

PYRMONT ULTIMO LANDCARE INC

9C/2 Bowman Street,
PYRMONT NSW 2009
Tel: 9571 9727; 0409 552 117
Email: eelenius@bigpond.net.au
www.pyrmontultimolandcare.org.au

7 October, 2001

Mr Joel Johnson,
Manager, Parks, Trees and Aquatic Facilities,
City of Sydney,
GPO Box 1591,
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Johnson,

Draft Greening Sydney Plan

We refer to our submission on the Street Tree Master Plan dated 7 September, 2011 which included a number of recommendations which equally pertain to the draft *Greening Sydney Plan* (GSP). We repeat them among the following recommendations.

Policy Context – We note that the GSP sits below the Environmental Management Plan and above the yet to be released *Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan* (Fig 2.1, p8). We again urge deferral of consideration of the GSP until Council has determined its philosophy towards Biodiversity and Urban Ecology as contained in the UESAP. To finalise either the Street Tree Master Plan or Greening Sydney prior to the UESAP renders the latter largely irrelevant as it will have to be subservient to, rather than be a driver of the other two policies.

Recommendation: Consideration of the draft Street Tree Master Plan 2011 should be deferred until Council, and the community, have considered the recommendations of the Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan, which should provide an overarching approach to greening the City based on sound ecological principles.

The Greening Sydney Vision – Given our recommendations regarding the Street Tree Master Plan (STMP), we urge that the vision of *Empowering the Community to Green our City* (p6) be the key element in achieving the other elements of the Vision. The inflexibility of the STMP actually disempowers the community and sets the scene for objections and confrontations which can be avoided by a less dictatorial approach to greening the city. The approach of the “right tree for the right place” must be achieved through consultation, not Council edict (p11). Whilst other elements of the Vision are worthy, it is essential that they be implemented with community buy-in and in a flexible manner. We would also wish to see much more emphasis on Biodiversity as the guiding principle for the vision.

Recommendation: Greening the city should be achieved through maximising community involvement in all aspects of the plan, and the adoption of a flexible approach guided by Biodiversity principles.

Research – The GSP (p11) recommends research projects. We remind Council that exhaustive research has already been undertaken on urban ecology in the City both through the project undertaken by Dr John Broadbent, and by the Australian Museum (UESAP). Their recommendations are very clear and it is now time for the City to implement them. We are also advised that the STMP was based on overseas research. We believe it is time for the City of Sydney to establish a landscape philosophy which embraces diversity, expansion of habitat and a distinctive Australianness, rather than recreating European or North American cityscapes. We should be establishing a landscape which proudly differentiates Sydney from sub-tropical Brisbane, tropical Broome (with its boab trees), or European Paris (with its plane trees). The distinctive Sydney bushland, with its high species diversity, should be celebrated in our landscape designs and provide a distinctive, Sydney-centric aesthetic through the planting of trees with an unpredictable form to provide an attractive, and softening contrast to the verticality and hard-edged geometric form of much of the City landscape, and mixed shrubs to provide food and shelter for small birds and animals (not unnatural monocultures).

*Recommendation: The GSP should be about implementing **Sydney** research already undertaken, rather than benchmarking the City's approach to landscape against overseas research; and developing a Sydney aesthetic for the public domain.*

Skills and Resources – We support the recommendation that City staff, contractors and volunteers have the right skill sets (p19). Our experience has been that there is little or no knowledge within the contract gardening sector, of biodiversity and/or ecological principles. “If it can't be done with poison, a whipper-snipper or a leaf-blower – it can't be done” seems to be the prevailing wisdom. Even among landscape designers there is an obsession with mass planting of a single species (even if native) rather than a mixed, more natural approach to landscaping. Further, it appears to be the fashion to plant hybrid species, rather than local natives. Designers appear to favour geometric concrete over curves and soft surfaces in our parks. There is little or no knowledge among contractors of the difference between weeds and natives and we have experienced our thriving natives being poisoned or, in the case of the Glebe Blue Wren group, removed altogether. There are a number of professional and volunteer groups who do have the appropriate skill sets in both design and maintenance, but they do not appear to be consulted by Council or other government instrumentalities. eg PUL's submission to the Street Tree Master Plan Review was almost completely ignored.

