



Appendix 6

Correspondence from Mr John Patrick, John Patrick P/L and Mr Dave Williams, ArbEcology providing commentary on the Agreed Actions

Special Meeting of Council

Friday 9 October 2009 at 7:00pm

Queenscliff Town Hall
50 Learmonth Street, Queenscliff

Information contained in these Appendices are for the CONFIDENTIAL and PRIVILEGED use of Councillors until 4:30pm on the Wednesday before the meeting.

THIS MATERIAL DOES NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF COUNCIL

8th October 2009


Mr. Lenny Jenner
Chief Executive Officer
Borough of Queenscliffe
PO Box 93
QUEENSCLIFF VIC 3225

Dear Lenny,

Re: Tree Management, Queenscliff Parks

I have received your excellent summary of our meeting held on Monday 5th October 2009 in Victoria Gardens. I believe this provides an appropriate record of what was discussed and hope that this will allow Council to move ahead and implement management works on the trees, works that are essential to allow future plantings to secure attractive vegetation cover in the town for future generations.

Yours sincerely,


John Patrick
Principal
John Patrick Pty Ltd

JOHN
PATRICK

LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTS

JOHN PATRICK PTY LTD
ABN: 62 952 638 242
324 VICTORIA ST
RICHMOND VIC 3121
AUSTRALIA

TEL: +61 3 9429 4855
FAX: +61 3 9429 8211
EMAIL:
admin@johnpatrick.com.au

LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTS

LANDSCAPE
HERITAGE
CONSULTANTS

LANDSCAPE
MANAGEMENT

HORTICULTURAL
CONSULTANTS

7 October 2009

Lenny Jenner
Borough of Queenscliffe
50 Learmonth St
Queenscliff VIC 3225



ArbEcology Pty Ltd
ABN 55 168 125 643
30 O'Shanassy St
North Melbourne, VIC 3051
Phone: (03) 9329 4640
Fax: (03) 9329 3837
Email: enquiries@arbecology.com.au

Dear Lenny,

RE: Summary Report of Agreed Tree Actions- 5 October 2009

I would like to acknowledge receipt of your summary report of agreed actions in Princess, Citizens and Victoria Parks, Queenscliff and can confirm that all the contained recommendations are consistent with my report and discussions held on site on the 5th October 2009.

I would also like to make the following comments regarding the proposed actions:

- Many of the proposed actions will have benefits in addition to the risk management aspect. For example, the establishment of mulch beds will have a beneficial impact on tree health and vigour and the reduction in pedestrian traffic can alleviate soil compaction.
- In all cases the costs of mitigating any risk should be weighed against the health and significance of the tree. For example, in Citizens Park Tree 165 is recommended for removal despite a low risk. Two factors will have influenced this decision, the poor health of the tree and the low likelihood of improvement without substantial and resource intensive management combined with its location in a children's playground. While, for the purposes of the risk assessment, the value of a child's life was considered equal to that of an adult's, it should be acknowledged that public expectations for the protection of children generally exceed that of adults.
- In response to queries raised during our site visit, I revisited the risk assessment for the trees on Gellibrand St adjacent to Citizens Park, in particular Trees 155, 156 & 166, to determine the impact of risk management actions other than tree

www.arbecology.com.au

removal. Due to the intermingling canopies and the uncertainty over the impact of the removal of one without the other, Tree's 155 & 156 should be considered for removal or retention as a single entity. With the elimination of car parking under Tree's 155, 156 & 166 the Risk of Harm becomes 1/26,306, 1/32,171 & 1/24,232 respectively. It should be noted that this assessment has only considered the removal of vehicle targets and not the potential for an increase in pedestrian targets resulting from removing the vehicle targets. The relatively minor reduction in risk is due to the inherently higher value placed on pedestrian targets as opposed to vehicle targets so as a consequence the removal of vehicle targets will not have the same impact as removing or reducing the pedestrian target. While this reduction in risk may be considered acceptable in the short term it should be weighed against the costs of the temporary installation of infrastructure sufficient to prevent car parking (and preferably pedestrian access also) and the flow on effects to the local area (financial and practical) of the reduction in car parking spaces. In my opinion removal remains the preferred management option.

- All of the recommended actions are short term actions to manage the risk over the coming summer. They will in no way negate the need for a documented inspection and maintenance regime as part of the longer term management of each park.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or require any clarification.

Yours Sincerely,



Dave Williams

BSc (Ecol), BForSc (Hons), GDipHort (Arb)
MIFA, MISA