

ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
3643	Peter	Catto	do not support the plan	
3663	Alan & Carol	Alfeld	support the plan	We need no more trees by our house as we have 4 pin oaks on our property BUT Money would be better spent fixing footpaths around here that the exiting trees have broken up footpaths and are dangerous
3612	Stephen	Reed	support the plan	Several trees in Vanderbilt Place also should be checked. One at the entrance to Vanderbilt place has ruined the new footpath that was provided just a few years ago
3603	Christopher	Chapman	support the plan	while the original submissions were health orientated our greatest issue is the nuisance aspect. Not only do the leaves block our gutters and gather in our drive the worst of all are the seeds. These get everywhere, under our garage door, into our car vents.  Several trees have already been removed due to their locations having been in the way of earthquake repairs  We'd like to see the remaining trees removed and replaced with something more suitable
3589	Bev & Murray	Woods	have some concerns	Providing the trees are removed at no cost to us.  The trees are not on our land, and we have months when we can't leave windows open or even sit outside. They should not be on streets where houses are involved,
3588	A D	Clent	support the plan	I consider these trees to be both a nuisance value and a health concern.  The seed from the trees penetrate throughout the house which then makes them a health problem
3587	L	Prinsloo	support the plan	
3563	John	Gartly	support the plan	<u>Proposed removal of Silver Birch trees on Rempstone Drive</u> Rempstone Drive is Council property and the trees on Rempstone Drive are Council owned. Residents in Rempstone Drive have the Council as a neighbour and as the owner of the offending birch trees not a good neighbour. I believe that I as a resident of Christchurch City have a right to enjoy my residential environment and that the City Council has an obligation to ensure that my enjoyment is retained. Council policy does not provide for the planting of trees the size of these silver birches in the narrow berm width of a residential street such as Rempstone Drive. For eighteen years I have paid Council to clean up the street mess these trees have created. Why should I then have to spend additional time and cost cleaning up the street and my own section. <u>Health Concerns</u> Council have over many years dismissed concerns about physical health issues caused by the trees citing their policy that any complainant must produce a medical practioner certificate stating the patient's symptom is caused solely by the trees. This I consider to be an unreasonable demand, which sets a block against doing anything. A practioner will always base a diagnosis on what the patient says and will qualify his certificate accordingly. What medical advice did Council obtain in formulating their policy to ensure that it established achievable limits? Then there is no account taken of mental health problems. Years of dealing with physical health issues, the persistent and never- ending nuisance caused by the trees and the negative response by Council to their removal. Revolutions have been generated over lesser issues. <u>Nuisance Value</u> Much has already been written on this subject. This is my third written submission. I offer two examples of how these trees affect our ordinary daily lives and they both concern the seeds generated. I have two large trees adjacent to my property. Washing a car in one's driveway should be a simple enough chore. But imagine trying to complete this task under a continuous rain of silver birch seeds. As fast as dirt and grime is removed, seeds deposit themselves on the wet surface and if removed by washing a fresh deposit is made. Seeds cannot be removed until the car is taken elsewhere and allowed to dry. A great inconvenience and nuisance. Last Good Friday on a cold wet day I was forced to clear my overflowing spouting of silver birch seeds. I have a mesh screen that prevents birch twigs and whole leaves entering the spouting but nothing can stop birch seeds. The spouting was clogged with seeds and broken-down leaves. I removed five buckets of seeds. Unless one experiences living under the rain of birch seeds it is not possible to gauge their nuisance capacity. To my knowledge no one from Council has visited my property to see first-hand the scale of the nuisance. <u>Healthy Trees</u> Often Council reports state that the trees are healthy as if this is justification for tree retention. But this is the very issue our complaint is about. The larger the tree, the healthier the tree, the bigger the problem. <u>No Budget for tree removal</u>



ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
				<p style="text-align: right;"><i>Attachment A</i></p> <p>Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) Pollen and Human Health: Problems for an Exotic Tree in New Zealand. Ian F. Spellerberg, Nils E. Eriksson, and Vincent St. A. Crump</p> <p>Abstract. Silver birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) is commonly used as a street tree in temperate climatic regions. However, the medical literature contains a wealth of reports on the health effects of pollen from silver birch. In many countries such as New Zealand, silver birch is the main tree that causes allergic symptoms, including seasonal hay fever, asthma, and other health conditions such as food allergies (the oral allergy syndrome). Exposure to pollen from silver birch is more likely to occur in cities because of the numbers of the trees and the human population density. Even if there were doubts about the extent of the problem and the costs associated with the problem, the precautionary principle should apply. The health related problems of silver birch should be promulgated and trees should be removed. Key Words. Allergies; human health problems; silver birch pollen.