

CIVICA



20 February 2023

Yonis Ahmad
Project Manager
RP Infrastructure
Level 19, 9 Hunter Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report regarding forty-eight (48) trees located within the vicinity of the proposed carparking zones at Tamworth Hospital

Dear Yonis,

We are pleased to provide you with the following Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report for forty-eight (48) trees within the grounds of Tamworth Hospital.

Complete use of this report is authorised under the conditions limiting its use as stated in Appendix A Item 7 of *"Arboricultural Reporting Assumptions and Limiting Conditions"*.

Should you have any queries relating to this report, its recommendations, or the options considered please do not hesitate to contact us on 1300 272 671.

Regards,



Andy Clark

Consulting Arborist
Dip. Hort. (Arb.), AQF Level 5

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
2	Introduction	3
3	Scope	3
4	Methodology.....	3
	4.1 Data Collection.....	3
5	Observations	5
	5.1 Location.....	5
	5.2 Site Trees.....	6
	5.3 Tree Retention Values	7
	5.4 Proposed Construction.....	7
	5.5 Heritage Status	14
	5.6 Botanical and Environmental Status	14
6	Discussion.....	15
	6.1 Determining TPZ Encroachment.....	15
	6.2 Impact of Proposed Development.....	15
7	Tree Protection and Management Recommendations.....	17
	7.1 Tree Removal.....	17
	7.2 Tree Retention	18
	7.3 Site survey	18
	7.4 Specific Protection Measures.....	18
	7.5 Generic Protection and Reporting Measures	19
	7.6 Activities Prohibited within the TPZ.....	20
	7.7 Protective Fencing Specification	21
	7.8 Trunk and Ground Protection.....	22
	7.9 Tree Protection Signs.....	23
	7.10 Project Arborist.....	23
	7.11 Project Milestones.....	24
	7.12 Compliance Reporting.....	24
	7.13 Proposed Pruning	24
	7.14 Offset Tree Planting	25
	7.15 Additional Excavation/Trenching within TPZs	25
	7.16 Plant Health Care.....	25
	7.17 Irrigation	25
	7.18 Mulching.....	26
8	References.....	26
	Appendix A. Arboricultural Reporting Assumptions and Limiting Conditions.....	27
	Appendix B. Explanation of Tree Assessment Terms.....	28
	Appendix C. Tree Retention Values.....	31
	Appendix D. Plant Health Care and Mulching.....	33
	Appendix E. Tree Assessment Data	38

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1.1 The following Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Report) regarding forty-eight (48) trees located within the grounds of Tamworth Hospital. The subject site was identified by RP Infrastructure (the Client) as possessing trees that may be impacted upon by five (5) proposed carparking zones.
- 1.1.2 In part, the project scope was to nominate subject trees that can be retained, or require removal to facilitate the proposed development, as well as identify and reduce potential conflicts between subject trees and site development. Accurate information on the area required for tree retention and methods/techniques suitable for tree protection during construction have been provided. The assumptions and recommendations may alter in the future following a review of further detailed planning and construction plans.
- 1.1.3 A site survey should be completed using a registered surveyor. Tree numbers contained within this report and located on the individual tree tags onsite should be used in the survey. The TPZ, SRZ and Retention Value of all trees (Category A, B, C and U) should be displayed accurately on the site survey and subsequent development plans, using appropriate colour coding where possible
- 1.1.4 Fifteen (15) trees would require removal, based on the supplied design, to facilitate development. Ten (10) of these have direct conflict with the proposed carparking spaces, while the remaining five (5) have major TPZ encroachment of greater than 40%.
- 1.1.5 A further two (2) trees should be removed, in the context of development (Category U), due to poor health and/or structure, although both trees would also require removal due to either direct conflict or major TPZ encroachment.
- 1.1.6 The remaining thirty-one (31) trees are recommended for retention. Within this number, Trees 46, 51, 62, 64 and 67 have proposed development within their TPZ (Figure 17) of a TPZ encroachment percentage that should enable retention with some specific protection measures, such as further assessment following detailed design and/or site arborist supervision during initial excavation.
- 1.1.7 Tree retention values have been determined based upon a modified version of the British Standard and which have been prescribed into one of the following four (4) categories, A, B, C and U. Refer to Appendix C for further detail. Generally, relevant consent authorities will consider:
- **A** retention value trees as a site constraint and may require alterations to the proposed development design and/or specific protection measures to allow retention, unless the proposed development outweighs the retention value of the tree
 - **B** retention value trees as a site constraint consideration, lesser changes should be considered to retain such trees
 - **C** retention value trees are not considered a site constraint
 - **U** retention value trees are considered a site opportunity, as such trees are recommended for removal regardless of the proposed development.

1.1.8 Trees impacted by the proposed development:

Category	Description	Total	Removal		Retain	
			located within development footprint	irrespective of future development	with specific protection	with generic protection
A	High retention value trees	1			62	
B	Moderate retention value trees	32	26, 28, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 60, 63		46, 51, 64, 67	27, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 55, 56, 59, 61, 68, 69
C	Low retention value trees	13	21, 31, 52, 65, 66, 73			19, 20, 32, 53, 54, 57, 58
U	Trees to be removed irrespective of proposed development	2		29, 50		

2 Introduction

- 2.1.1 Civica ArborSafe was engaged by Yonis Ahmad on behalf of the Client to complete an (early) Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report on forty-eight (48) trees located at various locations within the grounds of the Tamworth Hospital, Dean Street, Tamworth.
- 2.1.2 The proposed development has been reviewed and in summary consists of the expansion of existing, and/or construction of new carparking spaces within the Hospital grounds across four (4) zones.
- 2.1.3 The report was intended to provide information on site trees and how they may be impacted upon by the proposed development. Report findings and recommendations provided are based upon guidance provided within Australian Standard AS 4970–2009: *Protection of Trees on Development Sites*.
- 2.1.4 Observations and recommendations provided within this report are based upon information provided by the Client and an arborist site visit. These assumptions may alter in the future following a review of further detailed planning and construction plans.

3 Scope

- 3.1.1 Carry out a visual examination of the nominated trees located within the vicinity of the proposed development.
- 3.1.2 Provide an objective appraisal of the subject trees in relation to their species, estimated age, health, structural condition, useful life expectancy (ULE) and viability within the landscape.
- 3.1.3 Based on the findings of this investigation, provide independent recommendations on the retention value of the trees.
- 3.1.4 Nominate subject trees that can be retained or require removal to facilitate the development.
- 3.1.5 Identify and reduce potential conflicts between subject trees and site development by providing accurate information on the area required for tree retention and methods/techniques suitable for tree protection during construction.
- 3.1.6 Provide information on restricted activities within the area nominated for tree protection, as well as suitable construction methods to be adopted during demolition and/or construction.

4 Methodology

4.1 Data Collection

- 4.1.1 Andy Clark of Civica ArborSafe carried out a site inspection of the subject trees on 28 October 2022.
- 4.1.2 Trees that are the subject of this report were identified by reviewing the proposed carparking zones within the supplied development documentation, with all site trees above 3m in height included within this report. Data was included for an additional four (4) trees, situated within an existing informal carparking space immediately south of the proposed Zone 1 carpark. Several small juvenile self-sown trees/shrubs situated along the existing southern Zone 2 carpark perimeter fence have been omitted from the report based on their species, current size and/or potential future size and contribution to local amenity.
- 4.1.3 The subject trees were inspected from the ground using the initial component of Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) (Mattheck, 1994). No foliage or soil samples were taken and no aerial, underground or internal investigations were undertaken.

- 4.1.4 Tree height and canopy width were estimated and have been provided in a variety of ranges with 5m increments. Trunk diameter at breast height (DBH) and trunk diameter at the root crown (DRB) were measured with a diameter tape and provided to the nearest centimetre.
- 4.1.5 Tree impacts and TPZ encroachment assumptions are based upon measurements obtained during the onsite arborist visit and reviewing the overview plans against existing infrastructure and tree data and locations.
- 4.1.6 Environmental and Heritage information has been sourced from the NSW Central resource for Sharing and Enabling Environmental Data (SEED) mapping tool. The source of all information has been referenced accordingly.
- 4.1.7 Data collected on site was analysed against the supplied development documentation by Andy Clark, following which relevant findings and recommendations were formulated and collated into report format.
- 4.1.8 Tree protection zones (TPZ) and structural root zones (SRZ) were calculated in accordance with the Australian Standard AS 4970–2009: *Protection of Trees on Development Sites* (refer to Section 7.6).
- 4.1.9 Retention values have been determined based upon a modified version of the British Standard BS 5837–2012: *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction* (refer to Appendix C).
- 4.1.10 All photographs were taken at the time of the site inspections by the author and have not been altered for brightness or contrast, nor have they been cropped.
- 4.1.11 Basic overlay plans of the proposed development were provided to ArborSafe in late October 2022.
- 4.1.12 No proposed underground service locations, detailed cut/fill or section drawings/plans have been reviewed in the preparation of this report.

