

Schedule of Potential Modifications - based on community feedback

| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
|------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | Exemptions too biased towards landowners and due to their broad nature, are susceptible to misuse | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce a % limit for the exemption. For example max 50% removal. Evidence in the form of an accurate plan before 'all clear' is given. 2. In addition to 2, limit removal of vegetation over a trunk width (easy to measure), and no habitat trees to be removed. Confirmation of habitat trees would require Administration staff inspection on basic evidence such as cockatoo chewed gum nuts and visible hollows. 3. Revert to revoked Policy level of exemption – which is a shift towards the WALGA model. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple to deliver and review, not considered a significant burden and would minimise the likelihood of site's being clear-felled. 2. Limits the need for technical reports and can be based on obvious evidence. Does require additional staff resources for inspection or review of evidence. Likely to slow down approval processes. 3. Likely to replicate the experience with the revoked LPP33. Does not find a new balance. Requires staff resources in compliance and assessment. |

| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
|------------|---|--|---|
| 2. | Providing better education for landowners moving to the City. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addendum of a process flow chart. 2. Addendum of landowner 'guide for tree removal and retention' based on final policy. Guide provided in new resident packs. 3. Annual spring media campaign targeted at landowners and residents on the benefit of retaining trees in the lead up to summer. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple to deliver and attach to final version of Policy. 2. Easy to deliver as an explanatory guideline in accordance with the flowchart. May delay Policy being presented to Council – could be a later addendum. 3. Budget required. Estimate \$5,000. <p>Note, multiple can be implemented.</p> |

| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
|------------|--|--|--|
| 3. | Adding amenity value rather than just number of trees being removed. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add a flat-fee if a tree is over a certain size, implying its amenity impact. 2. Trees over a certain size are not subject to any exemptions due to their amenity value. Add a simple multiplier to the per-tree calculation. 3. Revert to City of Melbourne modified methodology for a tree's value which was part of the revoked LPP33. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple to deliver and consistent with the simple approach in the draft Policy. 2. Does require additional staff resources for inspection or review of evidence. Likely to have a moimest slow-down of approval processes. Will impact the broad exemptions for residential-only 'mum and dad' developers. 3. Resulted in a single tree being valued at approximately \$95,000 in the revoked LPP33. |

| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
|------------|--|---|--|
| 4. | Changing the contribution cap. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change the cap from \$10k to \$20k 2. Change the cap from \$10k to \$50k 3. Remove the cap. | <p>All options are simple to implement.</p> <p>All options would increase proportionately the financial impediment of removing trees.</p> <p>The City would likely need an internal system to deploy funds that are received through this Policy. One method of deployment could be an annual planting program which achieves the intended benefit of the contributions.</p> |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 5. | Limit the residential exemption to a proportion of the site, or existing canopy. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limit the residential exemption to a maximum clearing of 80% of the site area. This would set the base level and no further exemptions would apply under the broad residential-only exemption. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This could be calculated based on a desktop assessment, or proofed on-site with a map provided by the landowner. It could identify trees proposed to be removed, and those to be retained. This could be a non-technical assessment as its |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>2. Limit the residential exemption to a maximum of 50% clearing of the site area. This would set the base level and no further exemptions would apply under the broad residential-only exemption.</p> <p>3. Limit the residential exemption down to 30% tree canopy being maintained. If 30% canopy does not exist, the broad residential-only exemption would not apply.</p> | <p>just about numbers, not about the ecological merit. There would be moderate resource implications.</p> <p>2. Same as 1.</p> <p>3. The requires staff to inspect the site and establish an accurate canopy estimate. High alignment with Urban Forest Strategy and content of submissions.</p> |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 6. | Introduce a exemption limit based on number of trees, or a percentage. | <p>1. Limit the residential exemption to a maximum clearing of trees on a square metre basis. For example maximum exemption of one tree per every 100m² of the site area up to 500m² (five trees). This would set the base level and no further exemptions would apply under the broad residential-only exemption.</p> <p>2. Limit the residential exemption to a maximum clearing of trees at</p> | All - This is likely to be a simple calculation and easy to implement compared to potential change No.5. |