</p> <p>Introduction. In the arboriculture literature, there are many articles that include lists of trees that are suitable for urban environments. Similarly, in the research literature, there are many papers that deal with selection of trees for urban environments (see for example Ware1994; Kristoffersen 1999; Saebo et al.2003). There are many factors to consider, including suitability of the site, aesthetic and design factors, and nuisance factors. Nuisance factors include propensity to drop limbs, shed bark, have unpleasant odors, and have poisonous properties. The fact that some plants and plant pollen cause allergies (allergenic) has been known for some time. Indeed, there are some species such as privet (<i>Ligustrum</i> spp.) and ragweed or mugwort (<i>Ambrosia</i> spp.) and, more recently, olive (<i>Olea europaea</i>) that pose allergy-related problems worldwide and are troublesome for agriculture (Baldo et al. 1992; Wickens2001). Some plant species that cause allergies are so widespread that it is difficult to eradicate them. However, some species of trees that are introduced species may be much more manageable by way of some eradication and by education. Allergy-free gardening has been addressed by several authors such as Ogren (2000). However, management of plants that cause allergies may have to be modified country by country because of local conditions. Silver birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) is native to Europe and Asia Minor. It has been introduced to Australia and New Zealand. Ecologically, silver birch is a fast-growing and short-lived species. It has male catkins on the ends of small shoots, visible all winter. The female flowers are typically on branched stalks and some appear at the base of the male catkins. The pollen is dispersed by wind over several weeks in the summer. The pollen can be spread over considerable distances, and in our experience (Sven-Olov Strandhede, pers. comm.) in Europe, the pollen can even cross the Baltic sea. In temperate climatic regions, silver birch is, with few exceptions, considered to be a suitable species as a street tree. Many authors extol its universal appeal as an ornamental trees suitable for private gardens and streets and parks. The main reasons for its popularity include its whitish/silver-colored bark, graceful form, and autumn colors. However, some civic authorities (e.g., Palmerston North, New Zealand) list silver birch as being unsuitable because of the seeds and the roots. In New Zealand, pollen from introduced species is a common cause of hay fever and asthma. A major contributor is the pollen from perennial rye grass. Among tree species, the pollen from pines has not been found to be a problem. Of all introduced species in New Zealand, the introduced silver birch is the main problem.</p> <p>The health-related problems of silver birch pollen, although well documented in the medical literature, appear not to have reached arboriculture literature or landscape architecture literature. Conversations with arboriculturalists and landscape architects have confirmed this conclusion. The purpose of this article is therefore to promulgate the issue and prompt discussion.</p> <p>Extract from: Arboriculture &amp; Urban Forestry 32(4): July 2006 137</p>
3392	D J & L E	Weir	support the plan	<p>Congratulations to the 23 residents of Rempstone Drive for their foresight and wisdom of their request to have 19 invasive silver birch trees removed from their frontage.</p> <p>They are a completely unsuitable species for the positions they occupy.</p> <p>The pollution they creat with leaves, catkins and twigs littering water channels, verges, footpaths and spoutings and root damage footpaths and lawn maintenance is continuous.</p> <p>During the winter would be the optimum time for this work to be completed while the growth is dormant and before another year of misery begins.</p> <p>While the contractors are doing this work we request that they remove three other trees on the corner of Rempstone and Vanderbilt Place as indicated on your plan.</p> <p>We are not sure of their species but to us are even worse pollutants than the silver birch trees on Rempstone Drive.</p> <p>Hoping this request reaches a favourable conclusion to our quandary and exasperation.</p>
3391	Marion	Keeman	have some concerns	<p>The Council planted silver birch trees, the seeds invade every persons property that makes Council responsible for cost of any replants.</p> <p>A street with no trees is neither good for the beauty of street or native seeds are the problem. Leaves are part of that nature.</p>

ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
				<p>Living alone one has a limited budget with high cost. I would be unable to contribute to cost. The tree on corner of Rempstone &amp; VandeBilt is not in a good place for safety being so close to corner.</p> <p>Smaller growing trees are far more suitable for the whole street.</p>
3370	Christine	Hamilton	support the plan	<p>Silver birch pollen is the main cause of allergic symptoms including hay fever, asthma and food allergies</p> <p>Needing to put Silver birch debris into Red Bin as the Green Bin is not large enough to hold the amount the trees are dropping</p> <p>Myself and 2 sons suffering from itching eyes, swollen lips etc when Silver birch pollen is in the air</p> <p>I am having to constantly clear guttering and it is all from Silver Birch leaves</p> <p>Silver Birch trees are known to cause ill-effects</p> <p>Silver Birch is an introduced and noxious species</p>
3353	Ormond	Wilson	do not support the plan	I see no particular reason for removing the trees. They do not directly affect my health in any way
