



Naturally Trees

'Expert Arboricultural planning, advice and care since 1998'

Arborist Reports, Landscape Design, Flora and Fauna Surveys,
Biodiversity and Ecological Impact Assessments &
Bushfire Protection Assessment Services

Naturally Trees
PO Box 5085
Elanora Heights
NSW 2101, Australia
Phone: 0417250420
info@naturallytrees.com.au
www.naturallytrees.com.au
ABN: 58 359 914 843

4 June 2021

Frenchmans Lodge Properties Pty Ltd
C/- Centurion Project Management Pty Ltd
Level 25, 88 Phillip Street
Sydney NSW 2000

To whom it may concern,

**RANDWICK COUNCIL RFI COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE DA APPLICATION
DA/642/2020
11, 15, 17 and 19 Frenchmans Road, Randwick NSW**

Comments from Landscape Officer:

- Council is concerned with the impact of the new footprint on the 22m x 20m **Lemon Scented Gum (T7)** near the southwest site corner, as while the setback from the front boundary has been increased from 4530mm – 7405mm & 3350mm – 5855mm in this part of the site respectively (when compared to what was shown on the Pre Lodgement Plans), the tree is actually offset 2.5m from the front boundary, as well as at a corner/bend, which narrows this part of the site even further, so even at these new setbacks, it is considered that the works could still be within only 2-3m of the tree.*
- This uncertainty arises from the fact that the location of its trunk and crown have not even been shown on the architectural plans at all, which means that an accurate assessment is not possible, and needs to be rectified. Distances in millimetres between the tree and all new works also need to be provided as confirmation.*

Arborist Response:

The tree in question is now shown on the revised Architectural plans. The landscape structures (decking and stairs) are proposed to be lightweight timber structures on pier structures to be built in accordance with the arborist report recommendations. Refer (Section 3 and 4 & Appendix 6) of the submitted Arborists Report for clarification.



Comments from Landscape Officer:

- *The Arborist states that "proposed landscape structures will be suspended on small piers" in this area. If this is being relied upon to minimise impacts, and is critical for the survival of the tree, then Council would need construction/engineering details/notations of what this will look like and how it will be delivered on-site;*

Arborist Response:

These elements of works are dealt with in (Section 3 and 4 & Appendix 6) of the submitted Arborists Report. We recommend that DA condition be included that arborist approved processes and structural methodology be approved by the Arborist prior to CC.

Comments from Landscape Officer:

- *Similarly, there's a row of neighbouring trees on adjoining private sites, being **T10-14** at 9 Frenchmans Road, **T15-17** at 8 Astolat St & **T20** at 27 McLennan Ave, all against the common boundary. The survey shows only a timber paling fence adjacent **T10-17**; however, the Ground Floor Stormwater Plan, dwg 19826, rev 03, dated 28/08/20, shows excavations for a new retaining wall and drainage infrastructure will be performed right up onto these common boundaries, against their trunks, which does not seem to have been assessed at all? Council requires a description of how the applicant intends to proceed with these works without affecting these trees;*

Arborist Response:

The retaining wall on Civil drawing C100 adjacent T20 has been amended to reflect the fact that the Architectural DA documented boundary planter is at the same RL as the adjacent property (20 McClelland). The Architectural plan shows the landscape pathway to the south of the 20 McClelland boundary (adjacent the boundary planter) as slightly elevated on an implied pier system to deal with the proposed Ground Floor RL being higher than the adjacent property rear RL (at the T20 trunk RL).

Consequently, there will be no retaining wall protruding excessively into the root zone. Currently the existing condition at the rear to and adjacent of 20 McClelland is a concrete slab, brick wall and strip footings at the boundary to T20, suggesting that ingress of T20 roots to this part of the site is likely minimal if at all present. Refer to Civil drawings 250 and 251 to confirm the hardstand areas (& C100 to highlight the adjacent property RLs etc).

The T10-T14 & T15-T19 fence lines may be erected as pier type fences, be it timber paling or similar. The proposed boundary RLs at the fence lines generally follow the adjacent property RLs. The Civil drawing documents show an on-ground swale for directing overland flows of water. It does not show an inground drainage lines along these tree locations.



Comments from Landscape Officer:

- *There is already a brick wall and concrete surfacing and below ground services on the common boundary and within the subject site, adjacent **T20**, with the Arborist calculating that the new works will result in a 20% incursion of its TPZ, which is major, and normally not sustainable. While it is assumed that these existing structures may have inhibited root growth into this site to some degree, this cannot be quantified unless root mapping is undertaken. If major roots are in fact in the area of the new works they could not simply be severed and the tree expected to survive. As it's located on another site, Council must ensure it will not be adversely affected in anyway, prior to granting consent.*

Arborist Response:

Root mapping is not possible without extensive demolition works to what we understand is a critical service area of an existing operating residential aged care facility. This is not practicable. We would recommend extensive root mapping and arborist supervision of works in this zone to ensure significant roots that may be present, are protected. Refer (Section 3 and 4 & Appendix 6) of the submitted Arborists Report for clarification.

I trust this provides adequate clarification of the matters raised in relation to the application. Should you require further clarification, please contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely



Andrew Scales
Dip. Horticulture
Dip. Arboriculture AQF5

