

Subject: FW: Mail delivery failure

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 12:19:44 -0700

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: <rossm@autoship.com>

CC: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <cagebc@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Muirhead:

Your letter re trees follows a number of similar complaints about the manner in which the District enforces its tree policy. On one hand we are adamant in preventing residents who wish to cut trees on their own property primarily for safety reasons but on the other hand we have no problem cutting trees en masse that are healthy to accommodate development.

This inconsistency and ad hoc application of our tree policy is typical of bureaucracies where the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing and where subjectivism is ruling the decision making process. It is with this in mind that I recently made a motion that we curtail the activities of this bureaucracy and that we introduce an element of common sense and allow residents most of whom love trees to use their own (tree) judgment.

Unfortunately my motion was not carried and from your letter it would appear that the "no common sense tree policy" is enforced with considerable enthusiasm.

I will give a copy of this letter to Mayor and Council as well as to the Senior Management Committee as well as to the Federation of North Shore Community Associations (FONVCA) as well as my own Community List and CAGE BC.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to my attention.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

From: Ross Muirhead [<mailto:rossm@autoship.com>]

Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2003 2:32 PM

To: Ernie Crist; Janice Harris; Lisa Muri; Maureen McKeon Holmes; Richard Walton; Don Bell; Edgemont Village Brian Platt; Susan Stratis

Subject: 3098 Pasiley Rd subdivision comments

Re: Proposed Subdivision at 3098 Paisley Rd. File 3060-20-19.03

Comments from Ross Muirhead at 3096 Paisley Rd.

I request to review the arborist report on the status of the grove of trees under question at this proposed subdivision. I also would like to read the comments by the District Forester, Mark Brown who I presume has critiqued the report on the status of the trees. The brief that I received from the District, dated June 17th, says, "Due to the poor condition of several trees in the front yard (due to previous topping), the Arborist report recommends removal of the trees as a group to prevent future tree failure."

The trees located in front of the existing house is totally unique in the District. Where else would you find 19 trees (firs, cedars and hemlocks) and 2 tall ivy trees in a front yard? Because of the close proximity of the 22 trees within the given space, I think it is proper to call the grouping a grove. A grove should also be seen as a 'micro-forest', which adds complexity to the stand both as a habitat site and strengthening their interrelationship Vs seeing them as single trees.

If this grove is clear-cut (removed as a group), as proposed in the arborist report, it will be an unnecessary removal of a large stand of stable trees, and a sad day for Paisley Road and the environmental record of the District.

The grove has been standing as unit since the 1940's. Now we are told by the arboists (which also has a tree cutting service and whose report was paid by Norrt Homes the developer) that because several trees (3 by my count) have historic broken tops that they are in 'poor condition' and thus the whole group of 19 trees have to be removed. I am waiting for the logic of this conclusion to come to light.

I have observed the 3 trees with the broken tops and the point where the original top was broken, in each case, there is now several healthy new vertical tops growing in place. Walk in any forest and a percentage of trees will have this characteristic. The location of the point where the original top is missing is not exposed to rot - in its place are new healthy vertical tops. Thus the concern of the tops missing should not be an issue.

The smallest tree in the grove is the only one rotting. It is at estimated being 35 ft tall. I have observed several woodpeckers borrowing into this tree for insects. It is the classic wildlife tree.

I am just being cynical to think that the arborists report provides conclusions that fit nicely into the developer's subdivision plan? I would have to surmise at this time from what I've read, that the arborist's general conclusions about the tops, is a smokescreen for the rationale to remove all the tress and make way for the new houses. Because of set backs from top of back, the new houses have to be set closer to the road where the grove now stands.

Is it safe to say, that if the arborist had concluded that the grove of trees under question were to continue to evolve into an old-growth condition over the next 100 years (old-growth reaching a climax state at approx. 500 -800 years) and posed no immediate safety hazard, then the subdivision would not be approved by the District because of the integrity of the grove?

I've been living next door to 3098 for 33 years and have seen some strong wind storms come through both our yards. About once in every 5 years the area along Paisley will experience what I would call a severe wind storm. After such a storm, our yard at 3096 may have 1-2 branches down. 3098 may have 2-3 branches come down along with a heavy layer of needles. In that time no windows have been broken, no person has been injured and no damage to the roofs. At this time, there are no hanging branches or 'widow makers' in any of the trees.

The impact of the subdivision proposal on our property is significant. From of our front yard, instead of looking across and through a beautiful stately grove of trees, with views of the Lions, we would be looking into the side of 2 storey house. The open frontage of 3096 and 3098 create one continuous green space. Pedestrians have commented to me how they enjoy this section of the street because of the park like quality. This is in contracts to 2 subdivided properties further up the street that have no large trees whatsoever.

The existing house has potential for renovation of its 50's rancher style and with the retention of its front yard micro-forest could continue to be a very wonderful piece of property.

After I read the Arborists Report and Mr. Brown's comments, I will submit additional comments.

Regards,

Ross Muirhead
3096 Paisley Road
North Vancouver, BC
V7R 1C9
604.986.9773