3308	D J	Hammond	support the plan	<p>Silver Birch trees need to go in Rempstone Drive.</p> <p>There are a health hazard. If replaced the be tree display a pitcher around Christchurch</p>
3260	David	Barwick	have some concerns	<p>A suitable alternative to the Silver Birches would be Kowhai (Sophora microphylla) as the litter production is limited, the trees do not get to tall and the early spring blossom is highly attractive to nectar feeding birds. Mature kowhai are also very deep rooted and do not lift the kerbing and footpaths as they age.</p> <p>-Japanese Cherries (Prunus x yedoensis) could be used sparingly to provide some colour contrast with the Kowhai.</p>
3258	Peter	Boyes	do not support the plan	<p>I do not support the removal of all the trees without a commitment to replanting.</p> <p>I would support the removal of selected trees where they are close together to even out the plantings along the street, this would improve the look of the street. Large trees give the street a more established look which I like.</p> <p>I feel thinning out the trees along the street and Increasing the frequency of street sweeping in the autumn will reduce any nuisance value to adjacent properties and infrastructure to an acceptable level</p> <p>While I have some sympathy for anyone with health issues relating to these trees I believe the Silver Birches will only be one of many pollen and seeding plants contributing to those health issues.</p>
3170	P & B	Johnson	have some concerns	<p>These trees are a health hazard for alergy sufferers and the sooner they are removed the better.</p> <p>Why not plant Feijoa trees in their place! They are evergreen and have an attractive red flower in the summer and sought after for their fruit which is so beneficial in the winter for its Vitamin "C"</p>
3169	R W G	Daglish	have some concerns	<p>We support the removal of the silver birch trees in Rempstone Drive provided they are replaced with something that is less destructive on footpaths and do not shed their leaves and seeds to the same extent as birch.</p> <p>Some collaboration and assistance from the City Council on replanting to produce a uniform street frontage would be appreciated</p>
3136	Mary	Corbett	support the plan	We live just around the corner and we also have silver birch trees near the corner of Brigham and Rempstone and are fed up with the leaves in Autumn. All the trees are huge and not at all pleasing to the eye so all such trees should be removed.every year they come around and cut some branches off then the trees grow bigger.i totally support the removal of these trees.
3079	Glen and Jenice	Brown	do not support the plan	
3078	Lex	Bunting	support the plan	<p>Yes I support the plan</p> <p>Due to the mess they make</p>

ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
				<p>I am allergic to them</p> <p>Their roots break up the foot paths and make them uneven which is a danger to me and others of my age and people with diminishing eyesight when you are out walking</p>
3002	Kevin	McKay	do not support the plan	<p>The trees add to the visual amenity of the area.</p> <p>The trees visually soften the architecture of the area and provide a pleasant visual atmosphere when entering the street. They provide a peaceful environment and add value to living in the area.</p>
3001	G and S	Pugh	do not support the plan	<p>The trees on Rempstone Drive are an asset to the street. It would be a real shame to remove them and replace them with a native species presumably due to a minority that don't like a few leaves on their property and lodge claims of ill health. I am concerned now of these people poisoning the trees for their own gain and hope it doesn't come to that.</p> <p>The Birch trees are beautiful they need to be left on our street</p>
2988	Dr Dugald and Mrs Shirley	McDonald	support the plan	<p>We are one of the petitioning households.</p> <p>Living in the wind-cast zone of these trees makes life hell during the lengthy seed-distribution period. The seeds permeate all parts of our home, gardens and water features and children's paddling pools. It is impossible in a light wind to open a door or window without seeds blowing in. They colonise the herb garden, rendering items such as parsley inedible because the seeds cannot be dislodged. They poison the bird bath water and turn it bright red.</p> <p>We believe that that the CCC needs to accept responsibility for the historical mistake of planting these trees which it now classifies as noxious. The Council also needs to take responsibility for the additional social costs its has inadvertently placed upon residents. It's analogous to the grit that was broadcast by the old gasworks. There are real costs in time and energy in keeping free of these invading seeds - clouds of millions of them. When wet, these become street litter and block drains. Records will show that Astor Place has a long history of flooding from blocked stormwater intakes.</p> <p>We are not able to claim any dyswelfare on health grounds because of the high scientific rigour which the CCC medical advisers have set. We should, however, like Councillors to imagine what it is like to have to breathe in and eat these seeds for six-months of each year.</p>
2945	Christine	Baxter	have some concerns	<p>If it can be proven that peoples health is suffering because of birch pollen then I support the plan. However, for me leaf fall is not a good reason to chop the trees down. We have leaf fall from the trees in Vanderbiut Place for weeks on end during autumn but I would never suggest they should be cut down. They are too beautiful to destroy and the money would be better spent on more essential projects.</p>