5 Observations

5.1 Location

- 5.1.1 The four (4) proposed carparking zones were located within the grounds of Tamworth Hospital (Figure 1).
- 5.1.2 Site soils were expected to differ from natural soil horizon profiles due to extensive and longstanding site development and usage.
- 5.1.3 The site was located within the Tamworth Regional Council Local Government Area (LGA).




Figure 1. Excerpt from –Site Plan – Proposed Overall – Ref (Dwg. No. A01-002, Rev. E). (STH, 15 February 2023).

5.2 Site Trees

- 5.2.1 Trees can be identified on site using white tree tags which are typically located at approximately 2m from ground level on the southern side of the trunk. The tree numbering starts at Tag 19, as earlier tags form a subset of a previous survey undertaken within the site.
- 5.2.2 The majority of trees are considered to be planted stock, or possibly self-sown from local provenance seed. The treescape is well established with thirty (30) of the existing surveyed trees (62.5%) rated as mature and a further four (4) trees (8.5%) being in the senescent category. Ten (10) trees (21%) were rated as semi-mature and a further four (4) trees (8%) rated as juvenile specimens.
- 5.2.3 Twenty-one (21) species were identified across the site with the most prevalent being *Eucalyptus sideroxylon* (Red Iron Bark), *Eucalyptus melliodora* (Yellow Box), *Grevillea robusta* (Silky Oak) and *Phoenix dactylifera* (Date Palm).
- 5.2.4 There were a couple of self-sown juvenile trees of weedy tendencies situated around Tree 21 which were not included due to their small size and species.
- 5.2.5 Refer to images in the 5.4 – *Proposed Construction* section of this Report for tree pictures.




Figure 2. Site map showing subject trees. The red lines delineate the four(4) zones containing the subject trees that may be impacted by the proposed development. Tree attributes are to be obtained from Appendix E – Tree Assessment Data. (ArborSafe, October 2022).

5.3 Tree Retention Values

- 5.3.1 Retention values were determined based upon a modified version of the British Standard BS 5837–2012: *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction*. This standard categorises tree retention value based upon assessment of the tree's quality (health and structure), and life expectancy. Other criteria such as its physical dimensions, age class, location and its Amenity, Heritage and Environmental significance are also considered. A breakdown of attributes required for each category can be obtained from Appendix C – Tree Retention Values.


Category	Tree numbers
A	62
B	26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69
C	19, 20, 21, 31, 32, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 65, 66, 73
U	29, 50

5.4 Proposed Construction

- 5.4.1 The basic overlay plans of the proposed development have been reviewed and in summary consist of the expansion of existing, and/or construction of new carparking spaces within the Hospital grounds across four (4) zones (refer to Figure 1–6).

Carparking Solution

Zone 1 – Carpark D
Expansion, combination of
Visitors and Staff - 32* spaces



alith Infrastructure | 20 October 2022

1 Site Plan - North East - Carpark D
SCALE 1:300

Figure 3. Excerpt from Arborist Scope - carparking Zone 1. Red arrow shows direction of Figure 4 image. (Client, 20 October 2022).



Figure 4. Overview image of carparking Zone 1 with Trees 19 and 20 to the left. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).



Figure 5. Overview image of the Zone 1 – extension area (refer to Figure 2), showing Trees 22–25. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).




Figure 6. Excerpt from Early Works Carpark Plan North West Carpark B Zone 2 (Dwg. No. A11-431, Rev. J). Red arrows shows direction of Figure 7 and 8 images. (STH, 15 February 2023).



Figure 7. Overview image of carparking Zone 2, with Tree 27 in the foreground. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).



Figure 8. Overview image of carparking Zone 2, with Tree 30 in the foreground. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).



Figure 9. Excerpt from Early Works Carpark Plan South West Carpark A Zone 3 (Dwg. No. A11-421, Rev. G). (STH, 15 February 2023).



Figure 10. Overview image of carparking Zone 3, with Tree 40 in the left foreground. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).



Figure 11. Excerpt from Early Works Carpark Plan South West Carpark A Zone 4 (Dwg. No. A11-411, Rev. J) Red arrows shows direction of Figure 12–15 images. (STH, 15 February 2023).



Figure 12. Overview image of carparking Zone 4, with Tree 52 and 46 in the foreground. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).



Figure 13. Overview image of carparking Zone 4, with Palm 60 in the left foreground and Trees 53-59 in the group. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).



Figure 14. Overview image of carparking Zone 4, with Tree 62 in the right foreground. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).



Figure 15. Overview image of carparking Zone 4. (ArborSafe, 28 October 2022).

5.5 Heritage Status

- 5.5.1 The proposed development site has no trees identified as being of national or state heritage significance. (SEED, n.d.).
- 5.5.2 Tree 40, a *Eucalyptus melliodora* (Yellow Box), and a double row of *Phoenix dactylifera* (Date Palms) identified as 39, 43, 44, 45, 46, 59, 60 and 61 are mentioned as having Local significance in the Tamworth Council LEP (Urbis, June 2012)

5.6 Botanical and Environmental Status

- 5.6.1 The site trees were considered common species in the local area and as such hold limited botanical significance.
- 5.6.2 A number of the trees were observed to have cavities or hollows which may have been of use to local fauna. These trees were identified as 26, 27, 29, 40 and 52.

6 Discussion

6.1 Determining TPZ Encroachment

- 6.1.1 **Major encroachment.** As per the Australian Standard AS 4970–2009: *Protection of Trees on Development Sites*, a major encroachment into the TPZ of any tree is considered to occur when it is beyond 10% of the total TPZ area. Trees with major encroachment may require removal or, in certain instances, be retained with specific protection requirements throughout the construction stage.
- 6.1.2 **Minor encroachment.** Under the aforementioned standard, a minor encroachment is determined as being less than 10% of the total TPZ area. Trees with minor encroachment may be retained with specific, generic or no protection requirements throughout the construction stage.
- 6.1.3 **No encroachment.** Trees with no encroachment may be retained with generic or no protection requirements throughout the construction stage.
- 6.1.4 For the purposes of this report, trees to be removed or retained have been identified as those:
- Requiring removal due to a level of encroachment into their TPZ that would likely result in a detrimental impact upon their future health and/or stability
 - Retainable and requiring specific protection requirements throughout construction (i.e. generic requirements plus arborist supervision and careful construction methods within their TPZ)
 - Retainable and requiring generic tree protection measures only (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).

6.2 Impact of Proposed Development

- 6.2.1 Review of the proposed design, and of the basic overlay plan provided, has been undertaken in the context of tree retention and removal across the site.
- 6.2.2 The trees affected by direct conflict with the proposed construction footprint would require removal under the current design. To retain any of these trees a redesign or relocation of the development would be required. Refer to Appendix E for full detail.
- 6.2.3 The other main development impact which affects trees, but not necessarily to the point of requiring immediate removal, is through significant root damage due to major TPZ encroachment. Root damage largely occurs due to two (2) main impacts – soil compaction (compacting existing site soil to build on or installing additional fill to raise soil levels) and/or direct root severance (excavation for service installation or lowering surface levels).
- 6.2.4 Negative tree impacts can manifest as either a reduction in health and/or vigour due to root loss (absorption and/or transport roots) resulting in a reduction in water and nutrient absorption capability or on tree stability if larger roots are impacted. Ultimately, the outcome for the trees depends on a number of variable factors including species, age, current health, TPZ encroachment percentage, soil type, topography, previous site use and the proposed design and construction methodology.
- 6.2.5 Compacted soils, especially artificially compacted soils such as those found under driveways or building platforms, have a higher bulk density down to a deeper level of subsoil. Bulk density is the term used for describing the weight of soil per unit volume. The broad engineering thinking is that the higher the density the more stable the road surface due to less soil movement in expansion, contraction, or compression. A higher bulk density is produced by compacting the soil to reduce available pore space between the soil particles.