Recommendation: Council should review its list of landscape designers and contractors, in consultation with Biodiversity experts and local Landcare/Bushcare groups with a view to employing consultants and contractors with the appropriate qualifications to implement the UESAP and enhance Biodiversity and habitat.

In terms of resources, we noted in the STMP (PB-16) that one of the justifications for rejecting mixed species street planting is the difficulty of tree supply. We again urge that the City establish its own native nursery, noting that at the Council meeting held on 19

September, a majority of Councillors rejected a motion from Cllr Burgmann to do so. It is noted that Leichhardt Council which has largely supported the volunteer-run Rozelle Bay Community Native Nursery, the only one within the City's boundaries, will be relocating to new premises at White's Creek. The City currently provides assistance to this nursery to the tune of 4 hours per week of staff time. With the relocation there will be **NO** native nursery within the City's boundaries. PUL obtains plants for its projects from the Rozelle Nursery, as well as from Randwick City Council Community Nursery and Cornucopia Nursery both of which provide opportunities for volunteers and are used for school and community workshops – valuable spin-offs from the core nursery activities. There is also a Marrickville Community Nursery and Strathfield Council Native Nursery. It is unacceptable that the City refuses to consider providing more support for a native nursery within its boundaries, but relies totally on facilities run by other nearby Councils, or, in the case of Cornucopia, Gladesville Hospital, for plants for its parks, streets and gardens. We urge the Council to reconsider its position, including consideration of taking over responsibility for the existing nursery at Rozelle Bay, recruitment and training of volunteers, provision of a full-time, paid Biodiversity co-ordinator to manage the facility, thus demonstrating its true commitment to the greening of Sydney.

Recommendation: The City should include within the Greening Sydney Plan the establishment of a native plant nursery and develop expertise to ensure supply of local native trees and plants for its streets, parks and public spaces and as an educational resource for the community, including schools.

Greening New Development – We note in 4.4 (p27) the recommendation to institute appropriate planning controls for new developments to require and encourage developers to provide soft landscaping. We applaud this objective but ask that the benefits include “habitat”. We also are concerned that any planning controls have inbuilt flexibility and provide for maximum community consultation. In addition to green roofs etc. we ask that a new category of “urban bushland” be created which requires different treatment and rules than those applying to the more traditional public parklands. An example of urban bushland to replace bushland habitat cleared from the site, is being created at 1 Distillery Drive, Pyrmont which can be a model of “best practice” from the City of Sydney – not from overseas.

Recommendation: Institute a landscape code of “urban bushland” and ensure flexible planning controls for new developments and redevelopment of appropriate public spaces.

Community Engagement – We greatly appreciate the assistance given to PUL by the City and others and the relative freedom given to us to achieve our own green vision. We encourage the City to ensure that any formal Bushcare program be simple and flexible and not too prescriptive or bureaucratic.

Increasing canopy – We applaud the goal of increasing canopy cover in the City of Sydney by 50% in 2030 and 70% by 2050 but point out that some trees on public and private land which currently contribute to the canopy are weed trees eg *Celtis sinensis* which should be removed. Tree Preservation regulations currently take no account of pest species, only height. In addition, a number of problem street trees continue to be on the STMP list, including Hills Figs (appropriate for parks but not pavements). In the short-term it may be

necessary to reduce canopy by removal of these trees, recognising that their replacements may take a number of years to provide canopy cover.