2944	James and Pat	Carroll	Do not support the plan	<p>Yes. I've had this concern for 20 years.</p> <p>The trees should never have been planted - your department should have foreseen that they would grow too big and that the birch type would become a nuisance with 1 calkins 2 seeds 3 leaves this has caused no end of problems with flooding, blocked gutter and cracked footpaths.</p> <p>Approaching 80yrs Im not able to carry out "your work" and have reached the point of mental annoyance.</p> <p>PS Don't try and convince me you haven't the money to cut them down. You appear to have plenty for "sports"</p>
2896	Bob	Davidson	do not support the plan	<p>From the CCC Background statement two issues emerge, 1/ Household's reasons stated for removal of trees are : (a) personal health concerns &amp; (b) nuisance, 2/ Council Tree/ Human health policy says : The tree to be the the sole cause of persons health condition.</p> <p>Given the CCC statement on the tree health, the nuisance issue would therefore appear to be relatively irrelevant &amp; indicative of maybe laziness &amp; aimed to merely support the other issue, our question on the health issue being, has the Council taken the time &amp; made the effort to prove its own policy in terms of its stated policy with all of the 23 households? Also pls consider that tree lined streets is a feature of the wider subdivisions &amp; communities in this area &amp; one of the primary reasons we elected to come here..</p>
2887	Bevin & Leslie	Johnson & Fischer	support the plan	<p>Cannot believe the Health and well being of trees takes precedence over the Health and well being of humans. If we were to own trees on private property that continually caused Health issues, plus litter peoples homes with leaves and seeds, block spouting, and roadside drains and roots destroying the foot paths I am sure Council would request us to mitigate the problem or have the tees removed. Not only are the trees in question a health issue they are also a hazard with tree roots protruding and destroying the foot paths which becomes a hazard under the Health and Safety issue when negotiating the foot paths, this is of a serious concern. As to the maintenance of the trees we have lived in this street for twenty years, during thit time we can only recall once that the trees have been attended too by way</p>

ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
				removing some branches. This was done when the trees were far to mature, currently the size of the trees are more conducive to be growing in a mature bush. We do not agree with the comment (currently there are no tree safety concerns that would initiate their removal) as you know there is no guarantee that one or more of these trees will cause further damage either structurally, peoples Health and possible injury through tripping on the protruding roots. In the interest of peoples Health and Safety these trees need to be removed and have the foot path repaired. We have the right to live peacefully in our home with out enduring health issues from these trees and continually putting up with the also nuisance value. Some days we cannot open our front door or garage door without having leaves and seeds inundate our home. We invite any representative responsible for making the decision for these trees to come to our house and witness what we have to endure. We also have the right to walk on the foot paths without the fear of being tripped on protruding tree roots. As for the maintenance of these trees it has almost been zero by the authority that is responsible for their care.
2882	Mrs J	Wadsworth	support the plan	
2881	Carolyn	Lyford-Brady	support the plan	Would consider a reasonable contribution towards removal of the tree.  Happy for no new tree to be placed in the silver birch's place
2880	Ian Lynn & Fleur Harris		do not support the plan	We would like to make the following points  1. These people bought their properties knowing the trees were there  2. If they where such a 'problem' they shouldn't have purchased these properties  3. If the trees are removed they should be replaced at the expense of the signatories of petition  4. The aesthetic value and shading in summer far outweighs the 'nuisance' issue  5. 'Nuisance value' and 'health concerns' irrelevant as per part (1). People should not buy properties IF the roadside trees are viewed by them as a nuisance or health issue
2878	Nancy	Brough	do not support the plan	We live at end of Astor Place and have not noticed any health issues.  All trees have fallen debris at some stage.  We think the trees are beautiful and add value to neighbourhood and especially since they are healthy should NOT be removed
2877	Bill & Karen	McElhinney	have some concerns	We generally support the plan, however feel we have no obligation to contribute to the replacement costs as we had no input into the planting of these trees in the first instance.  Anyone who knows anything about trees would be well aware of the damage silver birch root systems would cause to the footpaths and berm of the surrounding areas
2822	wayne	Hook	support the plan	
2773	Barrie Paul	Johnson	support the plan	I agree fully that the Silver Birch trees in all of the streets in the area should be removed. Thornley Place has a very dangerous root problem for pedestrians.  The reasons are Health, mainly for asthma sufferers.  Also the tree roots of Silver Birch & other large trees, ie Flowering blossoms, make it dangerous for people using the footpaths. Being elderly I find this to be very dangerous.
2750	Adam	Lines	do not support the plan	I do not support the proposed tree removals
2744	Maraea	Calvert	support the plan	I'm all for it. I would like my street to be silver birch free as it blocks our gutterings on our house and has damaged storm drains. Not to mention. My asthma issues.
2708	Karen	Stephens	support the plan	Those trees are a nuisance as all of the little tiny bits that come off the tree get inside and yes it effects your health and also your gutters. Get rid of all of them we have bad enough air as it with smog this just makes it harder to enjoy clean air.