- 6.2.6 The effect of compacted soils on plants is somewhat influenced by the soil type but generally a reduction in available pore space reduces the available area for oxygen and water within the soil. A reduction in available soil water and oxygen inhibits root activity within the soil, as they are essential for root elongation and growth, and the lack of these properties is considered a major limiting factor. The impact of significant soil level rises across the TPZ generally occurs over a longer time frame, as the stored energy can still be utilised and shifted within the tree even if the long-term use of the affected root is limited, than if the roots were directly severed. This generally allows the tree more time to react to the changed growing environment. Root severance has the same effect, reduction in root function and capability, but on an instantaneous time scale where there is no time for the tree to adjust.
- 6.2.7 The assumption of allowable encroachment and minimal long-term health or structural impacts to the trees rely on a combination of the following being used - root sensitive construction methods being adhered to within the TPZ, minimal excavation within the TPZ to limit root severance (i.e. construction placed outside the TPZ where possible), fill rather than excavation utilised to affect level changes where possible (i.e. to minimise root severance and allow the trees root system time to adjust), no construction occurring within the SRZ, compensatory area being available around the unimpacted aspects of the trees and the enhancement of the existing TPZ area (i.e. mulched, soil conditioning and irrigation when required).

7 Tree Protection and Management Recommendations

7.1 Tree Removal

- 7.1.1 Fifteen (15) trees would require removal, based on the supplied design, to facilitate development. Ten (10) of these have direct conflict with the proposed carparking spaces, numbered 21, 26, 28, 42, 45, 49, 60, 65, 66 and 73, while the remaining five (5), numbered 31, 47, 48, 52, and 63, have major TPZ encroachment of greater than 40%.
- 7.1.2 A further two (2) trees should be removed, in the context of development (Category U), due to poor health and/or structure, although both trees would also require removal due to either direct conflict or major TPZ encroachment

Recommendation	Category A High retention value		Category B Moderate retention value		Category C Low Retention value		Category U No retention value	
	Qty	Tree numbers	Qty	Tree numbers	Qty	Tree numbers	Qty	Tree numbers
Remove for development	0		9	26, 28, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 60, 63	6	21, 31, 52, 65, 66, 73	0	
Remove in the context of development	0		0		0		2	29, 50



Figure 16. Site map showing trees requiring removal. (ArborSafe, October 2022).

7.2 Tree Retention

7.2.1 Thirty-one (31) trees were recommended for retention and require generic, and sometimes specific, protection measures during construction to ensure they remain viable following the completion of works.

Recommendation	Category A High retention value		Category B Moderate retention value		Category C Low Retention value	
	Qty	Tree numbers	Qty	Tree numbers	Qty	Tree numbers
Retain with specific protection requirements	1	62	4	46, 51, 64, 67	0	
Retain with generic protection requirements	0		19	27, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 55, 56, 59, 61, 68, 69	7	19, 20, 32, 53, 54, 57, 58

7.3 Site survey

7.3.1 A site survey should be completed using a registered surveyor. Tree numbers contained within this report and located on the individual tree tags onsite should be used in the survey.

7.3.2 The TPZ, SRZ and Retention Value of all trees (Category A, B, C and U) should be displayed accurately on the site survey and subsequent development plans, using appropriate colour coding where possible, using the information contained in the attached Appendix E - Tree Assessment Data Sheet.

7.4 Specific Protection Measures

7.4.1 Trees 46, 51, 62, 64 and 67 have proposed development within their TPZ (Figure 17) of a percentage, slightly above the generally acceptable 10% (refer to Appendix E – Tree Assessment Data Sheet), that should enable retention with minimal long term impact. Further assessment following detailed design should be undertaken to assess their retention suitability.

7.4.2 If no further design reviews are undertaken, site preparation excavation is to be carried out only under arborist supervision and works should be undertaken using techniques that are sensitive to tree roots to avoid unnecessary damage. Such techniques include:

- Arborist supervision
- The use of machinery should be undertaken from areas of hardstand to avoid potential root compaction
- The proposed excavation should commence at the outer extent of the TPZ and move inwards to minimise root damage to the tree
- No excavation should occur within the SRZ of these trees
- Roots discovered are to be treated with care and minor roots (<40mm diameter) pruned with a sharp, sterile handsaw or secateurs. All significant roots (>40mm diameter) are to be recorded, photographed and reported to the project arborist.



Figure 17. Site map showing trees requiring specific protection measures. (ArborSafe, October 2022).

7.5 Generic Protection and Reporting Measures

7.5.1 All retained trees require generic protection measure (Figure 18). Refer to Section 7.6–7.12 for further detail.



Figure 18. Site map showing tree requiring generic protection measures. (ArborSafe, October 2022).

7.5.2 All trees to be retained require protection during the construction stage. Tree protection measures include a range of:


- Activities restricted within the TPZ
- Protective fencing
- Trunk and ground protection
- Tree protection signage
- Involvement from the project arborist
- Project milestones
- Compliance reporting

7.6 Activities Prohibited within the TPZ

- Machine excavation including trenching
- Storage
- Preparation of chemicals, including cement products
- Parking of vehicles and plant
- Refuelling
- Dumping of waste
- Wash down and cleaning of equipment
- Placement of fill
- Lighting of fires
- Soil level changes
- Temporary or permanent installation of utilities and signs
- Physical damage to the tree

7.7 Protective Fencing Specification

- 7.7.1 Protective fencing (Figure 19) is to be installed as far as practicable from the trunk of any retained trees. Fencing should be erected as per the image below before any machinery or materials are brought to site and before commencement of works (including demolition).
- 7.7.2 In some areas of the site (i.e. protection of trees on neighbouring properties) existing boundary fencing may be used as an alternative to protective fencing.
- 7.7.3 Once erected, protective fencing must not be removed or altered without approval from the project arborist. The TPZ fencing should be secured to restrict access.
- 7.7.4 TPZ fencing is to be a minimum of 1.8m high and mesh or wire between posts must be highly visible. Fence posts and supports should have a diameter greater than 20mm and should ideally be freestanding, otherwise be located clear of the roots. See image below.
- 7.7.5 Tree protection fencing must remain intact throughout all proposed construction works and must only be dismantled after their conclusion. The temporary dismantling of tree protection fencing must only be done with the authorisation of a consulting arborist and/or the responsible authority.
- 7.7.6 The subject trees themselves must also not to be used as a billboard to support advertising material. Affixing nails or screws into the trunks of trees to display signs of any type is not a recommended practice in the successful retention of trees.




Legend:

- 1. Chain wire mesh panels with shade cloth attached (if required), held in place with concrete feet
- 2. Alternative plywood or wooden paling fence panels. This fencing material also prevents building materials or soil entering the TPZ
- 3. Mulch installation across surface of TPZ (at discretion of the project arborist). No excavation, construction activity, grade changes, surface treatment or storage materials of any kind are permitted within the TPZ
- 4. Bracing is permissible within the TPZ. Installation of supports should avoid damaging roots.

Figure 19. Depicts standard fencing techniques. (AS 4970–2009).

7.8 Trunk and Ground Protection

- 7.8.1 Given that proposed works are often within the TPZs of retained trees, standard protective fencing may not always be a viable method of protection. In these areas trunk protection and ground protection should be installed prior to the commencement of works and remain in place until after construction works have been completed.
- 7.8.2 Where construction access into the TPZ of retained trees cannot be avoided, the root zone of each tree must be protected using either steel plates or rumble board strapped over mulch/aggregate until such a time as permanent above ground surfacing (cellular confinement system or similar) is to be installed.
- 7.8.3 Trunk and ground protection (Figure 20) should be undertaken in line with the Australian Standard AS 4790–2009: *Protection of Trees on Development Sites* as per the image below:



Notes:

1. For trunk and branch protection use boards and padding that will prevent damage to bark. Boards are to be strapped to trees, not nailed or screwed.
2. Rumble boards should be of a suitable thickness to prevent soil compaction and root damage.

Figure 20. Depicts trunk and ground protection techniques. (AS 4790–2009).

7.9 Tree Protection Signs

- 7.9.1 Signs identifying the TPZ (Figure 21) should be placed at 10m intervals around the edge of the TPZ and should be visible from within the development site.



Figure 21. Depicts standard fencing techniques. (AS 4970–2009).

7.10 Project Arborist

- 7.10.1 An official “Project Arborist” must be commissioned to oversee the tree protection, any works within the TPZ’s and complete regular monitoring compliance certification.
- 7.10.2 The project arborist must have minimum five (5) years industry experience in the field of arboriculture, horticulture with relevant demonstrated experience in tree management on construction sites, and Diploma level qualifications in arboriculture – AQF Level 5.
- 7.10.3 Inspections are to be conducted by the project arborist at several key points during the construction in order to ensure that protection measures are being adhered to during construction stages and decline in tree health or additional remediation measures can be identified.

