



Attachment A:

March 27, 2017 Council Report
“12 K de K Court Boulevard Trees”



R E P O R T

Parks & Recreation

To: Mayor Coté and Members of Council **Date:** 11/27/2017

From: Dean Gibson
Director of Parks and Recreation **File:** 2250.18
Item #: 22/2017

Subject: **12 K de K Court Boulevard Trees**

RECOMMENDATION

THAT staff be directed to undertake thorough pruning of the existing three boulevard trees at 12 K de K Court and increase the tree pruning cycle to once every three years as described in Option #3 in this report, and

THAT staff be directed to research existing regional policies related to city tree planting and city tree maintenance in relation to the preservation of view-scapes and report back to Council.

ORIGIN/PURPOSE

The purpose of the report is to respond to Council's request that staff prepare a report back to Council subsequent to a delegation from the Dockside Strata Council at 12 K de K Court appearing before Council seeking the removal of upland trees on the esplanade boulevard fronting the Dockside Strata building.

SUMMARY

In 2007, the City implemented a tree removal and replacement program along the upland side of the esplanade boulevard between the foot of 10th Street and Quayside Park. In late 2016, a delegation from the Dockside Strata (12 K de K Court) appeared before City Council

requesting that three boulevard trees fronting their property be removed citing that the trees were inappropriately selected for the given location and that the trees were beginning to impact resident's views to the river contrary to indications provided to residents at the time the trees were planted.

Options to address the residents' concerns include:

- Maintain the status quo with respect to the planned pruning program and ongoing maintenance cycles for the esplanade boulevard trees.
- Remove and replace trees through tree transplantation or tree cutting.
- Undertake thorough pruning of trees and increase the frequency of the tree pruning cycle along the esplanade.

Staff recommend the third option.

BACKGROUND

On October 3, 2016 a delegation from the Dockside Strata Council at 12 K de K Court appeared before Council to present their concerns regarding the species selection and growth of five trees that were planted in the boulevard adjacent to their building in 2007. The delegation was concerned that three of the trees were not growing in the manner as purported that they would when originally installed, and that the trees are now beginning to obstruct the river views from some of the dwelling units in the Strata building. There was also concern that over time, the subject trees would grow to a state that views to the river would be completely blocked at those times during the year when the trees were "leafed out". The delegation presented Council with supporting documentation in a report entitled "*Dockside Trees – A Time to Act*".

Council directed staff to look into the matter and report back.

EXISTING POLICY/PRACTICE

In early 2016, the City adopted its first Urban Forest Management Strategy. This strategy identified that the City was losing its tree canopy coverage at a rate of approximately 1.5% each year. The strategy proposed a series of recommendations to help assist the City in stopping and reversing this trend. One result has been the adoption of a Tree Protection and Regulation bylaw. Another has been direction from Council to develop an ambitious planting program for new trees.

Prior to 2016, save for a bylaw protecting trees on City streets and in specified environmentally sensitive areas, the City has had few policy or regulatory tools to guide the management of the City's Urban Forest. In the absence of policy, staff have exercised professional discretion in accordance with industry best practices as recommended by the

International Society of Arboriculture. It has been the practice of the City to maintain a program to plant trees where none have existed in the past and to remove and replace inappropriate and/or diseased and damaged boulevard trees as part of the City's efforts to beautify the community, exercise stewardship over the urban forest and help sustain the ecology of the local environment.

DISCUSSION

2007 Tree Planting and Replacement Program

In early 2007, a comprehensive boulevard tree removal and replacement program was undertaken along the upland portion of the esplanade between the foot of 10th Street and Quayside Park. This program was initiated as a result of the poor condition associated with extreme aphid infestation of many of the trees in this area. At the time, staff were also anticipating the future removal and replacement of the trees located in the planting strip on the river side of the esplanade walkway in connection with expected repairs to the head wall that runs beneath the walkway. The objective was to install and allow the trees on the upland side of the esplanade to begin to mature well in advance of the expected removal and replacement of the trees on the river side, thus maintaining some degree of tree canopy coverage continuity in the area. The tree planting program was preceded in late 2006 by meetings with the Quayside Community Board and area residents. The tree removal and replacement program was widely accepted by the neighbourhood save for objections from some resident's at 12 K de K Court who petitioned Council to remove the new trees fronting their property. In the end, Council passed a resolution in favour of retaining all the trees as originally envisioned in the original comprehensive planting program.