*Recommendation: Tree Preservation regulations should be amended to allow the removal of weed trees such as *Celtis sinensis* from public land and inappropriate street trees, eg Hills Figs, from footpaths, even if this results in short-term canopy reduction. A mix of appropriate local native species should be installed as replacements.*

Local Canopy Issues – At present, Waterfront Park in Pyrmont is controlled by Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority. However, it is destined to be transferred to the City's ownership in the future. A large number of trees have died, including figs along the foreshore walkway, required to be planted as a condition of consent for the DA. The remaining, largely Angophora trees in the park are spindly and not flourishing, and provide little shade. In particular, the children's playground has no shelter, especially in summer, as there are no trees to the west or south of the swings. Whilst the trees in Pirrama Park have fared better, more canopy trees should be planted in the green point area as it is not appropriate for team games (due to its proximity to the harbour) but is popular for picnics, but there are not enough trees to provide shade. It would also be desirable to plant some trees in the large and barren concreted area in front of the kiosk, both for shade, and to soften and green the landscape in this area. We ask that appropriate local native trees be planted to augment the existing in these, and possibly other Pyrmont/Ultimo parks, with an emphasis on species diversity, rather than monoculture. We have proposed suitable trees in our submission on the Street Tree Master Plan.

Recommendation: that the Greening Sydney Plan include provision of additional local native trees to be planted in Waterfront and Pirrama Parks to provide shade for picnickers, and protection for the children's playground.

Again, we ask that consideration of *Greening Sydney Plan* be deferred until the *Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan* has been finalised, in consultation with the community. We attach a copy of our submission on the STMP as it should be read in conjunction with this submission.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Elenius
Co-Convenor

cc All Councillors

PYRMONT ULTIMO LANDCARE INC

9C/2 Bowman Street,
PYRMONT NSW 2009
Tel: 9571 9727; 0409 552 117
Email: eelenius@bigpond.net.au
www.pyrmontultimolandcare.org.au

7 September, 2001

Mr Joel Johnson,
Manager, Parks, Trees and Aquatic Facilities,
City of Sydney,
GPO Box 1591,
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Johnson,

Draft Street Tree Master Plan

We refer to our submission to the review of the Street Tree Master Plan dated January, 2010 (NB the Council agenda of 18 July, 2011 wrongly attributed this submission to Pyrmont Action Inc) which included a number of recommendations, none of which have been included in the draft Master Plan 2011. This is extremely disappointing. The following recommendations are again submitted in the expectation that they will be taken into account in the final Master Plan, noting the support that the City is providing for the objectives of the Pyrmont Wildlife Corridor and similar projects being undertaken in the City.

Policy Context – The draft STMP has been released prior to the public release and Council consideration of the *Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan*. As quoted in the *Biodiversity Study for Johnstons Canal Shared Pathway* (p22) prepared by the Australian Museum for the City of Sydney, June, 2011 the draft UESAP proposes the following actions:

- Protect indigenous flora and fauna
- Increase native vegetation cover (in particular, multi-layered plantings)
- Increase the range of local species used in plantings; and
- Improve connectivity

The STMP demonstrably flies in the face of these recommendations. In addition, a key issue identified in the draft *Greening Sydney Plan* (p15) is “Policy Integration”. Given that the primary objectives of the draft *Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan* are to “prioritise, protect, conserve and enhance the native flora and fauna in the LGA (and adjacent areas where applicable) and engage the community in these activities” it is clear that the STMP at best pays lip service to such integration. The Liveable Green Network 2010 document was approved for exhibition several weeks after the release of the STMP and the Urban Forest

Policy is as yet unavailable although referred to in the STMP and *Greening Sydney Plan*. *Sustainable Sydney 2030* barely mentioned biodiversity.

The City has not developed an overarching philosophical approach to Greening the City, instead has adopted a piecemeal approach based on subjectivity and personal preference. On the one hand, it appears to support the expansion of native habitat in the *Greening Sydney Plan* (p18) and the draft UESAP, and on the other, especially in the STMP, there appears to be a conscious effort to promote the use of exotic species over habitat trees. Eucalypts are singled out as species that seem to perform poorly as street trees in inner urban areas, yet there are a number of very healthy eucalypts growing in Pyrmont (Harris Street) which are flourishing, yet are destined to be replaced by plane trees at the end of their lives. There is also a claim (PB-5) that bushfires cause “bolting” of growth of natives, yet we are hardly likely to have bushfires in this densely urban area. Myrtaceae species are highlighted as susceptible to disease (therefore are unsuitable) but in the same section, Plane trees are also identified as at risk of disease, but they are deemed entirely suitable as a dominant street tree throughout the City – and in Pyrmont (PB17-18).

