

Levee Maintenance vs. Cutting Down ALL the trees – How Green in Sugar Land?

When I raised this issue a few weeks ago, my goal was to create awareness and encourage people to question whether so many trees really must go. I want the LID to discriminate properly in all respects how and when they remove trees.

Is it not possible to rather consider both trimming broken trees and removing diseased trees a part of what defines maintenance? Could this not include planting new trees occasionally where determined safe, and in doing so avoid creating an ugly barren wasteland?

The LID say no, ALL the trees must go. Over the next few years they will continue to thin out the trees until they're all gone

What would I like to see? Certainly, please remove diseased trees. Space the trees so that enough sunlight filters through to keep the grass healthy. Similarly, trim the branches to allow more light through. Smaller trees and shrub between the big trees will also help protect the big trees from the wind.

This levee is considered an “internal levee”. Internal levees compartmentalize any breaches in the perimeter levee. Does this mean that in the event of such a breach, that the homes adjoining the levee will be flooded? Are these citizens aware of the danger of living right up close to an internal levee?

Our neighborhood streets are mostly lined with trees which make it very attractive and soothing for our human spirit. At the same time they're potentially dangerous and could certainly damage our homes, or worse. Does this mean we should live without trees? No! Maintain them by trimming branches, removing diseased trees, and replanting where possible – and do the same along the levees!