2016 Request from Dockside Strata Corporation (12 K de K Court)

On October 13, 2016, a delegation from 12 K de K Court appeared before City Council to present their report entitled "*The Dockside Trees – A Time to Act*". The intent of the presentation and report was to present a case that would support the Strata's request to have three of the boulevard trees (two Yellowwood, one Black Gum) planted in back 2007 removed. The rationale for the removal included information that the trees were exceeding the expected growth projections anticipated in 2007 and as a result, there was concern that the growth pattern was trending towards significantly impacting the views of the river from the Dockside Strata Units.

Attachment "A" provides a more detailed chronology the events in 2006/2007 and an overview of the 2016 tree removal request and supporting rationale from the Dockside Strata.

City Arborist Assessment 2016

Attachment "B" provides a summary of the City's Senior Arborist's assessment of the esplanade boulevard trees and a description of the site context.

The City Arborist has reviewed the Dockside Strata report and recently conducted her own assessment of the trees in question. The City's Arborist has confirmed that the anticipated growth characteristics of the subject trees are generally in keeping with the report commissioned by the Dockside Strata but does note that a wide variety of local factors can influence the ultimate growth of trees, including the fact that the trees are growing in an urban setting. Left to grow in their natural state, the subject trees could be expected to exhibit the following growth characteristics:

- Paperbark Maple: 20' – 30' in height; spread of one half or equal to height; slow growth rate.
- Black Tupelo (Black Gum): 30' – 50' in height; spread of 20' – 30'; moderate growth rate described as slow to medium; anticipated growth rate of 20-30cm per year in this region's local climate; tree is expected to mature around the 65-80 year mark.
- Yellowwood: 30' – 50' in height; spread of 40' – 55'; slow to medium growth rate; anticipated growth rate of 25-30 cm per year in the region's local climate; tree expected to mature around the 50-65 year mark.

The City Arborist does note that the trees have indications that would suggest that they have not received comprehensive pruning since they were originally planted in 2007 and that this lack of maintenance may be contributing to current less than desirable growth characteristics.

Site Context

The placement of the trees fronting 12 K de K Court is generally in keeping with the pattern and spacing of the remaining esplanade boulevard trees planted in 2007. The specific three trees in question are located approximately five feet closer to the building face than many other trees along the esplanade. This fact combined with the massing of the majority of the building close to the property line and the elevation of the ground floor units relative to the elevation of the trees, may be contributing to a greater sense of impact on views of the river than in other locations along the esplanade.

Options for Response

In consideration of the current situation, and its evolution over the past 10 years, several options exist to address the matter. These options and the resulting implications are discussed below. In all scenarios, it is assumed the existing two Paperbark Maple trees will receive pruning and maintenance in accordance with established maintenance practices outlined in Option #1 and that no further extraordinary mitigation work will be undertaken on these two trees as they do not appear to present an issue from the perspective of the Strata. In addition, the proposed tree pruning alternatives are intended to be applied to all

upland esplanade boulevard trees in order to maintain a degree of uniformity in the growth and development of this row of riverfront trees.

1. **Maintain the Status Quo** – Undertake routine pruning of the trees in conjunction with the planned maintenance of other trees along the Esplanade. This schedule indicates that the trees would receive pruning in 2017 and approximately every five to seven years thereafter with corresponding monitoring at year three intervals to assess if a subsequent small pruning prescription is warranted and to address potential issues associated with epicormic shoot growth. It is noted that the subject trees have yet to receive pruning associated with training the growth of young trees. As such, the pruning in 2017 is likely to be somewhat more comprehensive than would typically be performed during other subsequent maintenance cycles.

From an arboricultural best practice perspective, the intended outcome of the 2017 maintenance pruning cycle (currently scheduled for completion before mid-April) will be to manage and shape the tree canopy to enable a strong, healthy and balanced tree canopy. The scope of work will include performing an in-depth pruning practice that improves the structural integrity of the trees. This includes removing or subordinating weak, crowded or competitive stems and limbs as well as thinning branches to reduce weight on limbs and increase air and light penetration. Once the Arboriculture crew has finished with the prescribed pruning, the trees will be noticeably less dense and wide. It is not considered a best practice to attempt to lessen the height of these trees. This weakens a tree and puts it at risk for future ailments and failures. Having said that, there are pruning practices referred to as drop crotch pruning that could be applied to the Yellowwood trees should it be warranted as they become taller and older.

