

In Europe & America they have a culture of respecting & protecting their older trees. Just last month news flew around the world of 'Herbie the Elm' who finally lost his life at 214 years after being treated for Dutch Elm disease 15 times. The community was out in force to honour that passing of that tree. Mature trees provide a link to our history. This is not meaningless.

Public trees are the only infrastructure Council has that appreciates over time. Trees are worth significant money. Council needs to do a Tree Inventory so we know what assets we actually have. To remove mature trees will result in a drop of property values &, if residents start to recognise how important street trees are to the value of their property, Council will not easily convince them that the healthy, lovely, shady tree out front has to go.

How can Council be considering a Climate Change Policy when they intend to remove the very things that are vital in removing CO₂? Council should be planting 1,000 trees a year & only removing trees where there is no other option, not removing trees because they are mature. All around the world they are planting trees due to global warming. It is strange that our Council is planning to remove trees.

I also wonder whether some of the trees marked for removal could recover with watering, fertilising & dead branch removal. They have been struggling through a long & protracted drought. If they are causing pavements to lift, remove some cement. Don't remove the tree. Other councils use porous footpath. Why can we?

I was also disappointed to see that there are no plans to establish a Significant Tree Register.

Please don't rip all the trees out at once. If they have to go it should be a gradual process. It's patently wrong to do otherwise. I think it should be done case-by-case, street-by-street with community consultation.

I like to pass around copies of an article from the Los Angeles Times about trees & their impact on urban communities published 6 February 2010 if I may. Absence of extensive mature tree canopy leads to increased aggression, graffiti, vandalism & littering all of which costs Council money. The article talks about benefits of the urban forest.

I do think it is a good paper. It has many points of merit. It is comprehensive & it definitely tries to improve the LGA. I hope the writer & other involved staff take no offence at my objections. They are not personal. Thank you for your time.

Good evening. It is obvious a lot of work has gone into writing this & that Parks & Gardens have been working under-resourced for many years. I am pleased that Parks & Gardens have been granted an increase of staff.

I was pleased to read that Council's Tree Strategy is going to go through a process of community Consultation. It is so significant. It deserves wide distribution giving people the opportunity to comment. I hope Council will hold a community consultation out in public meetings rather than rely on people to send in submissions.

I like that Council is advocating:

- Increasing the tree canopy
- Planting many more larger trees & at least one large tree in every street
- Planting trees on the road
- Planting in more appropriate places
- Increasing the number of trees in parks
- Planting trees in disused sites
- Doing more maintenance
- Educating the community

And is concerned about:

- the continuing loss of trees on public property
- public accountability
- the pruning practices of Energy Australia
- the character of Marrickville LGA

Overall I think the Paper is a good one & I support it going through to the next stage with the following qualifications.

I was shocked to read the recommendation to remove 1,000 trees per year. I know they will be replaced, but I think this is of limited value, as the paper itself reports that a large percentage of new plantings do not survive, either through vandalism, lack of water, injury etc.

The community will lose 1,000 trees a year with the expectation that few of the new plantings will survive. This will result in a denuded municipality that already looks bare in many areas compared to other councils throughout Sydney.

How will our wildlife survive? Council is already concerned about the loss of canopy on private property. We also have a responsibility to wildlife. They need food & homes as well.

I was shocked to read that mature & large trees are to be removed. I do not understand why this needs to be so. If I understood correctly, 59% of public trees are considered over-mature. Are they all to be removed? I also don't understand why Council wants to remove all the Eucalypts. They flourish in other councils, including high-density councils in Sydney.