7.11 Project Milestones

7.11.1 The following visits and milestones were recommended as to when on-site tree inspection by the project arborist is required:

Item	Purpose of Visit	Timing of Visit(s)	Prerequisites
1	Pre-start induction	Following sign off from Item 1. Contractor to provide a minimum of five days advance notice for this visit.	Prior to commencement of works. All parties involved in the project to attend.
2	Supervision of works in TPZ's including all regrading and excavations	Whenever there is work planned to be performed within the TPZ's. Contractor to provide a minimum of five days advance notice for such visits.	
3	Regular site inspections	Minimum frequency monthly for the duration of the project.	The checklist must be completed by the Project Arborist at each site inspection and signed by both parties.
4	Final sign off	Following completion of works.	Practical completion of works and prior to tree protection removal.

7.12 Compliance Reporting

- 7.12.1 Following each inspection, the project arborist shall prepare a report detailing the condition of the trees. These reports should certify whether or not the works have been completed in compliance with the consent relating to tree protection.
- 7.12.2 These reports should contain photographic evidence where required to demonstrate that the work has been carried out as specified.
- 7.12.3 Matters to be monitored and included in these reports should include tree condition, tree protection measures and impact of site works which may arise from changes to the approved plans.
- 7.12.4 The reports and Compliance Statements shall be submitted to the Project Manager (as well as the Clients' nominated representative) following each inspection.
- 7.12.5 The reports and any Non-Compliance Statements shall be submitted to the Project Manager (as well as the Clients' nominated representative) if tree protection conditions have been breached. Reports should contain clear remedial action specifications to minimise any adverse impact on any subject tree.

7.13 Proposed Pruning

- 7.13.1 It is anticipated that minor pruning only will be required, largely centred on reduction or crown lifting to facilitate site access during construction, of no greater than 10% of any one trees total crown area. Such pruning is considered to have minimal long term health impact to the tree.
- 7.13.2 All pruning is recommended to be completed in accordance with the Australian Standard AS 4373–2007: *Pruning of Amenity Trees* (Standards Australia, 2007) and undertaken by a suitably qualified arborist (minimum AQF 3 arborist).
- 7.13.3 Reduction pruning should focus on the removal of smaller diameter branches where feasible and remove no greater than 10% of the total crown. Branches no greater than 50mm diameter are to be removed unless specifically approved by the project arborist.

7.14 Offset Tree Planting

- 7.14.1 Offset planting should reflect the number of trees removed and the initial loss of amenity and biomass. New trees should be of long-term potential and sourced from a reputable supplier.
- 7.14.2 Replacement tree species must suit their location on the site in terms of their potential physical size and their tolerance(s) to the surrounding environmental conditions. To avoid unethical or unprofessional tree selection and/or their placement within the landscape, replacement tree species must be selected in consultation with a consulting arborist, who can also assist in implementing successful tree establishment techniques.
- 7.14.3 Replacement tree species must have the genetic potential to reach a mature size potential of those trees removed to facilitate the development. As a guide, potential height will be a minimum of 10m (or more) and produce a spreading canopy so as they may provide amenity value to the property and contribute to the tree canopy of the surrounding area in the future.

7.15 Additional Excavation/Trenching within TPZs

- 7.15.1 In the event additional excavation is required within the TPZs of retained trees identified within this report, or any other site trees, arborist involvement will be required to ensure works are undertaken in accordance with the Australian Standard AS 4970–2009: *Protection of Trees on Development Sites*.
- 7.15.2 Where excavation or trenching is required to facilitate installation of underground services within the TPZs of any site trees arborist supervision is required. Works should be undertaken using techniques that are sensitive to tree roots to avoid unnecessary damage. Such techniques include:
 - 1. Excavation by hand
 - 2. Excavation using a high-pressure water jet and vacuum truck
 - 3. Excavation using an Air Spade with vacuum truck.
- 7.15.3 Machine excavation should be prohibited within the TPZs of retained trees unless undertaken at the direct consent from the project arborist and/or the responsible authority.

7.16 Plant Health Care

- 7.16.1 When managing a tree affected by development incursions within its TPZ, plant tonic and growth stimulant drenching should be undertaken. Plant tonic and growth stimulant drenching is the process of adding diluted products directly to the root area of a tree to promote and assist trees to cope with loss of roots during the development process. They also assist trees to provide better resistance to sap sucking insects and fungal attack/disease and improve the establishment of beneficial microbial populations and nutrient uptake. See Appendix D – Plant Health Care and Mulching

7.17 Irrigation

- 7.17.1 Regular checks are required to ensure retained trees are receiving the correct amount of water. The majority of a tree's fine water absorbing roots are located in the top 10–30cm of soil. To undertake a basic soil moisture test, dig a small hole to a depth of 40cm at the dripline of the tree. If the soil is moist at this depth, water is not needed. Slow irrigation that provides an even coverage and targets the absorbing roots is the key to successful irrigation and encourages a deeper tree root system. Irrigation near the trunk is unnecessary as for most trees there are generally fewer water absorbing roots in this area. Irrigating the soil from half-way between the trunk and the dripline as well as beyond the dripline will provide water where it will most effectively be used. Preferably, water your trees during the cooler evening and early morning period when temperatures are lower, humidity is higher, and the air is calmer thereby reducing water evaporation from the soil surface. Irrigation in the middle of the day is not harmful to most trees however it is less efficient.

7.18 Mulching

- 7.18.1 Mulching regulates soil moisture and temperature levels, suppresses weeds, minimises soil compaction and reduces run off during periods of heavy rain. Acquiring wood chip mulch from programmed tree works (and by purchasing it from local tree contractors) would be a proactive way to improve the growing conditions around trees that ultimately will result in improved tree health and vitality.
- 7.18.2 Mulch should aim to cover an area at least as large as a tree's crown projection (and preferably larger) for it to be effective. It should also be laid at a uniform thickness of 75–100mm. Mulch should also be placed over damp to wet soil and never over dry soil. Application during the cooler months of the year is ideal. In areas where grass exists where you wish to mulch, spray the grass first with a non-selective herbicide and allow it to wilt and die before placement. This practice will negate grass growing up through the mulch over time.
- 7.18.3 Mulching within the canopy areas of trees not only improves long term tree health but also acts to reduce tree risk by reducing targets that pass and/or congregate under their canopies. This in turn will minimise the likelihood of injury in the event of a branch failure.

8 References

- Mattheck, C. a. B. H., 1994. *The Body Language of Trees: A Handbook for Failure Analysis*. H. M. Stationery Office: University of Michigan.
- SEED, N. G. -, n.d. *SEED - Sharing and Enabling Environmental Data*. [Online] Available at: https://geo.seed.nsw.gov.au/Public_View/index.html?viewer=Public_View&locale=en-AU
- Standards Australia, 2007. *AS 4373–2007 Pruning of Amenity Trees*, GPO Box 476 Sydney NSW 2001: Standards Australia.
- Standards Australia, 2009. *AS4970–2009: Protection of Trees on Development Sites*, Sydney: Standards Australia.
- The British Standards Institution, 2012. *BS5837–2012: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction*, London: BSI Standards Limited.
- Urban, J., 2008. *Up By Roots - Healthy Soils and Trees in the Built Environment*. Champaign (Illinois): International Society of Arboriculture.
- Urbis, June 2012. *Heritage Impact Statement*, Sydney: Urbis.

Plans of the existing site and of the proposed development were provided to ArborSafe in late October 2022 and include:

- Arborist Scope – Carparking, October 2022.
- Site Plans, Demolition Plans and Carpark Plans, Drawings A01-002, A10-000, A10-001, A11-202 to 205, A11-411, A11-421m A11-431, A12-001, STH, 13-15 February 2023.

Appendix A. Arboricultural Reporting Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownership of any property are assumed to be good. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character.
2. It is assumed that any property/project is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes or other government regulations.
3. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified in so far as possible, however, the consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of the information provided by others.
4. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services.
5. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
6. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by anyone but the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior written consent of the consultant.
7. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report, nor any copy thereof, shall be used for any purpose by anyone but the person to whom it is addressed, without the written consent of the consultant. Nor shall it be conveyed by anyone, including the Client, to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales or other media, without the written consent of the consultant.
8. This report and any values expressed herein represent the opinion of the consultant and the consultant's fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified value, a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.
9. Sketches, diagrams, graphs and photographs in this report, being intended as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or surveys unless expressed otherwise.
10. Information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflect the condition of those items at the time of inspection.
11. Inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible components without dissection, excavation or probing. There is no warranty or guarantee expressed or implied that the problems or deficiencies of the plants or property in question may not arise in the future.