Resourcing Impact: This approach can be managed within the existing available resources (personnel and financial) within the Parks Horticulture Division and does not divert resources from existing work plans.

2. **Remove and replace three trees**

- a. *Tree Transplantation* – Two or three of the subject trees (Yellowwood, Black Gum) can be removed either by cutting them down or by digging them up and relocating them to an alternate location in the City. New trees, selected to be less impactful on the views, could then be planted in the location of the old ones. This approach, while partially satisfying the interests of the directly impacted residents, will diminish the overall effect of the balanced and unified pattern of tree species along the length of the esplanade.

Resourcing Impact: Tree transplantation will create financial impacts not anticipated in the Parks Horticulture budget 2017. A quotation provided from a

local reputable tree moving and tree care company proposes a fee of \$2,900 per tree for relocation and \$3,200 per tree of post transplantation tree care over two growing seasons. The typical cost to purchase and install a new young tree (by City forces) is \$500 per tree. Therefore, the total estimated cost to relocate and maintain, plus replace the two Yellowwood trees and one Black Gum tree is \$19,800.

- b. *Tree Cutting* - Alternatively, the trees could simply be removed by cutting them down. This would represent approximately one half of a day of the City arboriculture crew's time to remove the three trees plus \$450 in contracted services to remove the remaining stumps. Under this scenario, in order to align with the City's tree protection bylaw, two new trees should be planted for every one tree removed. Therefore the total cost to remove the three trees and replace with six trees (three at 12 K de K Court and three elsewhere in the City) would be approximately \$3,450.

In addition to the removal and replacement work described above, additional maintenance (tree watering) of the new trees would be required above and beyond that which would typically be required of the remaining trees along the esplanade for the first several years. This would represent the diversion away from other priority work of watering crews in the equivalent amount of 2-3 days per year for a minimum of two years. (A crew typically consists of one staff member and a specially equipped watering truck).

3. ***Undertake thorough pruning of trees and increase tree pruning cycle*** – The intent of this approach is to, over time, manage the rate of growth and density of the canopy with the objective of maximizing view corridors without compromising the long term health of the trees. The pruning in the initial year will be similar to that described in above Option #1 but the frequency of pruning would be escalated from the current five to seven year cycle to a three year cycle. Following this initial pruning cycle, a benchmark for future pruning for the subject trees can be established. This benchmark can then be used in subsequent years as part of an annual review of the trees to determine:
- the extent to which the intended outcomes (managing overall crown width and shape, maintaining view corridors and tree health) are being achieved,
 - if a different course of action (i.e. Option #2 above) is warranted.

Resourcing Impact: This approach will have an incremental resourcing impact beyond the typical tree maintenance as outlined in Option #1 due to the increased frequency of the pruning cycle. Assuming annual inspections each year, it is estimated that three days of City arboriculture crew's time per six year maintenance pruning cycle would be redirected from other priority work.

The Dockside Strata has indicated its first preference is for the removal of the three trees. As an alternative, the Strata is prepared to consider removal of the trees with subsequent replacement with trees felt to be more “suitable” for the location (Option #2 above).

Associated Implications of Options

Attachment “C” discusses in more detail the associated implications of the above proposed options. These implications include consideration of:

- the potential for setting a precedence with respect to the City’s management of trees where views are a factor, and
- the neighbourhood community engagement process undertaken in 2006 leading up to the implementation of the tree removal and replacement program.

Given the absence of formal policy with respect to the priority to be given to preserving and enhancing views and tree planting and maintenance, Council may wish to consider directing staff to review the practices and policies of neighbouring communities and report back to Council with the results.

SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

- **Financial Impact** – The financial impact of many of the options is relatively modest. The most expensive option being the relocation of existing trees which may require expenditures in the order of \$19,800. Equally important to both Options #2 and #3 is the diversion of staff resources away from existing work plans. Relative to the size of the City’s Urban Forest, the Horticulture Division is lightly resourced in caring for trees in the City requiring that staff routinely need to re-prioritize rescheduled maintenance work to deal with emergencies and emerging issues. This approach is not considered a best practice within the arboriculture profession.
- **Social Impact** – Overwhelmingly, communities value and support the greening of neighbourhoods and cities due to the esthetic and environmental benefits associated with trees. Issues surrounding trees and their impact on view corridors are largely a matter of personal preference and vary widely from household to household across the City. The adoption of the Urban Forest Management Strategy in 2016 suggests that the City has strong convictions towards the value and importance of trees in the City.
- **Environmental Impact** – The environmental benefit of trees is widely recognized. Trees filter the air, cool the earth, assist in the retention of moisture in the soils, save energy, and enhance our community’s overall economic sustainability.

