

Key points – ISCCC meeting, 8.10.19

Peter Kanowski, ANU/ IFA

The renewed focus on urban trees by both ACT Govt & NCA very welcome; planted urban trees, as well as nature reserves, are key to character of our city and quality of life

The case is well-supported –
eg heat mapping (was cold/wind originally);
wellbeing – physical and mental health;
real estate value ...

Some issues are common, some different, between ACT & NCA land:
common issues

- age, often declining condition, climate change stress; \$ needed

different issues

- individual trees/ groups of trees significant for NCA – less so ACT
- trees on ‘private’ land important for ACT
- nature reserves ACT

So - much in common, but some important differences.

Beginning with NCA, I hesitantly say it’s the ‘simpler’:
next steps as outlined by Sally/ Duncan are sensible.

For ACT land, we have a larger set of challenges, and more trees ...
the LIP (Living Infrastructure Plan) outlines the case for valuing and investing in our trees and other living infrastructure,
target of 30% probably at the bottom end of what we should aim for;
and complicated by great variation between different areas of Cbr;
some contributions by NP that I think are peripheral to the urban target.

We need to assess more on a suburb by suburb/ or at least region by region basis, ensure we reach a minimum in each;
and also that we don’t lose significant tree assets in development process, as has been happening in densification.
In that context, we need to think harder about how we allow tradeoffs –
on the one hand – between loss of established trees that are not of a

threshold level of significance and establishment of new trees – there are some recent examples of this ...

We also need to reconfigure densification guidelines that are effectively stripping areas of densification of the possibility of more than pot plants because of the plot ratios and design configurations.

Lastly, we need to rethink the relationship between development approvals and funding for living infrastructure investments, so that there's a direct link between redevelopment investment and living infrastructure investment (including to maintain that infrastructure).

Then there are a few special cases where C'wealth and ACT interests intersect outside of NCA land – good example in IS is former AFS/ CSIRO site at Y'lumla, part of Westbourne Woods established by Charles W. It has >30% cover, but we need to protect in redevelopment ...

In conclusion, it's great that both govts have recognised need to pay more attention to our Living Infrastructure, especially urban tree assets; they are fundamentally what makes Cbr a special and a liveable city. It's great that we have Ministerial champions in both Federal & ACT – in Nola Marino and Shane Rattenbury, and also Urban Services colleague Chris Steele.

But we need to move from the plans to real investment.

I don't think either govt has yet come to terms with much greater level of funding required to renew and manage our LI, especially trees.

We do need to come to terms with that, and find ways to generate those funds on an ongoing basis ...