Appendix B. Explanation of Tree Assessment Terms

Tree number: Refers to the individual identification number assigned within the ArborSafe software to each assessed tree on the site and the number which appears of the tree's tag.

Tree location: Refers to the easting and northing coordinates assigned to the location of the tree as obtained from the geo-referenced aerial image within the ArborSafe software.

Tree species: Provides the botanic name (genus, species, sub-species, variety and cultivar where applicable) in accordance with the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (ICBN), and the accepted common name.

Trees in group: The number of trees encompassing a collective assessment of more than one tree. Typically grouped trees have similar attributes that can be encompassed within one data record.

Height: The estimated range in metres attributed to the tree from its base to the highest point of the canopy. Where required height will be estimated to the nearest metre.

Diameter at Breast Height (DBH): Refers to the tree's estimated trunk diameter measured 1.4m from ground level for a single trunked tree. These estimates increase in 50mm increments. Where required DBH will be measured to give an accurate measurement for single trunked trees, trees with multiple trunks, significant root buttressing, bifurcating close to ground level or trunk defects and will be measured as per the Australian Standard AS 4970–2009: *Protection of Trees on Development Sites*.

Tree Protection Zone (TPZ): A specified area above and below ground and at a given distance measured radially away from the centre of the tree's trunk and which is set aside for the protection of its roots and crown. It is the area required to provide for the viability and stability of a tree to be retained where it is potentially subject to damage by development. The radius of the TPZ is calculated by multiplying its DBH by 12. $TPZ\ radius = DBH \times 12$. (Note "Breast Height" is nominally measured as 1.4m from ground level). TPZ is a theoretical calculation and can be influenced by existing physical constraints such as buildings, drainage channels, retaining walls, etc. (Standards Australia, 2009).

Structural Root Zone (SRZ): The area close to the base of a tree required for the tree's anchorage and stability in the ground. The woody root growth and soil cohesion in this area are necessary to hold the tree upright. The SRZ is nominally circular with the trunk at its centre and is expressed by its radius in metres. $SRZ\ radius = (D \times 50)^{0.42 \times 0.64}$ (Standards Australia, 2009).

Canopy spread: The estimated range in metres attributed to the spread of the tree's canopy on its widest axis. Where required crown spread will be estimated to the nearest metre.

Origin: Refers to the origin of the species and its type.

Category	Description
Indigenous	Occurs naturally in the local area and is native to a given region or ecosystem.
State Native	Occurs naturally within State but is not indigenous.
Australian Native	Occurs naturally within Australia and its territories but is not a State native or indigenous.
Exotic Evergreen	Occurs naturally outside of Australia and its territories and typically retains its leaves throughout the year.
Exotic Deciduous	Occurs naturally outside of Australia and its territories and typically loses its leaves at least once a year.

Health: Refers to the health and vigour of the tree.

Category	Description
Excellent	Canopy full with even foliage density throughout, leaves are entire and are of an excellent size and colour for the species with no visible pathogen damage. Excellent growth indicators, e.g. seasonal extension growth. Exceptional specimen.
Good	Canopy full with minor variations in foliage density throughout, leaves are entire and are of good size and colour for the species with minimal or no visible pathogen damage. Good growth indicators, none or minimal deadwood.
Fair	Canopy with moderate variations in foliage density throughout, leaves not entire with reduced size and/or atypical in colour, moderate pathogen damage. Reduced growth indicators, visible amounts of deadwood, may contain epicormic growth.
Poor	Canopy density significantly reduced throughout, leaves are not entire, are significantly reduced in size and/or are discoloured, significant pathogen damage. Significant amounts of deadwood and/or epicormic growth, noticeable dieback of branch tips, possibly extensive.
Dead	No live plant material observed throughout the canopy, bark may be visibly delaminating from the trunk and/or branches.

Age: Refers to the life cycle of the tree.

Category	Description
Young	Newly planted small tree not fully established may be capable of being transplanted or easily replaced.
Juvenile	Tree is small in terms of its potential physical size and has not reached its full reproductive ability.
Semi-mature	Tree in active growth phase of life cycle and has not yet attained an expected maximum physical size for its species and/or its location.
Mature	Tree has reached an expected maximum physical size for the species and/or location and is showing a reduction in the rate of seasonal extension growth.
Senescent	Tree is approaching the end of its life cycle and is exhibiting a reduction in vigour often evidenced by natural deterioration in health and structure.

Structure: Refers to the structure of the tree from roots to crown.

Category	Description
Good	Sound branch attachments with no visible structural defects, e.g. included bark or acute angled unions. No visible wounds to the trunk and/or root plate. No fungal pathogens present.
Fair	Minor structural defects present, e.g. apical leaders sharing common union(s). Minor damage to structural roots. Small wounds present where decay could begin. No fungal pathogens present.
Poor	Moderate structural defects present, including bifurcations with included bark with union failure likely within 0–5 years. Wounding evident with cavities and/or decay present. Damage to structural roots.
Hazardous	Significant structural defects with failure imminent (3–6 months). Defects may include active splits and/or partial branch or root plate failures. Tree requires immediate arboricultural works to alleviate the associated risk.

Useful Life Expectancy (ULE): Useful life expectancy refers to an expected period of time the tree can be retained within the landscape before its amenity value declines to a point where it may detract from the appearance of the landscape and/or presents a greater risk and/or more hazards to people and/or property. ULE values consider tree species, current age, health, structure and location. ULE values are based on the tree at the time of assessment and do not consider future changes within the tree's location and environment which may influence the ULE value.

Category
0 Years
<5 Years
5–10 Years
10–15 Years
15–25 Years
25–50 Years
>50 Years

Defects: Visual observations made of the presenting defects of the tree and its growing environment that are, or have the capacity to impact upon, the health, structural condition and/or the useful life expectancy of the tree. Defects may include adverse physical traits or conditions, signs of structural weaknesses, plant disease and/or pest damage, tree impacts to assets or soil related issues.

Tree Significance: Includes environmental, social or historical reasons why the tree is significant to the site. The tree may also be rare under cultivation or have a rare or localised natural distribution.

Arborist Actions: A list of arboricultural and/or plant health care works that are aimed at maintaining or improving the tree's health, structural condition or form. Actions may also directly or indirectly reduce the risk potential of the tree such as via the removal of a particular branch or the moving of infrastructure from under its canopy.

Appendix C. Tree Retention Values

Based upon a modified version of the British Standard BS 5837–2012: *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction* – recommendations.

Category and definition	Criteria (including sub-categories where appropriate)		
Category U			
Trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as viable trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 5 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Trees that have a severe structural defect that are not remediable such that their failure is expected within 12 months.Trees that will become unviable after removal of other Category U trees (e.g. where for whatever reason the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning).Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate and irreversible overall decline.Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and or safety of other trees nearbyLow quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.Noxious weeds or species categorised as weeds within the local area. <p>Note: Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value* which might make it desirable to preserve.</p>		
	1. Arboricultural Qualities	2. Landscape qualities	3. Cultural and environmental values
Category A			
Trees of High Quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 25 years and of dimensions and prominence that it cannot be readily replaced in <20 years.	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual (in the wild or under cultivation); or those that are important components of groups or avenues.	Trees or groups of significant visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features. (e.g. feature and landmark trees).	Trees, groups or plant communities of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. remnant trees, aboriginal scar trees, critically endangered plant communities, trees listed specifically within a Heritage statement of significance).
Category B			
Trees of Moderate Quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of 15–25 years and of dimensions and prominence that cannot be readily replaced within 10 years.	Trees that might be included within Category A but are downgraded because of diminished condition such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention beyond 25 years.	Trees that are visible from surrounding properties and/or the street but make little visual contribution to the wider locality.	Trees with conservation or other cultural value (trees within conservation areas or landscapes described within a statement of significance, locally indigenous species).
Category C			
Trees of Low Quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of 5–15 years, or young trees that are easily replaceable.	Trees of very limited value or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.	Trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value.

* Where trees would otherwise be categorised as U, B or C but have significant identifiable conservation, heritage or landscape value even though only for the short term, they may be upgraded, although they might be suitable for retention only.

Tree Quality

		Health**			
		Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor	Dead
Structure	Good	A	B	C	U
	Fair	B	B	C	U
	Poor	C	C	U	U
	Hazard *	U	U	U	U

* Structural hazard that cannot be remediated through mitigation works to enable safe retention.