| | | <p>one tree per every 100m² of the site area up to 1000m² (ten trees). This would set the base level and no further exemptions would apply under the broad residential-only exemption.</p> <p>3. Limit exemption to two trees. This would set the base level and no further exemptions would apply under the broad residential-only exemption.</p> <p>Note* These options would progressively make it harder to remove trees.</p> | |
|------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 7. | Introduce exemption based on lot size. | <p>1. Limit the residential exemption to a maximum clearing of 80% of the site area for lots under 1000m². This would set the base level and no further exemptions would apply under the broad residential-only exemption.</p> <p>2. Limit the residential exemption to a maximum of 50% clearing of the site area</p> | All options are viable to implement. |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>for lots 1001m2 to 4000m2. This would set the base level and no further exemptions would apply under the broad residential-only exemption.</p> <p>3. Limit the residential exemption to a maximum of 30% clearing of the site area for lots 4001m2 and above. If 30% of the site is already cleared, the broad residential-only exemption would not apply.</p> <p>This exemption could be worded to allow either more or less exemptions as lots increase in size. It may be more beneficial to retain more as lots get larger, as there is likely to be greater capacity for long term retention.</p> | |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 8. | Study which models the Impact of the draft Policy in achieving | <p>1. No action.</p> <p>2. Depending on the exemptions the Administration could monitor</p> | <p>1. The draft Policy provides certainty regarding the planning process, which is beneficial for procedural</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Urban Forest Strategy aspirations. | <p>the impact of the Policy on canopy cover through approvals issued and report annually on things like offsets collected, and numbers of trees formally retained, and trees planted.</p> <p>3. Prior to adopting the Policy the Council could provide budget for modelling of the projected of the impact of the policy to inform its provisions.</p> | <p>certainty for landowners and developers within the City. It is a misconception that a tree based Local Planning Policy will be able to hit all the Urban Forest targets.</p> <p>2. This will not be a significant resource burden, but will require resourcing.</p> <p>3. This will require a budget allocation from Council. At this time there is no estimate of cost. This would delay implementation of the draft Policy.</p> |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 9. | Staff Resourcing | <p>1. No action</p> <p>2. Council budget a nominal sum or FTE to support implementation of the draft Policy</p> <p>3. Council request a detailed business case to be provided</p> | <p>1. No action may be appropriate depending on the level of exemptions in the final version. If exemptions are wound back and more detailed assessments are required, there is a risk that not resourcing will create</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | based on the final version of the draft Policy. | <p>assessment bottlenecks and delay approvals.</p> <p>2. Based on the impact of the revoked policy which was tracked in terms of its impact across the Statutory Approvals and Front Counter teams, there was an approximate 5% impact. Based on the site of the teams a rough estimate of FTE demand is 0.5-0.8 FTE.</p> <p>3. A detailed business case would identify the burden of the draft Policy across the organisation in an accurate manner. This would delay implementation of the draft Policy, but would ensure once adopted, the Policy measures would be implemented as anticipated.</p> |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 10. | Greater connection to the Urban Forest Strategy canopy targets. | 1. No change. | 1. It is implied that by the City redeploying offset funds for replanting programs, there is |

| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Increase the connection between the offset payments being directly providing reinstatement of canopy by updating the wording of the policy. This could be either within the Policy, or as part of explanatory guidelines. 3. Introduce limits to exemptions as described in modification 5(3). | <p>sufficient link to the Urban Forest Strategy canopy targets.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Increasing wording would make the use of offsets more transparent. 3. The requires staff to inspect the site and establish an accurate canopy estimate. High alignment with Urban Forest Strategy and content of submissions. |
|------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 11. | Canopy target can be set higher | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action. 2. Include greater visibility of canopy targets. 3. Provide a higher canopy target than the Urban Forest Strategy 30%. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is implied that by the City redeploying offset funds for replanting programs, there is sufficient link to the Urban Forest Strategy canopy targets. 2. Increasing wording would make the use of offsets more transparent. |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | | | 3. Council can adjust the canopy target up or down, however consistency with the Urban Forest targets are logical. A higher target is likely to be a financial and/or design burden for new developments. |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 12. | <p>Amend the Policy to focus on local trees that are easily identified to be native and excluded, or proportionately excluded from exemptions.</p> <p>This modification can also apply to habitat trees.</p> | <p>1. No action</p> <p>2. Provide a list of species which are excluded from residential-only exemptions.</p> <p>3. No native species to be exempt.</p> | <p>1. No resource load added.</p> <p>2. Providing a list will require staff to verify species which would have a moderate resource demand.</p> <p>3. This would trigger a high number of development applications for tree removal</p> |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 13. | Urban Forest maintenance program | This is outside the scope of the Policy, there is no possible modification to the draft. | Nil. |

| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
|------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 14. | Increasing the offset ratio | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action. 2. Increase the ratio from 2:1 to 3:1. 3. Increase the ratio proportionately as the rate of numbers of removal increase. For example 0-5 trees 2:1, 5-10 trees 3:1. Over 10 trees 5:1. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2:1 ratio – with correct species choice – would provide a net benefit to canopy cover, and the additional benefit of the canopy moving from private land to City land where it can be managed. 2. This would be a 1/3 increase to offset yield with no additional resource. 3. This is forecast to be a disincentive to removal. |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 15. | Add a tree list for replanting | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.No action. 2. Add a tree list | <p>Providing a tree list for replanting could be provided as an addendum to the Policy.</p> <p>It may delay Council consideration of the Policy.</p> |

| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
|------------|---|--|--|
| 16. | Additional identification of trees and early tagging. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action 2. Add requirement for plaques. 3. No option 3. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tree labels were effective when applied through the revoked Policy. 2. Metal or similar plaques are going to cost more, but could be appropriate in certain landmark circumstances for significant trees. |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 17. | Purchase voucher provided to residents | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action 2. Release offset funds as vouchers for residents in the locality where the demand for an offset was generated. 3. No option 3. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The draft Policy already collects funds for deployment for tree planting. Council can consider offering a Tree rebate and fund it through the budget process. 2. The release and management of funds is possible, but would require resources. Also requires partnership with a nursery. |

| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
|------------|--|--|---|
| 18. | Policy awareness program | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action. 2. The City would through normal communications provide notices to the community and affected businesses to ensure the most likely affected landowners and businesses – local and from nearby local government - are aware of the limitations of the new policy. 3. The City could complete a funded media program to raise awareness of the new Policy. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. It is normal practice to advise affected stakeholders of new policies, and it is a regulatory requirement to publish a notice of a new policy. This would be accommodated within existing budgets. 3. A more comprehensive media campaign with additional print and social media outputs would enhance visibility of the new Policy – which is likely to increase its chances of successful implementation. This is not included in the existing budget and is estimated between \$2,500 - \$4,000. |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 19. | Introduce contribution of one tree per new | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action. The R-Codes require tree planting for all new houses, but this is on-site. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given the draft Policy facilitates offset contributions from |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | house, but the tree planted on City land. | <p>2. Add a new service fee to be paid as part of a building permit for a contribution amount, to be used for the purpose of planting a tree on City land near the new house.</p> <p>3. Nil</p> | <p>developments that generate tree removal, a general contribution of one tree for each new house could be considered to fall outside the scope of the draft Policy, and is more likely related to the implementation of the Urban Forest Strategy.</p> <p>2. The Administration would need to consider the validity of this service fee and its consistency with the Local Government Act if it was a Policy change Council wishes to pursue. The fee could be less than the replacement tree cost of \$1000, particularly if the tree</p> |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 20. | Council can take greater compliance action. | Not Applicable | Enforcement action is set by other mechanisms such as the planning Scheme, and planning Regulations. |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Having a policy in place would make breaches to the City's planning framework clearer, and arguably more compliance action with penalties could be pursued.</p> <p>Ultimately decisions on compliance action need to be made on a case-by-case basis on the evidence available.</p> |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 21. | Council can adopt the WALGA model tree policy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action 2. Adopt a bespoke policy fit for the needs of the City of Kalamunda. 3. Adopt the WALGA policy. | The WALGA policy's main distinguishing feature is its much stronger bias towards retention than the draft Future Forest policy. |
| Identifier | Description | 1 Low, 2 Medium, 3 High level of response | Administration Notes |
| 22. | Council can consider extending exemptions to land which is not only used for residential purposes. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No action. 2. Change the wording from 'residential only' to add in business activities Council is | The residential exemptions were a focus due to experience through implementation of the revoked policy. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>supportive of being able to remove trees to expand.</p> <p>3. No option 3.</p> | <p>The Administration experienced that landowners of land used for residential purposes were disproportionately affected by the revoked policy, such that when the policy was implemented and applications were sought, the majority of tree removal was approved – rather than being retained.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|