Recommendation: Consideration of the draft Street Tree Master Plan 2011 should be deferred until Council, and the community, have considered the recommendations of the Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan and Greening Sydney Plan, which should provide an overarching approach to greening the City based on sound ecological principles.

Tree Monoculture – Our submission to the review recommended that a principle of Street Tree planting should be to encourage biodiversity through mixed planting of natives and/or natives interspersed with appropriate exotics which provide a colourful or variable display for significant periods of the year, and habitat for native birds and animals. The draft STMP is focused on the opposite approach with subjective statements such as “the use of a single species usually has the greatest impact on people’s positive perception of the street” (pA-7) or “the need to “provide consistency and visual uniformity for each street” (pB-10). The whole notion of “visual uniformity” is a purely subjective proposition. There are many people with a contrary viewpoint, especially those with an understanding of ecological principles/biodiversity. The City must decide, **after** consideration of the *Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan*, whether it wishes to slavishly ape the European landscape, or establish a landscape philosophy which embraces diversity, expansion of habitat and an Australianness through mixed planting both in our streets and parks. In this regard, the statement (subjective) in the section on Aesthetic/Design Criteria (pB-8) that selected species should have a “predictable” form with an upright trunk and stable branch structure can also be challenged. It can equally be argued by those with a different aesthetic that trees with an unpredictable form provide an attractive, and softening contrast to the verticality and hard-edged geometric form of much of the City landscape.

We note and support the overall objectives of greening (*Greening Sydney Plan*, p18) to *enhance habitat and promote biodiversity involving: increase the current diversity, abundance and distribution of locally-indigenous flora and fauna species; increase the existing extent of locally-indigenous vegetation across the LGA; establish a network of wildlife corridors linking key habitat areas* but are unable to reconcile these worthy aims with the reality of the STMP.

Another reason to reject the monocultural approach is susceptibility to disease. The STMP refers to pests and diseases, particularly in relation to Plane trees and some Myrtaceae species. Mass planting of just one species increases the likelihood of the spread of pests and diseases. For example, in Southern France, the Plane trees which line the Canal du Midi are progressively dying and as they are a monoculture, the Canal will now have large gaps along its edge. We have noted that areas mass planted, even with natives, in Waterfront Park, Pyrmont have succumbed to pests, including fig trees. Streets and parks planted with a variety of species retain canopy even in the event of diseases killing individual trees.

Recommendation: Street tree planting should be in accordance with biodiversity principles and provide habitat, be compatible with adjacent native gardens and corridors, provide visual variability, rather than uniformity, and be robust against pest and disease attacks through mixed planting.

Tree Species Selection – The objective “the right tree for the right location” is potentially laudable but again open to subjectivity. Who decides what’s right? PB-16 makes this quite clear. “The selection of which of the species to plant and the exact location within the street shall be at the sole discretion of the City of Sydney. Individual requests by adjoining residents for one or other of the species will typically not be accommodated.” Our experience in Pyrmont is that what might look appropriate on a map, can often be to the significant detriment of residents, and inimical to biodiversity and habitat. We urge a more flexible and consultative approach as locals often know best. A glaring omission from the three main categories of selection criteria is habitat requirements (pB-1), although Wildlife Habitat is mentioned on PB-4, but ignored in the plan for Pyrmont. Street trees designated for several streets adjacent our Pyrmont Wildlife Corridor sites (Saunders and Bank Streets and Quarry Master Drive) are exotics some of which, in fact, reproduce prolifically in our newly established bush, requiring hours of weeding by volunteers to control. Of course, we have no idea if the Pyrmont Wildlife Corridor sites have been identified as “priority habitat” as we have no access to the City’s draft *Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan*.