OPTIONS

In consideration of the request from the Dockside Strata delegation, options available to City Council include:

1. Direct staff to maintain the status quo with respect to the planned pruning program and ongoing maintenance cycles as described in this report.
- 2a. Direct staff to remove and replace trees through tree transplantation as described in this report.
- 2b. Direct staff to remove and replace trees through tree cutting as described in this report.
3. Direct staff to undertake thorough pruning of trees and increase the tree pruning cycle along the esplanade to once every three years as described in this report.
4. Direct staff to research existing policies related to city tree planting and city tree maintenance in relation to the preservation of view-scapes.

Options #3 and #4 are recommended.

COMMUNITY LIAISON

To assist with the preparation of this report, staff have met with the delegation that presented to Council to better understand the context for their concerns and to discuss potential options to address the matter.

CONCLUSION

The Parks and Recreation Department is tasked with the responsibility of caring for the City's inventory of trees on public lands, including hundreds of trees on City boulevards. In all cases, staff strives to exercise sound, professional judgment and attempts to balance the interests of individual property owners against the larger interests of the community as a whole.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Chronology of 2006/2007 Esplanade Tree Removal and Replacement Program and 2016 Tree Removal Request and Supporting Rationale from Dockside Strata

Attachment B - 2016 City Arborist's Report Summary and Site Context

Attachment C - Implications Associated with All Options

This report has been prepared by:
Dean Gibson, Director of Parks and Recreation

Approved for Presentation to Council



Dean Gibson
Director of Parks and Recreation



Lisa Spitale
Chief Administrative Officer



ATTACHMENT “A”

**Chronology of 2006/2007 Esplanade Tree Removal and
Replacement Program
and
2016 Tree Removal Request and Supporting Rationale from
Dockside Strata**

2007 Tree Planting and Replacement Program

In early 2007, a comprehensive boulevard tree removal and replacement program was undertaken along the upland portion of the esplanade between the foot of 10th Street and Quayside Park. A total of 18 trees were removed and 32 new trees were planted along the corridor. This program was initiated as a result of the trending condition for many of the trees to have extreme aphid infestations. These infestations were resulting in excessive “honeydew dropping” which was significantly impairing the enjoyment of the esplanade for all users. In addition, it was believed that the eventual full size of the subject trees would not be in keeping with the scale of the esplanade given their proximity to existing buildings and the size of other existing esplanade trees. While not stated in City correspondence as a driver of the 2007 tree removal and replacement program, staff recall, and the minutes of December 6, 2016 Quayside Community Board meeting reflect, that staff were also looking to the future anticipating that works associated with maintenance and repairs of the head wall that runs beneath the esplanade walkway may have necessitated the removal of the large trees growing in the center planting strip of the esplanade. This tree planting program was preceded in 2006 by meetings with the Quayside Community Board and area residents. While there was wide support for the new tree planting program, some of the resident's at 12 K de K Court expressed opposition to the planting of five trees (one replacement tree and four new trees) fronting their Strata building. These objections were considered by City Council over a period of months and ultimately, in consideration of a confidential poll conducted by the City of all owners at 12 K de K Court and other feedback from the community, a decision was made to retain all trees as envisioned in the comprehensive planting program.

Information provided to Quayside residents in December 2006, providing notification of the commencement of the tree removal and replacement program, identified the species of new trees that would be planted and provided a photograph to illustrate the general appearance of the tree. In that correspondence, it was indicated that the new trees had been selected to “complement the overall urban forest by increasing the diversity of the tree species.” The correspondence further indicated that in determining the location for each tree, efforts would be made to facilitate view corridors. In a subsequent e-mail template used in February/March 2007 to respond to residents who were expressing concern about the tree removal and replacement program, staff made reference to the December 2006 information notice and further elaborated that “specific species of trees have been selected in part due to the modest size and slow growth rate so as to minimize the impact of view corridors on neighbouring residences.”. In a subsequent staff report to City Council, on April 16, 2007, it was further re-iterated that the trees had been placed so as to minimize any potential direct interference with direct views of the river and that the tree species had been selected due to the variety in the landscape that they would provide and the they were not particularly vigorous growers, likely taking over 25 years

to reach their mature size. The Director of Parks & Recreation is quoted in the Royal City Record (April 25, 2007) as saying that the trees could grow to be 20 to 30 feet high.

