

Mat Humfrey

From:
Sent: Wednesday, 20 June 2018 12:44 PM
To: Mat Humfrey; DL CR Sandra Boulter
Cc: Denise Tyler-Hare
Subject: RE: Loma Street Canopy

Dear Mr Humfrey,

My correspondence with Cr Boulter was indeed a complaint on several fronts, viz, the abysmal canopy coverage in TOC and the inaction over Loma Street tree issues which have been a source of several emails by myself and another resident of Loma street over the past few months.

Cr Boulter has set out the complaint quite clearly, however I set out below what has previously been sent to council:

- Verge of # 25 which has a recently planted (about 2 months ago) jacaranda tree-why was this allowed?
- Verge of #27 which has a NFP that is entangled with the branches of a dangerous Coral tree (a species that is always dropping limbs on cars parked underneath)?
- Verge of #16 an NFP that is growing under a complete canopy of two other non-NFP species, which one will be removed?
- Verge # 18 that has a dead tree on the northern point, why has this not been removed and replaced by a NFP?
- Verge # 20 that has a coral tree limb entangled with a NFP?
- Verge #15 has planted native grass trees as well as having another non-NFP?

Given the fact that Loma Street is a designated NFP street the above situations clearly need to be rectified.

Kind regards

From: Mat Humfrey <CEO@cottesloe.wa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 20 June 2018 12:19 PM
To: DL CR Sandra Boulter <sandraboulter@westnet.com.au>
Cc: Denise Tyler-Hare <epm@cottesloe.wa.gov.au>;
Subject: RE: Loma Street Canopy

Cr Boulter,

The email chain below appears to me to be an interaction between an elected member and a resident over a policy issue rather than a complaint. Can you let me know what you believe the nature of the complaint is so I can reconsider?

Regards
Mat

Mat Humfrey
Chief Executive Officer



Town of Cottesloe

109 Broome Street | Cottesloe WA 6011
PO Box 606 | Cottesloe WA 6011
Phone: (08) 9285 5000
Fax: (08) 9285 5001
Email: CEO@cottesloe.wa.gov.au
Web: www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au



This electronic mail message is intended only for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you are not the addressee you are notified that any transmission, distribution or photocopying of this email is strictly prohibited. The confidentiality attached to this email is not waived, lost or destroyed by reasons of a mistaken delivery to you. If you have received this email in error please notify or reply to the sender immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: sandraboulter@westnet.com.au [<mailto:sandraboulter@westnet.com.au>]
Sent: Wednesday, 20 June 2018 12:10 PM
To: Mat Humfrey
Cc: Denise Tyler-Hare;
Subject: FW: Loma Street Canopy

Good Morning Mr Humfrey and Ms Tyler-Hare

I enclose copies of the email correspondence below.

Can I request that a CRM number be allocated to this ratepayer complaint –

“... Just taking the Loma Street issue in isolation, how difficult is it for an officer of the TOC to decide to remove trees on verges that are either dead, not a species that is designated for the street, approved and remove other species that are overcrowding already planted NFP? Does this type of action require a ratepayer's referendum for someone in the administration to exercise judgement and initiate steps to rectify what is obviously wrong regarding the Loma Street tree scape? Surely these can be done today within the existing guidelines and policy?...”

and that I be copied into any correspondence relating to concerns regarding the trees in Loma Street?

Yours faithfully

Cr Sandra Boulter

From: Sandra Boulter <sandraboulter@westnet.com.au>
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 5:47 PM
To:
Subject: Re: Loma Street Canopy

Thankyou

On 19 Jun 2018, at 4:25 pm,

wrote:

Hi Sandra,
I have no problem if it is forwarded on to the TOC.
Kind regards

From: sandraboutler@westnet.com.au <sandraboutler@westnet.com.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 19 June 2018 3:47 PM
To:
Subject: RE: Loma Street Canopy

Could I send your email into the TOC calling it a complaint and seeking a response?

Cheers
Sandra Boulter

From:
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 3:27 PM
To: sandraboutler@westnet.com.au
Subject: RE: Loma Street Canopy

Dear Sandra,

Thank you for your email.

I appreciate your empathetic thoughts with respect to the Loma Street issues.

My concerns are that the council and the administration are perhaps being caught up in a, paralysis by analysis which may result in further inaction and ultimately wastage of ratepayer's funds. However, I do understand the need for a comprehensive policy for the entire TOC.

Just taking the Loma Street issue in isolation, how difficult is it for an officer of the TOC to decide to remove trees on verges that are either dead, not a species that is designated for the street, approved and remove other species that are overcrowding already planted NFP? Does this type of action require a ratepayer's referendum for someone in the administration to exercise judgement and initiate steps to rectify what is obviously wrong regarding the Loma Street tree scape? Surely these can be done today within the existing guidelines and policy?

I am extremely vexed that a tree planting policy could only have a proposed budget of \$100,000 (same as 2016) as opposed to the hundreds of thousands that have been or will be spent on a pylon that has little iconic

symbolism and does not contribute to any lessening of the greenhouse effect.

If the council is serious about investing their surplus funds in investments that are only in "environmentally friendly industries", or it practices some form of sustainability, then how can a tree planting budget be less than that for the maintenance of a concrete pile in the ocean that has zero tangible community benefit?

Again, my thanks for your attentive and detailed response.

Kind regards

From: sandraboutler@westnet.com.au <sandraboutler@westnet.com.au>
Sent: Monday, 18 June 2018 5:10 PM
To:
Subject: RE: Loma Street Canopy

Thank you for your email,

I agree entirely about tree canopies in Cottesloe and I have urged for this to be higher priority since I was elected to Council over two years ago.