** Trees of short term reduced health that can be remediated via basic, low cost plant health care works (e.g. mulching, irrigation etc.) may be designated in a higher health rating to ensure correct retention value nomination.

Category A	Typically trees in this category are of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 25 years and of dimensions and prominence that it cannot be readily replaced in <20 years. The tree may make significant amenity contributions to the landscape and may make high environmental contributions. In some cases, trees within this category may not meet the above criteria, however possess significant heritage or ecological value. Trees of this retention value warrant design consideration and amendment to ensure their viable retention.
Category B	Typically trees in this category are of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of 15–25 years and prominence of size dimensions that cannot be readily replaced within 10 years. They may make moderate amenity contributions to the landscape and make low/moderate environmental contributions. Trees with this retention value warrant lesser design consideration in an attempt to allow for their retention.
Category C	Trees in this category are of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of 5–15 years, or young trees that are easily replaceable, may have poor health and/or structure, are easily replaceable, or are of undesirable species and do not warrant design consideration.
Category U	Trees in this category are found to be in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as viable trees in the context of the current land use for longer than five years. These trees may be dead and/or of a species recognised as a weed that resulted in them being unretainable.

Appendix D. Plant Health Care and Mulching

Guide to plant health tonics and root growth stimulants

Considering the varying sizes of trees in common urban landscapes, it is suggested that an application volume of combined water and product solution of 80–150L for small to medium sized trees (5-10m height), 150–250L for medium to large sized trees (10-20m height) and 250–400L for large to very large sized trees (+20m height). Note: a lesser volume of total mixed product could be used if a more concentrated mix is drenched and water irrigation used to further drench the area and therefore dilute the stronger mix application.

The following product recommendations have been based on previous successful works undertaken by ArborSafe. The information provided is to be used as a general guide only, depending on your tree species, health or location. We recommend you always refer to the manufacturers label before applying any product. You may need to further consult with ArborSafe or your Project Arborist to develop a more specific program for your tree needs.

- **Soil Conditioner** concentrate such as Kelpro, Seasol or similar 600–800mL/100L of water. A concentration of beneficial nutrients stimulating plant growth and root establishment, ideal for trees under stress.
- **Nitrogen Boost** concentrate such as Nitrosol liquid plant food or similar 300mL/100L of water. A general-purpose fertilizer that contains a nitrogen boost (the most abundantly used element for tree growth). NB: Care must be taken when applying general fertilizer, particularly where plants can be affected Phosphorus toxicity.
- **Root Biostimulant** concentrate such as Auxinone or similar 400mL/100L of water. A scientific blend of hormone root growth stimulants and vitamins assisting in the regeneration of roots.
- **Microbial Formulation** concentrate such as Nocate Liquid or similar 500mL/100L of water. Generally containing strains of beneficial soil microorganisms, humic acid, kelp, essential amino acids, vitamins, biotin, folic acid and natural sugars designed to enhance the establishment of beneficial microbial populations.
- **Carbohydrate Energy Source** such as Molasses 500-800mL/100L of water. Molasses is the by-product of sugar refining. It contains all the nutrients from the raw sugarcane plant and is a carbohydrate energy source that feeds soil microorganisms and increases microbial activity.
- **Surfactant/Wetting Agent** (optional) such as Dispatch (Liquid) 200–300mL/100L of water. Improves the infiltration and penetration of applied water and irrigation.

We recommend you always refer to the manufacturers label before applying any product using the above as a guide only.

Guide to mulching and maintenance for established trees

Whether a tree is a newly planted young tree, or a well-established mature tree, the area around its base is a key factor in its long-term retention and viability. Maintaining a soil environment that is conducive to tree root development is vital for trees of all ages. This guide provides information on appropriate maintenance practices around the base of trees including mulching and the restriction of activities that may cause harm to tree roots or trunks.

1. Why mulch?

Mulching is a plant health care action which can be undertaken to improve plant and soil health (Figure 22), as well as overall landscape aesthetics. Placing an organic (or sometimes inorganic) material on the soil surface reduces the level of direct sunlight contact. Mulching should not be confused with composting which involves incorporating organic matter such as composts or manures into the soil profile. All plants in their natural ecologies (except for some arid and coastal ecologies) are naturally mulched by the falling of leaves, bark, flowers and other organic material.

This action is of great importance in successful cultivation of plants as it:

- assists in the regulation of soil moisture and temperature levels
- helps to suppress weeds
- minimises soil compaction
- reduces run-off during periods of heavy rain
- adds organic matter to the soil, and
- improves overall structure, nutrition and water holding composition.

Mulch is best comprised of organic materials such as wood chips, leaf litter, straw or hay as these will degrade over time. Long-term mulching improves soil health and structure as it encourages the activities of earthworms, microflora and beneficial fungi. Inorganic materials such as stones and gravel can be moderately effective as mulch but will not provide the ongoing improvements to soil health.



Figure 22. An excellent example of how to mulch a young tree. (Lachlan Andrews, September 2015).

2. How to mulch

- Apply mulch to damp soil, as placing over dry soil makes it difficult to rehydrate. Applying during the cooler months of the year is an ideal time.
- If mulching on top of a pre-existing grass area, grass or weeds must first be hand weeded and/or sprayed with a non-selective herbicide and left to wilt and die before applying mulch.
- Mulch should be applied at a uniform thickness of 75–100mm and re-applied approximately every 12 months. Do not place mulch up against the trunk of a tree as the damp mulch can cause bark to decay.
- Apply over a wide area, at least as large as a tree's crown projection (preferably larger), within and outside the current root mass to encourage lateral root development and expansion.
- Wood chip mulch (such as that generated from wood chippers) is considered an ideal mulch for landscape use as it contains a wide variety of materials that are of different sizes (such as bark, foliage and timber), is relatively cheap to purchase, and can be obtained in large quantities. Stockpiling of mulch after tree contractors have conducted works at a site is a way of generating 'free' mulch and ensuring that plant material from tree pruning and/or removals is recycled on site, not imported from external suppliers, saving costs and making the site more self-sustaining.
- The use of mulch made from pine bark or red gum chips are discouraged as they seldom degrade and therefore do not add nutrition to the soil profile. The uniform particle size and resin content can provide an impervious layer to water as well as retarding gaseous exchange.
- Mulching within the canopy areas of larger trees (Figure 23) can not only improve long-term tree health but can also act to reduce tree risk by decreasing the number of targets that pass and/or congregate under their canopies. This in turn will minimise the likelihood of injury in the event of a branch failure.
- When using wood chip mulch, ensure that if it has been made from live plant material that is stored and allowed to compost for between 3 and 6 months prior to use. Never apply fresh, 'green' mulch around trees as this can induce what is called the nitrogen drawdown, which can result in the removal of nitrogen from the soil resulting in plants with nutrient deficiencies.

For further information refer to the Australian Standard AS 4454–2012: *Composts, Soil Conditioners and Mulches*.




Figure 23. Mulching established and young trees (ArborSafe Australia, 2020).

3. Root and trunk damage

The function of tree roots is primarily to provide water and nutrient uptake for the tree, provide stability through structural roots that anchor it to the ground and as a means of food and nutrient storage. Damage to tree roots can lead to a reduction to any or all of these functions.

Damage to tree roots (Figure 24 and Figure 25) and the lower portion of a tree's trunk is a common and often unnecessary occurrence that can lead to the entry of decay fungi into a tree's structural framework. Once present, decay may develop in larger structural roots and/or the base of the trunk, which can result in a reduction in tree health and in severe cases even compromise stability.

Works such as trenching and excavation are often the cause of root damage to trees. Refer to ArborSafe's Guide – Tree protection during construction or the Australian Standard AS 4970–2009: *Protection of Trees on Development Sites* for things to consider when performing construction activities near trees.

Everyday activities such as grass cutting via mowing or brush cutters can result in serious root damage or wounding to the lower trunk. Young trees with their trunks damaged by machinery often need replacing, while damage to the trunks and/or surface roots of established trees is not only detrimental to tree health but can also result in costly repairs to machinery.

Another advantage to mulching around the trunk and root crown is that it limits damage to both parts from mowing equipment. This in turn reduces mechanical damage and compaction.



Figure 24. An example of damage to tree roots caused via mowing. (Luke Dawson, June 2017).



Figure 25. Image showing wound caused to upper portion of surface root by mower. (Luke Dawson, June 2017).

