



# Arboricultural Impact Assessment For Proposed development at 310 Terrigal Drive Terrigal NSW

---

Prepared for  
LoftusLane Capital

By  
Michael Shaw  
Diploma Horticulture (Arboriculture) AQF5

01 June 2023

# Contents

1. Brief .....	3
2. Scope .....	3
3. The proposed development .....	3
4. Site description .....	4
5. Main documents utilised .....	5
6. Methodology .....	5
6.1. All tree assessments were carried out utilising the following methods .....	5
6.2. Measurements and observations were taken using .....	5
6.3. Data collection and encroachment calculation .....	6
7. Trees potentially affected by the proposed development .....	7
8. General Tree Protection Instructions .....	12
9. Tree protection zone information .....	13
9.1. Activities prohibited within the Tree Protection Zone .....	14
References .....	14
Qualifications and experience (Michael Shaw) .....	15
Appendix 1 Tree AZ .....	16
Appendix 2 Landscape significance and tree retention determination .....	17
Appendix 3 Tree survey data table .....	18
Appendix 4 Images (Tree protection plan / Google Earth image with plans and tree locations overlaid) .....	24

## 1. Brief

- 1.1. I am requested by Mr Pushkar Thakur from LoftusLane Capital to identify and assess all trees at or near 310 Terrigal Drive Terrigal that will be potentially affected by the proposed development, and to provide an arboricultural impact assessment which discusses relevant aspects of the proposed development's impact on existing trees.

## 2. Scope

- 2.1. This report focuses on trees within and close to the subject site that may be affected by the proposed development.

All trees were assessed visually from ground level in accordance with Mattheck and Breloer's Visual Tree Assessment methodology.

No excavation or invasive testing was conducted as a part of the visual tree assessment.

## 3. The proposed development

- 3.1. The proposed development is for the construction of a multi storey, residential complex with associated infrastructure and landscaping.

The proposed development is located within the suburb of Terrigal in the Central Coast local government area.

Several existing trees at or near the site will be affected if the proposed development occurs as planned.

This report has been prepared on behalf of LoftusLane Capital Partners (the applicant), in support of a Planning Proposal relating to land identified as 310 Terrigal Drive, Terrigal, which is legally described as Lot 27 in DP 1223375 (the site). The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Central Coast LEP 2022 by increasing the maximum permissible height of buildings to 32m, and the maximum floor space ratio to 1.4:1. The Planning Proposal will enable the site to be redeveloped from a vacant land parcel to an eight-storey residential flat building, with a café activating the corner of Charles Kay Drive and Terrigal Drive at the ground level. The concept drawings prepared by CKDS Architects demonstrate the potential for the site to accommodate 42 residential apartments and 75 car parking spaces across three basement levels.

## 4. Site description

- 4.1. The subject site (310 Terrigal Drive Terrigal) is a vacant, mostly cleared and generally flat land parcel which is bounded to the north and west by busy, multi laned roads.

Trees at the site are located mainly on the western, southern and eastern periphery of the subject property and on Council's nature strip outside the western boundary of the property and existing vegetation consists mainly of mature native trees, with introduced young, to mature, self-sown camphor laurels dispersed throughout.

The subject property is located in a designated 10/50 vegetation entitlement clearing area. However, the online tool has identified that the land parcel may exclude or otherwise restrict clearing under the 10/50 Code.

Below is the extract taken directly from the online tool.

*"The parcel of land you have selected is located in a designated 10/50 vegetation entitlement clearing area. However, you cannot use the 10/50 exemption to clear vegetation on this parcel of land. This land is excluded from the operation of the 10/50 Code as it has been identified as being wholly or partially within: Records of Critically Endangered Plants as mapped and provided by the Office of Environment and Heritage"*

## Site visit details

- 4.2. One unaccompanied site visit was made by the author on 16 May 2023 for the purposes of data collection and tree assessment for this document.

During this visit, tree location and other data was collected and assessments undertaken for the subject trees in relation to the proposed development.

The weather at the time of the site visit was fine and the effect of wind was negligible.

Site location (Google maps)



## 5. Main documents utilised

The following documents were provided for the author's information by Mr Thakur

- Preliminary design drawings (12 sheets), by CKDS Architecture, dated April 2023
- Site survey by Bannister and Hunter, dated 11 April 2022

At the time of writing, hydraulic, drainage or other underground infrastructure design plans have not been provided and have therefore not been considered in this assessment.

The effect that these design aspects will have on existing trees must be accurately considered and quantified when designs have been developed.

Other documents and information may have been provided, however the main ones used to assist the author with this assessment are listed above.