In late 2015 the Dockside Strata corresponded with the City proposing to have a qualified tree care contractor prune the five trees on the City's boulevard at the Strata's expense. A response was provided indicating that the trees in question were pruned in 2012 and do receive a light pruning each year (along with all Esplanade Trees) to allow for clearance to coincide with the annual Quayside Boardwalk festival, and that the trees were next scheduled in for routine pruning in 2017. The request to have a private contractor prune the City trees appeared to be made on the basis that the trees were impacting views to the river. The proposal was declined on the basis the work was scheduled to be done by City forces in the coming 12-16 months, there was no compelling case associated with immediate health or safety issues, and that it was not the practice to prune trees with the primary intent of enhancing view corridors.

2016 Request from Dockside Strata Corporation (12 K de K Court)

In August 2016, the President of the Dockside Strata Corporation (12 K de K Court) wrote to Mayor and Council requesting to make a presentation to City Council regarding the findings from their review of the history of the boulevard trees planting program. On October 13, 2016, a delegation from 12 K de K Court appeared before City Council to present their report entitled "*The Dockside Trees – A Time to Act*". Among other documentation, this report contained a consulting arborist's report from June 2016 which commented on the health, condition and species characteristics of the boulevard trees fronting 12 K de K Court. The presentation and report expressed concerns that three (two Yellowwood and one Black-Gum/Black Tupelo trees) of the five trees planted in the boulevard adjacent to their property were not growing in the manner as believed to have been described in information provided by the City in 2006. The delegation stated that the subject trees were on a course where they would be significantly larger with much denser foliage than originally purported. A request was made that the three subject trees be removed and the two remaining trees (Paperbark Maple) receive "window pruning" to improve the sightlines through the trees' canopy. The delegation's underlying concern was that the trees were inappropriately selected back in 2006/2007 and are on a growth course that would ultimately result in the complete obstruction of river views for several of the households in the Strata complex for several months of the year. It was felt that the resulting blocking of views would ultimately have a negative effect on impacted resident's enjoyment of their Strata units and the re-sale value of the residential units facing the river. In addition, it was suggested that having trees that impacted river views was generally contrary to the intent of having riverfront residential development.

The Strata commissioned a report from a consulting arborist in June 2016 that assessed the health, condition and species characteristics of the five trees planted in the City boulevard. The report summarizes:

- The five trees are in good health and are growing at a rate consistent with their species
- The typical height and spread for each species is:
 - Paperbark Maple – 20’ – 30’ in height; spread of one half or equal to height; slow growth rate.
 - Black Tupelo (Black Gum) – 30’ – 50’ in height; spread of 20’ – 30’; slow to medium growth rate.
 - Yellowwood - 30’ – 50’ in height; spread of 40’ – 55’; medium growth rate.
- Based on prime growing conditions and current rates of growth, it can be expected that the trees will reach sizes typical for their species.
- The density of the foliage (canopy) of the both the Black Tupelo and Yellowwood trees is such that it further inhibits the views from the residential units to the river. It is speculated that this condition will become more severe as the trees approach full maturity.

The Strata at 12 K de K Court has requested that three of the five tree planted be removed. While not a first preference, the Strata is receptive to the notion of replacing the subject trees with ones deemed to be less impactful than the current trees.

Staff have reviewed available records from 2006-2007 when the new tree planting program was proposed and implemented. It can be reasonably concluded that at the time it was the intention of the City increase the quantity and diversity of the trees planted along the esplanade and that favourable consideration for view corridors was a factor in the planning.