Recommendation: The STMP should have inbuilt flexibility to take account of the adjacent built environment and adjacent parks, gardens and areas of native habitat. It should not be set in stone.

We will comment on particular species in the general list, and as they pertain to Pyrmont and Ultimo, in the context of Environmental Selection Criteria:

- (a) *Plane trees* – Plane trees dominate Harris Street (but with some Eucalypts remaining in places), Pyrmont Street, Union Street and Miller Street. The STMP stipulates that the Plane tree will be the only species along almost the entire length of Harris Street in the future whilst elsewhere it is planned to replace it with other exotics – Golden Rain Tree and Japanese Zelkova. Plane trees present a number of problems.
Climate – The Plane tree is indigenous to Europe where it develops attractive autumn colours. In Sydney, the leaves brown off in the hot weather (as happened in February, 2011) and look awful for months until they finally drop in late autumn. They do NOT “green” Sydney for six to seven months of every year. *Allergies* – We are of the view that Plane trees are a major source of allergies – from bitter

experience. They cause breathing difficulties and rashes and not just for a short period as indicated on PB-9. The local medical centre has confirmed the Plane tree as a significant source of allergic reaction. Further we do not believe that people should be forced to walk around the street wearing wraparound sun glasses in order to avoid debilitating eye allergy symptoms (PB-10). *Functional Criteria* – The STMP states that “species with large or heavy seed pods, excessive leaf drop... will typically be avoided”. This describes to a tee the Plane tree which drops its leaves from the first heatwave until the depth of winter and its fruit are large and spikey. Even in August, the fluff from the Plane trees, and leaves, continue to lie in the gutters in Harris Street. Where they adjoin Pymont Wildlife Corridor sites, the leaves smother the growth of natives and don't break down into mulch. They have to be removed by hand. *Susceptibility to Disease* - As noted on PB-17 the Plane tree is affected by Sycamore Lace Bug which is far more likely to be spread in a monocultural situation. Whilst the STMP indicates that attempts have been made to reduce the reliance on Plane Trees, in Pymont it remains dominant.

- (b) *Hills Weeping Fig – Functional Criteria* - We are pleased to see the removal of this tree species from the STMP in Bowman Street and Refinery Drive, also from one side of Pirrama Road in Pymont but note its continued presence on the list of recommended trees. Whilst suitable for parks, they are quite unsuitable for streets as they completely block light and views when planted in front of houses and apartments, get into drains and lift pavements. Three Hills Weeping Figs have died and been removed from Bowman Street between Jones Street and Bank Street. Two were adjacent the newly establish urban bushland planted in association with the 1 Distillery Drive development and were in front of the cliff face. These should be replaced with eucalypts to complement the urban bushland and help replace some of the trees removed from the escarpment. These included ironbarks, blue gums, bloodwoods and other local species. The one removed from in front of Knox on Bowman should be of a type which will not block the light and sun from the north-facing apartments, in consultation with residents.
- (c) *Livistona australis* - This species was planted extensively in rows throughout Pymont in the early days of redevelopment. *Climate* - *Livistona's* natural environment is moist gullies where close groups have access to plenty of water, and are sheltered from drying winds. In Pymont they have been planted along the exposed foreshore at Pymont Point and on areas underneath the Western Distributor where they receive almost no rainfall. They do not flourish and have permanently dead fronds or are completely dead (corner of Bank Street and Quarry Master Drive). They are also dying in the gardens of some strata gardens at Jacksons Landing. It has also been noted that *Livistona* is a popular habitat for Indian mynahs and other invasive species. Where they are proposed to be retained in Pirrama Road, we ask that they be replaced with native canopy trees, as *Livistonas* do not provide shade in summer, noting that a key target of the draft *Greening Sydney Plan* relates to an increase in canopy (p27).
- (d) *Celtis australis* – Whilst not as prolific a seeder as *Celtis sinensis*, this species does represent a threat as a self-propagating weed tree. This tree has been listed as C4 noxious in Canberra. We quote from Section 4.4 Exotics and Environmental Weeds