I have driven/walked up Loma St a number of times with your issues at the forefront of my mind

I am aware of the 2020 mapping at <http://2020vision.com.au/> that shows Cottesloe in the red surrounded by other local governments in the orange. This of course is contributed to by the increasing density and redevelopment of the residential lots in Cottesloe, which leads to loss of trees on private property when lots are redeveloped. City of Stirling Council figures show it is just about impossible to keep up with loss of trees on private property with public planting. Protecting trees on private property is a vexed and generally unwelcome policy initiative. I would like to see some type of rates incentive for trees on private property and adjacent road reserves but I am not sure if this is possible and is one of the things that could be debated if a draft tree planning policy was brought to Council.

Quite apart from the increased amenity and increased property values from tree canopies, I am sure you are aware that tree canopies help keep us healthy by lowering heat island impacts and they reduce infrastructure deterioration rates such as road and footpath surfaces.

When the administration do plant street trees such as the trees in Napoleon St, which failed to thrive, expertise is needed about how to go about this. I put up successfully a motion to have scientist pull up a Napoleon St tree so they could tell us why they had not thrived. The report in March 2017, which is very disappointing to me is here [http://www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au/d/Resource Library/Council/Council and Committee Minutes and Agenda/Agenda and Minutes 2017/March 2017/JTX24Y7DXM30QQC73MJ95XTV5E16DC/FR2Q34TZDDB70QB.pdf/ArborCarbon+Report Napoleon+St+Tree+Assessment+Rev+A.pdf?](http://www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au/d/Resource%20Library/Council/Council%20and%20Committee%20Minutes%20and%20Agenda/Agenda%20and%20Minutes%202017/March%202017/JTX24Y7DXM30QQC73MJ95XTV5E16DC/FR2Q34TZDDB70QB.pdf/ArborCarbon+Report+Napoleon+St+Tree+Assessment+Rev+A.pdf?) and has wider implications for tree planting in Cottesloe.

On 26 April 2016, I put up a Notice of Motion for the administration to bring back to Council a tree planning and development policy it is here at page 83

http://www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au/d/Resource_Library/Council/Council_and_Committee_Minutes_and_Agenda/Agendas_Minutes_2016/April/DLVN65751STGXHITMPHWKAVOD0T7A7/YETHTQO9Z5FBZ59.pdf/Minutes+April+26+2016+Council.pdf?

The issues you raise below in regard to Loma st could be dealt with by such a policy. This has still not been brought to Council.

I also note that the Town of Cottesloe Community Strategic Plan at

http://www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au/d/Resource_Library/Council/Key_Docs/YRK8EWXTSLKXUSZVWWSFH89JI1X4K3/3RYL8O2IX10ONAY.pdf/Strategic+Community+Plan+2013+to+2023+-+Revised+June+2016.pdf? has as one of its priorities:

1.6 Implement policies that protect existing trees and that actively seek to increase the tree canopy in Cottesloe.

The draft budget for 2018/2019 produced by the TOC administration to be considered by Council at the upcoming June Ordinary Meeting of Council has only \$100,000 for tree planting over and above the Napoleon St Tree replanting. This is not very much but is competing with other projects in what is a very small budget.

One light at the end of the tunnel is that Council has required the administration to develop a green infrastructure management plan. However, the majority of Council members – not me - removed the requirement from the brief that required development of a tree valuation model as part of the TOC green infrastructure management tools.

While Council has allocated a tree planting budget but how this is done is currently decided by the administration under delegated authority. I would like the Council to have a greater role in how this is done but so far that is not supported by the majority of Councillors, so far as I understand it. I will try in the June budget meetings for Council to have some input into this process so it is more open, accountable and transparent to the community. Again, this issue could be addressed by a tree planting and development Council policy.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any ideas you have over and above what is suggested above.

Cheers
Cr Sandra Boulter

From:
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 4:24 PM
To: #councillors@cottesloe.wa.gov.au
Cc: 'CR Melissa Harkins' <CR.Harkins@cottesloe.wa.gov.au>; 'CR Sally Pyvis' <cr.pyvis@cottesloe.wa.gov.au>
Subject: re: Loma Street Canopy

Dear Councillors,

It is with no surprise that a recent ABC report has highlighted the lack of adequate tree canopy in Cottesloe a fact that is obvious to all residents but apparently not to the council or its executives. This assessment of Cottesloe is shameful and egregious to all rate payers given the quantum of rates that are harvested each year from residents.

I have previously pointed this out in prior emails when complaining about the hotchpotch of tree species planted in Loma Street, as opposed to its designated status of being

assessed as an NFP street. One only must look at the verges of number 18 (dead trees=zero canopy), number 15 (low native shrubs =zero canopy), number 25 (recently planted jacaranda =zero canopy??) etc to see the inadequate canopy in this street alone. How difficult or expensive is it to rectify these specific issues in Loma Street given the council is supposed to own and dictate the species that can be placed on verges?

Surely low tree canopy (a health issue in summer) should be on the top of the council's agenda as opposed to the excessive time and money being spent on a concrete pylon in the ocean. A pylon that should be removed and relocated to the top of the groyne with a plaque commemorating its history. This would alleviate hundreds of thousands of dollars being spent on maintenance and provide visitors with a readily accessible part of history to touch, photograph, read about etc. The money spent on concrete pylons in oceans should instead be spent on planting living organisms that enhance ratepayer's lifestyle as opposed to an innate object that will continually cost money for maintenance with no tangible return to ratepayers.

I continue to hope that common sense and logic will prevail, and that action will be taken to address the streetscape of Loma Street.

Kind regards

Tree canopy study reveals inner Perth heating up

Posted Sun at 6:15am

Cottesloe is known for its tall Norfolk pines but its total tree canopy is just 15 per cent.

ABC News: Irena Ceranic

<image001.jpg>