ATTACHMENT “B”

2016 City Arborist’s Report Summary and Site Context

City Arborist's Report Summary

The City Arborist involved in this project in 2006/2007 has since retired. The current City Senior Arborist has reviewed the Dockside Strata report and recently conducted her own assessment of the trees in question. It was noted that the consulting arborist retained by the Dockside Strata used an American reference to support the assessment of the boulevard trees. This is of significance because of the generally warmer climates and hardiness zones across many American states which can contribute to higher tree growth rates. In contrast, reference sources published in Canada, and in particular for the Pacific Northwest Region, may more accurately reflect the characteristics and growth patterns of tree growing specifically in this area. In spite of this difference, the City's Arborist has confirmed that the anticipated growth characteristics of the subject trees are generally in keeping with the report commissioned by the Dockside Strata. Growing conditions for trees in an urban setting are exposed to a wider variety of harsh conditions than trees in a natural forest. The combination of compacted soils, drought conditions, and other internal and external factors can alter a tree's growth rate and cause growth fluctuation on a year to year basis. The City Arborist further notes:

- Black Gum/Black Tupelo: moderate growth rate described as slow to medium; anticipated growth rate of 20-30cm per year this region's local climate (identified as Hardiness Zone 8); Tree is expected to mature around the 65-80 year mark.
- Yellowwood: slow to medium growth rate; anticipated growth rate of 25-30 cm per year in the City's local climate; Tree expected to mature around the 50-65 year mark.
- Due to the time of year the assessment was completed, an assessment of the density of the foliage was not able to be assessed. Observations from past years have shown that due to the lack of comprehensive pruning over the years, the density of the tree canopy is higher than it would be under normal pruning circumstances.
- The trees appear to be overdue for pruning that would typically include the removal of branches and stems to influence a tree's growth rate, branch spacing, strength of branch attachment and ultimately the size of branches and stems. This approach is consistent with best management practices for tree pruning.
- Structural pruning and young tree training will reduce the size of each tree's canopy by maximum of 25-30% and improve the overall structure, health and balance of each tree.
- Width reduction will occur naturally with Yellowwood trees as the weight on the tree canopy is brought back into balance.
- Thinning the canopy of the Black Gum will allow the tree to be less dense and increase air and light penetration.
- In 2016 the larger parallel row of Linden trees along the river side of the Esplanade were pruned to raise the underside of the tree canopy, ensuring

appropriate clearances for the general public and emergency vehicles. As a result, views through to the river were expanded.

Site Context

The location of the trees fronting 12 K de K Court are referenced in the images below. The two Yellowwood trees and one Black Gum tree are located in the center of the site, anchored to the east and west by the Paperbark Maple trees. The trees are spaced approximately 58 feet apart from each other. This distance is typical for most trees along the Esplanade. In their current unpruned state, the width of the canopy for the Black Gum and Yellowwood trees at their widest point is, respectfully, approximately 17 feet, 18 feet and 19 feet. This is generally consistent with the size of the same species along the length of the Esplanade. The trees are set back from the edge of the Esplanade sidewalk by approximately 10 feet. This set-back is approximately five feet more than many of the other trees along the Esplanade. Combined with the fact that the front of many of the units at 12 K de K Court are very close to the property line (in comparison other Strata units in the area), the proximity of the trees to the front of the building may be contributing to a greater sense of impact on the views to the river relative to other buildings along this frontage.







ATTACHMENT “C”

Implications Associated with All Options

Associated Implications of Options

In consideration of the above options it is also important to reflect on the impact associated with potentially establishing precedence for the management and maintenance of the Urban Forest with respect to the preservation of views and view corridors. As indicated in the Existing Policy/Practice section of this report, prior to 2016 the City has had few formal policies to guide the care of trees in the City. During the course of planning for new tree planting in any location in the City, many different factors are considered that ultimately influence the specific location and types of tree species planted. In areas of the City where it is relevant, consideration of view-scapes is one of the many factors that are taken into account. Once trees that are felt to be appropriate for the given setting are selected and planted, it has been the practice of Horticulture Division to maintain these trees in accordance with ISA best practices and without specific ongoing regard towards how the trees may/may not be impacting views as they grow to maturity. This practice has also been upheld in addressing matters where residents have requested the removal of mature City trees that may be impacting views in varying degrees.

Given the absence of formal policy with respect to the priority to be given to preserving and enhancing views and tree planting and maintenance, Council may wish to consider directing staff to review the practices and policies of neighbouring communities and report back to Council with the results.

It is additionally worth recalling that the esplanade tree planting program implemented in 2007 was implemented after a process that included representation from the Quayside neighbourhood and that, save for the concerns/objections from some of residents at 12 K de K court, had general support from neighbourhood residents. Debate around the potential removal of the planted trees at that time brought out many strong opinions from residents in the area.