4. How to avoid root and trunk damage

The following points serve to highlight ways to avoid damage to tree roots and trunks caused via grass cutting activities:

- Mulching around young and established trees negates the need for brush cutter and/or lawn mower use around the base of a tree. Mulching therefore not only creates a barrier between tree roots and trunk that are susceptible to damage, it improves soil condition, minimises soil compaction and decreases the total area required for mowing.
- Where mulching is not feasible, raising the cutting height of mowers and maintaining grass at a greater height can avoid unnecessary 'scalping' of roots and damage to mowers/blades.
- Where surface roots are located away from the trunk and in a location where neither the application of mulch nor the raising of mower height is inappropriate, it may be possible to raise the soil grade directly around the root/s to minimise damage. It is important that the application of new material does not result in significant changes to the soil profile that may inadvertently damage roots. Material applied should be permeable and allow the development of turf which will protect the roots. Coarse sand or a planting mix with a high sand to organic matter ratio (e.g. 80/20 mix) spread at a depth of 75–100mm could suitably protect the surface root from damage, while allowing turf to redevelop within the area.
- ArborSafe is able to answer any questions regarding the material, depth and method of application to be used to ensure the tree/s remain viable for the long-term.

Appendix E. Tree Assessment Data

Tree no.	Zones	Botanical Name	Common Name	Origin	Trees in group	DBH Total (cm)	DRB (cm)	Radial TPZ (m)	TPZ area (m2)	Radial SRZ (m)	Tree Height (m)	Canopy (m)	Health	Structure	Age	TLE (Yrs.)	Defects	Significance	Arborist comments	Tree Quality Score	Tree Retention value subcategory	Recommendation
19	1	<i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i>	Red Ironbark	Endemic	1	20	28	2.4	18.10	1.9	6	<5	Good	Fair	Juvenile	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Soil compaction;	Amenity value/shade;		C	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
20	1	<i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i>	Red Ironbark	Endemic	1	20	28	2.4	18.10	1.9	6	<5	Good	Good	Juvenile	15-25	Soil compaction;	Amenity value/shade;		C	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
21	1	<i>Eucalyptus</i> sp.	Eucalypt	Native	1	20	28	2.4	18.10	1.9	5-10	<5	Good	Fair	Juvenile	15-25	Co-dominant stems;	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Species identification uncertain due to lack of access to reproductive tree parts. Possibly Apple Box (E. bridgesiana) surrounded by small, juvenile weed species Celtis, White Cedar (exempt species). Within proposed carpark footprint	C	3	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
26	2	<i>Eucalyptus melliodora</i>	Yellow Box	Endemic	1	100	120	12.0	452.39	3.6	15-20	15-20	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 30mm; Epicormic growth; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade; Attractive landscape feature; Significant due to age/size; Significant habitat - nests/hollows;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Minor pocket cavity synonymous with a decayed branch stubs, and considered non-structural, observed within the main branching structure. 7m from adjacent building. Within proposed carpark footprint.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
27	2	<i>Eucalyptus melliodora</i>	Yellow Box	Endemic	1	90	110	10.8	366.44	3.4	16	15-20	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 60mm; Epicormic growth; Previous failure(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade; Significant habitat - nests/hollows;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 4m from exiting road & carpark curb. Upper canopy consists of multiple stabilised stems from previous crown failure at 4m. Situated at the bottom of a slight level change in grassed area. Minimal TPZ encroachment on eastern aspect due to ramp construction.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
28	2	<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i>	Chinese Elm	Exotic	1	58	73	6.9	151.14	2.9	5-10	10-15	Fair	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 30mm; Dieback; Included bark;	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : The included co-dominant basal union appears inactive at this assessment (no cracking, canopy separation, sap exudation). Good epicormic response growth observed from previous drought related dieback. Tree situated at base of minor level change in grassed area. 7.5m from roadside carpark curb. Within proposed carpark footprint.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
29	2	<i>Schinus areira</i>	Peppercorn	Exotic	1	64	78	7.7	185.48	3.0	5-10	10-15	Good	Poor	Senescent	<5	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Decay; Epicormic growth; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Significant habitat - nests/hollows;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Significant trunk decay reduces ULE. Direct impact with proposed carpark.	U		Remove tree irrespective of future development.
30	2	<i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i>	Red Ironbark	Endemic	1	67	97	8.1	204.30	3.3	15-20	10-15	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Previous failure(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Tree previously lopped at 6m with upper canopy consisting of (semi) stabilised regrowth. Previous stem failures have occurred. 10m from nth building. 12m from nth wst cnr of sth building. Minimal TPZ encroachment (Calculated at 6% - 6.5m from edge of carpark)	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
31	2	<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>	Chinese Pistachio	Exotic	1	44	49	5.3	87.58	2.5	6	5-10	Good	Good	Semi-Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Undesirable species;	Screen value; Weed species;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 2m from roadside carpark curb. Major TPZ.	C	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
32	2	<i>Callistemon salignus</i>	Willow Bottlebrush	Native	1	37	65	4.4	60.67	2.8	6	6	Good	Poor	Mature	5-10	Co-dominant stems; Included bark; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Tree presents with multiple included unions limiting ULE. Multiple Young Crepe myrtle and Celtis sp. growing around base of trees 31 & 32. Care required when constructing above ground concrete pedestrian footpath within TPZ.	C	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
33	3	<i>Eucalyptus viminalis</i> ssp. <i>viminalis</i>	Manna Gum	Endemic	1	77	110	9.2	268.22	3.4	10-15	5-10	Fair	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 60mm; Dieback; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : The tree is in a reduced state of health with canopy density at 70%, consisting largely of epicormic growth. Decline attributed to previous drought stress. Repeatedly pruned off powerline clearance on Western aspect. 8m from laneway curb.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
34	3	<i>Grevillea robusta</i>	Silky Oak	Native	1	54	67	6.5	131.92	2.8	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	10-15	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 60mm; Decay; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Tree previously lopped at 3m with upper canopy consisting of (sem) stabilised regrowth. Multiple previous branch failure points observed. 3m from laneway curb.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
35	3	<i>Grevillea robusta</i>	Silky Oak	Native	1	45	63	5.4	91.61	2.7	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	10-15	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 60mm; Decay; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Tree previously lopped at 3m with upper canopy consisting of (sem) stabilised regrowth. Multiple previous branch failure points observed. 3m from laneway curb.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
36	3	<i>Grevillea robusta</i>	Silky Oak	Native	1	46	62	5.5	95.73	2.7	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	10-15	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 30mm; Decay; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Tree previously lopped at 3m with upper canopy consisting of (sem) stabilised regrowth. Multiple previous branch failure points observed. 3m from laneway curb.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
37	3	<i>Cupressus</i> sp.	Cypress	Exotic	1	53	57	6.4	127.08	2.6	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Mechanical damage; Previous failure(s); Wound(s);		28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 2.5m from laneway curb.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
38	3	<i>Melaleuca bracteata</i>	Black Tea Tree	Native	1	43	48	5.2	83.65	2.4	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 6m from laneway curb.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
39	3	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>	Date Palm	Exotic	1	53	60	6.4	127.08	2.7	<5	<5	Good	Good	Semi-Mature	>50		Amenity value/shade; Unique location;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Palm planted in 4 x 5m garden bed in the centre of the laneway. Transplantable if required.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
40	3	<i>Eucalyptus melliodora</i>	Yellow Box	Endemic	1	120	135	14.4	651.44	3.8	15-20	10-15	Fair	Fair	Mature	15-25	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 30mm; Decay; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Previous failure(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade; Significant habitat - nests/hollows;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Tree previously lopped at 9m with upper canopy consisting of (semi) stabilised regrowth. Minor pocket cavity synonymous with a decayed branch stub, and considered non-structural, observed within the main stem at 7m. 1m from laneway curb. Minor TPZ encroachment due to single carpark extension on western aspect.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
41	3	<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>	Callery Pear	Exotic	1	38	43	4.6	65.33	2.3	5	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems;	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 6.5m from laneway curb.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
42	3	<i>Grevillea robusta</i>	Silky Oak	Native	1	43	57	5.2	83.65	2.6	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	10-15	Cavity(s); Co-dominant stems; Deadwood/stubs > 60mm; Decay; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Tree previously lopped at 3m with upper canopy consisting of (sem) stabilised regrowth. Multiple previous branch failure points observed. 2m from laneway curb. Within proposed carpark footprint.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
43	4	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>	Date Palm	Exotic	1	52	0	6.2	122.33		6	<5	Good	Good	Mature	>50		Amenity value/shade; Avenue tree;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Transplantable if required.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
44	4	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>	Date Palm	Exotic	1	52	0	6.2	122.33		6	<5	Good	Good	Mature	>50		Amenity value/shade; Avenue tree;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Transplantable if required.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
45	4	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>	Date Palm	Exotic	1	52	0	6.2	122.33		6	<5	Good	Good	Mature	>50		Amenity value/shade; Avenue tree;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Transplantable if required. Within proposed carpark footprint.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
46	4	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>	Date Palm	Exotic	1	52	0	6.2	122.33		5-10	<5	Good	Good	Mature	>50		Amenity value/shade; Avenue tree;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Transplantable if required. Within proposed new carpark garden bed. Arborist supervision.	B	2	Retain tree with specific protection requirements (i.e. Generic measures plus supervision of works within the TPZ and/or use of root sensitive construction techniques).
47	4	<i>Brachychiton populneus</i>	Kurrajong	Native	1	43	53	5.2	83.65	2.5	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems;	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 3m from existing carpark curb. Major TPZ encroachment from proposed driveway.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.