in the *Biodiversity Study for Johnsons Canal Shared Pathway* dated June 2011 prepared by the Australian Museum for the City of Sydney. "... *Celtis australis* has been planted and is regenerating profusely in surrounding areas, including the railway property where it has colonised and matured." (p21) The Study specifically recommends the removal of *Celtis australis* and proposes the use of substitute native species such as *Eucalyptus piperita*, *Angophora floribunda* or *Angophora costata* (p23). We ask that a mix of these species be substituted for *Celtis australis* in Pymont Bridge Road, Scott Street and Point Street. We also urge retention of the large *Melaleuca* growing at the corner of Point and Herbert Streets and if it dies, that it be replaced with another native, not *Celtis australis*.

- (e) *Phoenix dactylifera* – Is a haven for the common mynah.
- (f) *Acer negundo* – Is listed as C4 noxious in Canberra and is a recognised weed of bushland in Sydney.
- (g) *Liquidamber styraciflua* and *Robinia pseudoacacia* – *Functional criteria* - are both listed in Don Burke's list of the 10 "problem trees" because of its aggressive root system (*Liquidamber*) which gets into drains, and vigorous suckering habit (*Robinia*)
- (h) *Sapium sebiferum* – does not meet the *Functional Criteria* (B6) on a number of counts and now seeds profusely in local pocket parks.

Recommendation – We support progressive removal of the above trees, and replacement with a variety of native trees and appropriate deciduous trees of differing heights which can provide a continuous source of food and shelter to native birds and animals, expand the Pymont Wildlife Corridor and do not block light and views of residences.

- (i) *Jacaranda mimosifolia* – The Jacaranda is synonymous with Sydney, and a beautiful garden and park tree. However, its suitability as a street tree depends on where it is planted. Whilst deciduous, it retains its foliage well into August/September and if planted in front of houses or apartment buildings blocks light and winter sun, requiring residents to keep lights on during the day and heaters on during winter – hardly sustainable. *Functional Criteria* - In addition, during the flowering season, frequent maintenance is required to remove the flowers from the footpaths as they become slippery and represent a hazard. The STMP (pB-10) states that "species with fleshy fruits or leaves that become slippery on decomposition will be avoided for selection". Jacarandas are also prolific self-seeders and those in the vicinity of native habitat in and around Quarry Master Drive and John Street are invading the bushland and have to be removed by PUL volunteers.
- (j) *Koelreularia paniculata* – This tree has a tendency to invade adjacent land and is considered a weed by PUL in and around the wildlife corridor in Saunders Street.

Recommendation – These species should be used sparingly and in conjunction with other tree species in any one street to enable a flexible approach to be taken in

consultation with residents who may be adversely affected by their light-blocking effects or invasive tendencies.

We note that 10 new native species have been added to the list in the Plan. We ask that consideration be given to adding the following native species to the list to provide variety and species diversity:

<i>Angophora floribunda</i>	<i>E. haemastoma</i>
<i>Backhousia citriodora</i>	<i>E. pilularis</i>
<i>Banksia integrifolia</i>	<i>E. piperita</i>
<i>Banksia serrate</i>	<i>Cupaniopsis anacardioides</i>
<i>Callistemon linearis</i>	<i>Pittosporum undulatum</i>
<i>Corymbia citriodora</i>	<i>Melaleuca quinquinervia</i>
<i>Corymbia gummifera</i>	<i>Stenocarpus sinuatus</i>
<i>Eucalyptus gummifera</i>	<i>Brachychiton acerifolia</i>
<i>Grevillia robusta</i>	

