenay and Ansons	RES 2358 SECT 2 SO 4514	Liv 1, Outer Plains	17, 82	44	B	
T87	Monterey Cypress /Cupressus macrocarpa	Pearson Reserve, Bangor Road	PT RS 39126	Liv 2	17, 68	40	B	Failed to reach threshold (no particular merit)
T88	Various trees – see file	782 Weedons Road	Lot 1 DP 22179	Inner Plains	13	62	A	
T89	Tasmanian Blue Gum/Eucalyptus globulus	125 Lowes Road, Rolleston	Lot 6 DP 350314	Liv 1	13, 103	34	B	
T90	Tasmanian Blue Gum/Eucalyptus globulus	1055 Newtons Road, Sandy Knolls	Lot 2 DP 415649	Inner Plains	13	44	B	

T91	Monterey Cypress /Cupressus macrocarpa	1055 Newtons Road, Sandy Knolls	Lot 2 DP 415649	Inner Plains	13	44	B	
T92	English Oak/ Quercus robur	188 Adams Road, Greendale	Lot 5 DP 705	Outer Plains	12	52	B	
T93	English Oak /Quercus robur	188 Adams Road, Greendale	Lot 5 DP 705	Outer Plains	12	52	B	
T94	Totara /Podocarpus totara	Old Bowling Green Reserve, Springfield	Lot 8 DP 500	Liv 1	26, 52	36	B	
T95	English Oak /Quercus robur	Old Bowling Green Reserve, Springfield	Lot 8 DP 500	Liv 1	26, 52	38	B	
T96	Kowhai /Sophora microphylla	10 Waimakariri Gorge Road, Waddington	Lot 42 DP 15	Liv 1	22, 54	42	B	
T97	Spanish Fir /Abies pinsapo	10 Waimakariri Gorge Road, Waddington	Lot 42 DP 15	Liv 1	22, 54	62	A	
T98	Douglas Fir /Psuedostuga menziesii (2 trees)	Road reserve adjacent to Lot 1 DP 61202 925 Whitecliffs Road	Road Reserve (unformed)	Malvern Hills	16	42	B	
T99	Wellingtonia/ Sequoiadendron giganteum (5 trees)	Adjacent to site of old Tawera County Council Office/Depot, Springfield Road	Road Reserve	Outer Plains	21	32	B	Trees felled
T100	Wellingtonia/ Sequoiadendron giganteum	Site of old Tawera County Council Office/Depot, Springfield Road	Lot 2 DP 23887	Outer Plains	21	32	B	
T101	Monterey Cypress /Cupressus macrocarpa	Site of old Tawera County Council Office/Depot, Springfield Road	Lot 2 DP 23887	Outer Plains	21	32	B	
T102	Cabbage Tree /Cordyline australis	77 East Belt, Lincoln	Lot 3 DP 74920	Liv 1	14, 113	38	B	
T103	Common Lime /Tilia x vulgaris	Ladbrooks School, Barnes Road	Pt RS 2491	Inner Plains	14	40	B	
T104	English Oak /Quercus robur	Ladbrooks School, Barnes Road	Pt RS 2491	Inner Plains	14	40	B	
T105	Cabbage Tree /Cordyline australis	174 Ridge Road, Greenpark	Lot 2 DP 83716	Outer Plains	9	40	B	Failed to reach threshold (poor condition)
T106	Bhutan Cypress/ Cupressus torulosa	Trinity Church, McLaughlins Road	Pt RS 19215	Liv 1	68	34	B	

T107	English Oak/ Quercus robur (2 Trees)	27 Cairnbrae Drive, Prebbleton	Lot 105 DP 331951	Liv 1A6 (deferred)	14, 121	40	B	
------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------	----	---	--

Table 2: Nominated Trees

Location	Tree	Notes	Assessment	Result
17 Taumutu Road	Kauri	In domestic garden	Reaches threshold for protection	Protect
St James Anglican Church - High Street Southbridge	Oak tree		Reaches threshold for protection	Protect
St Andrews of the Glen Presbyterian - Methodist Church	Oak tree	Potential 'Gallipoli' Tree.	Reaches threshold for protection	Protect
The tree is located on the triangle of land on the NW corner of Springs & Ellesmere Junction Roads roundabout, opposite Lincoln University.	Cedar	Adjacent to road reserve - on private land Plaque reads "This tree was planted to commemorate the 25 years Atlantic Silver Plough contests 15th May 1980" John notes that he had to trim branches and clear away mulch to find the plaque under the tree. There is a photo of the tree being planted, p. 84 in Forrest Wood's book, Lincoln Ploughing Association Inc. The First 131 years 1869-2000. The author notes, 'The tree is planted in a small reserve of Lincoln College property on their corner of Springs Road.'	Reaches threshold for protection	Protect
Faulkner Way, Springfield	Avenue of Ash Trees	Rewi Alley Reserve	Reaches threshold for protection	Protect
Waihora Domain (Motukarara)	Arboretum	The Arboretum is next to the oak trees and was planted at the same time.	This group of trees is linked to and contiguous with the trees that are part of the DOC land adjacent. It contains a range of trees that are linked and display various values. The recommended method of	Do not list

			protection for this as a group/area is through a reserve management plan.	
Rolleston College	Macrocarpa		The tree is located on a designated school site. It is considered inappropriate to list it in the District Plan as there is the potential for conflict with the purpose of the designation.	Do not list
Liffey Reserve, to the east of the Gerald Street bridge	Cornus Controversa 'Variegata', Wedding Cake Tree, and commemorative plaque	Lincoln 150th tree commemoration - planted 2013	Very young tree, does not pass threshold.	Do not list
Sheffield (Sheffield Waddington Gallipoli Memorial)	Oak Trees		Very young trees, do not pass threshold.	Do not list
Foster Park	Various trees in vicinity of old Homestead		The use and development of Foster Park and the homestead is evolving and during the upcoming year a reserve management plan is to be developed to coordinate the management of the land. This is considered to be the most appropriate way to provide consistent management of the trees, together with the wider garden area and the homestead itself within the park.	Do not list
Upper Selwyn Huts	?	Memorial tree celebrating 100 years of the Upper Selwyn Huts being established.	This tree has not been able to be located, and even if located is likely to be too young to have obtained significance.	Do not list
SDC Reserve - St John Street, Southbridge	Blue gums		Already listed in the plan.	Do not list
Cream Can Corner	Blue Gum		Already listed in the plan.	Do not list
Farm of Mr Jim Smith & family who hosted the Contest, Shands Road area.	Unspecified		Tree dead (burnt), only plaque remains.	Do not list