Tree no.	Zones	Botanical Name	Common Name	Origin	Trees in group	DBH Total (cm)	DRB (cm)	Radial TPZ (m)	TPZ area (m2)	Radial SRZ (m)	Tree Height (m)	Canopy (m)	Health	Structure	Age	TLE (Yrs.)	Defects	Significance	Arborist comments	Tree Quality Score	Tree Retention value subcategory	Recommendation
48	4	Ulmus parvifolia	Chinese Elm	Exotic	1	48	76	5.8	103.91	2.9	5-10	10-15	Good	Fair	Semi-Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 1/2m from existing nth carpark curb & 5m from eastern carpark.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
49	4	Cedrus deodara	Himalayan Cedar	Exotic	1	24	32	2.9	26.06	2.1	5-10	<5	Good	Good	Semi-Mature	25-50		Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 3m from existing nth carpark curb & 9m from eastern carpark curb.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
50	4	Celtis sinensis	Chinese Hackberry	Exotic	1	20	25	2.4	18.10	1.8	5-10	<5	Good	Poor	Juvenile	5-10	Co-dominant stems; Included bark; Suppressed; Undesirable species;	Weed species;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Self sown weed species growing within a clump of Oleander.	U		Remove tree irrespective of future development.
51	4	Ceratonia siliqua	Carob Bean	Exotic	1	49	62	5.9	108.26	2.7	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Epicormic growth; Included bark; Poor pruning; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : The included union at ground & 2m appear inactive at this assessment (no cracking, canopy separation, sap exudation). Previously pruned for powerline clearance. 1m from existing nth carpark curb. TPZ encroachment of 12%. Arborist supervion when working within TPZ.	B	2	Retain tree with specific protection requirements (i.e. Generic measures plus supervision of works within the TPZ and/or use of root sensitive construction techniques).
52	4	Schinus areira	Peppercorn	Exotic	1	110	130	13.2	547.39	3.7	5-10	5-10	Fair	Poor	Senescent	<5	Cavity(s); Decay; Epicormic growth; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade; Significant habitat - nests/hollows;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Significant trunk decay limits ULE. Previously lopped at 4m for powerline clearance. Major TPZ encroachment as well as unstable structure unsuited to occupancy changes.	C	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
53	4	Callistemon citrinus	Crimson Bottlebrush	Native	1	30	35	3.6	40.72	2.1	5-10	<5	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Included bark; Suppressed;	Amenity value/shade; Within group;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Compressed canopy shape due to close proximity to adjacent trees.	C	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
54	4	Callistemon citrinus	Crimson Bottlebrush	Native	1	25	28	3.0	28.27	1.9	5-10	<5	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Included bark; Suppressed;	Amenity value/shade; Within group;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Compressed canopy shape due to close proximity to adjacent trees. 7m from cnr of existing carpark curb.	C	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
55	4	Ulmus parvifolia	Chinese Elm	Exotic	1	37	47	4.4	61.93	2.4	10-15	5-10	Good	Good	Semi-Mature	25-50	Co-dominant stems; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade; Within group;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 9m from existing cnr carpark curb. Further detailed design required.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
56	4	Grevillea robusta	Silky Oak	Native	1	48	60	5.8	104.23	2.7	10-15	5-10	Good	Fair	Mature	15-25	Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Previously pruned for powerline clearance.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
57	4	Acacia salicina	Willow Wattle	Endemic	1	26	32	3.1	30.58	2.1	5-10	5-10	Fair	Poor	Senescent	<5	Dieback; Suppressed;	Within group;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Asymmetrical crown shape due to suppression from neighbouring tree.	C	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
58	4	Callistemon citrinus	Crimson Bottlebrush	Native	2	25	30	3.0	28.27	2.0	6	<5	Good	Fair	Mature	10-15	Co-dominant stems; Included bark; Suppressed;	Amenity value/shade; Within group;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Asymmetrical crown shape due to suppression from neighbouring tree.	C	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
59	4	Phoenix dactylifera	Date Palm	Exotic	1	52	0	6.2	122.33		6	<5	Good	Good	Mature	>50		Amenity value/shade; Avenue tree;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Transplantable if required.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
60	4	Phoenix dactylifera	Date Palm	Exotic	1	52	0	6.2	122.33		5-10	<5	Good	Good	Mature	>50		Amenity value/shade; Avenue tree;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Transplantable if required. Within proposed carpark footprint.	B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
61	4	Phoenix dactylifera	Date Palm	Exotic	1	52	0	6.2	122.33		6	<5	Good	Good	Mature	>50		Unique location; Amenity value/shade; Avenue tree;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Transplantable if required. Situated within carpark.	B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
62	4	Eucalyptus melliodora	Yellow Box	Endemic	1	87	98	10.4	342.41	3.3	16	15-20	Good	Fair	Mature	25-50	Co-dominant stems; Epicormic growth; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : 4m from roadside curb. Further detailed design required. 13% TPZ encroachment. Arborist supervision, Machinery stand off.	A	2	Retain tree with specific protection requirements (i.e. Generic measures plus supervision of works within the TPZ and/or use of root sensitive construction techniques).
63	4	Jacaranda mimosifolia	Jacaranda	Exotic	1	33	38	4.0	50.17	2.2	6	5-10	Good	Fair	Semi-Mature	25-50	Co-dominant stems;	Amenity value/shade;		B	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
64	4	Eucalyptus sideroxylon	Red Ironbark	Endemic	1	51	62	6.1	117.67	2.7	10-15	5-10	Fair	Fair	Mature	15-25	Deadwood/stubs > 30mm; Dieback; Epicormic growth; Previous failure(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Good epicormic response growth observed following drought dieback. Further detailed design required. Arborist supervision, Machinery stand off.	B	2	Retain tree with specific protection requirements (i.e. Generic measures plus supervision of works within the TPZ and/or use of root sensitive construction techniques).
65	4	Lagunaria patersonii	Norfolk Island Hibiscus	Native	1	35	44	4.2	55.42	2.3	5-10	<5	Good	Fair	Mature	10-15	Co-dominant stems;	Amenity value/shade;		C	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
66	5	Jacaranda mimosifolia	Jacaranda	Exotic	1	35	40	4.2	54.65	2.3	6	5-10	Good	Fair	Semi-Mature	25-50	Co-dominant stems;	Amenity value/shade;		C	2	Remove - tree located within proposed development footprint or has major encroachment into its TPZ.
67	4	Eucalyptus sideroxylon	Red Ironbark	Endemic	1	100	120	12.0	452.39	3.6	5-10	15-20	Fair	Fair	Senescent	10-15	Epicormic growth; Parasitic plant/mistletoe; Poor pruning; Previous failure(s); Weak union(s); Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade; Significant due to age/size;	28-10-2022 : Andy Clark : Elevated RV due to age, size & species. Upper canopy has previously been reduced. 15% TPZ encroachment. Arborist supervision, Machinery stand off.	B	2	Retain tree with specific protection requirements (i.e. Generic measures plus supervision of works within the TPZ and/or use of root sensitive construction techniques).
68	4	Grevillea robusta	Silky Oak	Native	1	42	48	5.0	79.80	2.4	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Semi-Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Decay; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;		B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).
69	4	Grevillea robusta	Silky Oak	Native	1	38	45	4.6	65.33	2.4	5-10	5-10	Good	Fair	Semi-Mature	15-25	Co-dominant stems; Epicormic growth; Poor pruning; Wound(s);	Amenity value/shade;		B	2	Retain tree with generic protection requirements (i.e. protective fencing and restriction of activities within the TPZ).



For further information
Telephone 1300 272 671
www.arborsafe.com.au

CIVICA