Understorey Planting – We understand that the Street Tree team is also responsible for the selection of species planted in beds below the trees. In Pymont, we have welcomed the introduction of native species planted in the newly renovated section of Harris Street and recommend that this practice be gradually expanded across the area. In places, including in-road and median strips, such planting could provide habitat suitable for small native birds and reptiles through the introduction of appropriate shrubs and native ground cover, as well as a colourful display of flowers and fruit at various times of the year, noting the decrease in numbers of species such as the white-plumed honey easter and the superb fairy wren. We note the recommendation in the Johnstons Canal Study that artificial hybrids such as *Lomandra* Katrinus Deluxe which is used prolifically in Pymont streets and parks should be replaced with a non-hybrid species of *Lomandra*. We also recommend replacement of *Dietses* with either *Lomandra* (non-hybrid) or *Dianella*, both of which are hardy and attractive. Other understorey species could include *Hymenosporum flavum*, *Leptospermum spp*, *Grevillea spp*, *Pultenea spp* and *Westringea*.

Recommendation: Engage in progressive replacement of exotic understorey with natives, including those with native small bird habitat potential.

Community Engagement – The Street Tree program could be used to inform and educate residents about street trees, and the importance of habitat and biodiversity. Fact Sheets should be developed which can form the basis for engagement with and education of residents. When new plantings occur in residential streets (including the densely populated Pymont) nearby residents should be informed and given information about the proposed species and why they have been proposed (eg habitat values) and a range of alternatives. Residents can be invited to assist in selecting and caring for new plants and given the opportunity to report any problems. Such concerns should be responded to in a spirit of cooperation.

Recommendation: The STMP can form the basis of an education program on the values of trees, biodiversity and habitat using a flexible and consultative approach to such planting.

Removal of Weed Trees – We have identified some species of weed trees which remain on the list of appropriate Street Trees. However, there is one specific weed tree which is not on the Tree Species Selection list which should be removed as a matter of urgency. PUL has frequently asked the City to remove mature *Celtis sinensis* trees from streets and public lands, including Council depots in and around our Wentworth Park sites, but generally permission has been denied because of Tree Preservation regulations, although two have been removed. There are huge *Celtis* trees in Wentworth Park in among other trees (figs and eucalypts) where their removal would have minimal impact on canopy and where there would then be opportunities to replant appropriate local native replacements. These *Celtis* trees spread seeds prolifically on our sites and adjacent private gardens and should be removed.

Recommendation: Where Celtis sinensis trees are growing in City streets, property and other public land, they should be removed as a matter of urgency, and replaced with appropriate local native trees.

Tree Supply – We note (PB-16) that one of the justifications for rejecting mixed species street planting is the difficulty of tree supply. We reject this proposition. In our submission to the Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan we proposed that the City establish its own native nursery. At present it supplies assistance to the Rozelle Bay Community Native Nursery in the form of 4 hours per week of a staff member's time. This nursery, which operates with volunteer labour receives strong support from Leichhardt Council and provides PUL with many local native plants. Council also provides us with access to plants propagated by Randwick Council's Native Nursery, and from Cornucopia Nursery in Gladesville. We have never had difficulty in sourcing plants for our sites but, given the City's size and its expansion into the suburbs and its stated commitment to Greening Sydney, it should not have to rely on other Councils to provide it with appropriate native species for its streets and parks, but establish its own nursery and expertise. Appropriate sites exist in Pyrmont at the City's two depots adjacent Wentworth Park station.

Recommendation: The City should establish a native plant nursery and develop expertise to ensure supply of trees and plants for its streets and parks.

We regret that Council has been unable to arrange community meetings as promised in the Environment and Heritage Committee agenda of 18 July, 2011 (point 25). Such meetings would have enabled discussion and sharing of questions and concerns. However, we are pleased that staff have agreed to a site meeting in Pyrmont on 7 September. We reiterate our request to defer consideration of the STMP and draft *Greening Sydney Plan* until the *Urban Ecology Strategic Action Plan* has been finalised. The STMP does not give us confidence that Policy Integration is even close when it comes to Greening Sydney.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Elenius
Co-Convenor

cc All Councillors