These documents were provided to the author in electronic format via email.

## 6. Methodology

### 6.1. All tree assessments were carried out utilising the following methods

- Visual Tree Assessment Method (VTA) (Mattheck and Breloer,)
- Tree AZ (Barrell)
- Significance and retention value were assessed using STARS (IACA 2010)
- No aerial inspections, root excavations or soil sampling were conducted as part of this assessment
- Tree identification was based on visual inspection of features available at the time of inspection. A complete taxonomical process of identification was not conducted; therefore, the identification of trees in this document represents the probable identity of the species.

### 6.2. Measurements and observations were taken using

- Positioning and data recording conducted using a GPS PDA device.
- Binoculars and naked eye
- DBH (Diameter at Breast Height) was measured with a diameter tape or estimated at approx. 1.4 metres above existing levels
- Tree height and canopy spread was estimated or measured using a laser range finder and an inclinometer and/or based on surveyor's estimates

### 6.3. Data collection and encroachment calculation

All assessed and recorded trees have been identified with a number which corresponds with the number on the tree survey data table at Appendix 3 and its location at the subject site may be viewed on the aerial image at Appendix 4 Images.

The author attempted to locate the trees as accurately as possible by using Google Earth in conjunction with plan drawings and provided professional survey images, which were overlaid using the tools available in the Google Earth application. These images were placed manually, as accurately as possible and cross referenced with the location point data collected by the author and displayed on the Google Earth interface screen.

Measurements to the nearest TPZ/SRZ disturbance was measured using tools available in the Google Earth application and encroachment percentages were calculated using the "Proofdocs" TPZ Incursion Calculator which is available online.

## 7. Trees potentially affected by the proposed development

### Discussion

#### 7.1. Tree 1

Is a mature mountain blue gum which is located at the western boundary of the subject property.

This tree is in very close proximity to where the vehicular access ramps are proposed to be located and removal will be necessary due to a major and unsustainable tree protection zone (TPZ) encroachment which includes a structural root zone (SRZ) encroachment.

The health, vigour and structural integrity of this tree will be adversely affected and removal is necessary if the development proceeds as planned.

#### 7.2. Tree 2

Is a mature mountain blue gum which is located just outside the western boundary of the subject property and on Council land adjacent to Charles Kay Drive.

Minimal activity or works are planned to occur within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) radius of this tree and hence, no adverse effects are expected if adequately protected.

This tree may be protected and retained if protected by a tree protection zone (TPZ) which complies with Section 4 of AS4970-2009.

A physically fenced (1.8m high temporary cyclone fencing) tree protection zone (TPZ) shall be established before any works commence and shall remain in place until completion of the project.

The dimensions of the TPZ shall be to the dimensions specified at Appendix 3; Tree Survey Data Table and placement shall be as indicated at Appendix 4 Images.

Ground protection to protect the soil within the TPZ may be utilised as an alternative to erecting a fenced exclusion zone if the practicalities of the development process necessitates it.

Any works or activity proposed to occur within the TPZ other than works evident on the plans are to be conducted sensitively and in consultation with, or under direct supervision by an AQF5 consulting arborist.

No activity as specified at Section 10 of the report is to occur within the TPZ without written approval by an AQF5 arborist.

### 7.3. **Trees 3, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 13**

Are trees located on the subject property, as detailed at Appendix 3 Tree survey data table.

These trees are all located directly within, or in very close proximity proposed built features shown in the design.

It will be necessary to remove all of these trees if the development proceeds as currently planned, due to unsustainable and direct conflict with proposed features of the design.

### 7.4. **Tree 4**

Is a mature mountain blue gum which is located at the western boundary of the subject property.

This tree will experience a significant tree protection zone (TPZ) encroachment of 20% from soil disturbance and level changes necessary for the installation of the proposed new driveway access and ramp structures.

The health and vigour of this tree is very likely to be adversely affected if the development proceeds as planned.

If the proposed excavation and soil disturbance in the TPZ is reduced to about 10% or less of the TPZ area, this tree may be protected and retained without being adversely affected.

If the development proceeds as is currently planned, this tree is likely to be adversely affected and may die, however, the structural root zone is not affected by any obvious features of the proposed design and it will not be structurally compromised.



### 7.5. **Trees 5, 6 and 8**

Are semi mature, to mature camphor laurels which are all located near the western boundary of the subject property.

This species is exempt from protection in the Central Coast local government area and all may be retained or removed at the discretion of the property owner.

These trees are all located directly within the proposed vehicular access driveway and ramp structures and it will be necessary to remove all three trees if the development proceeds as planned due to unavoidable direct conflict with proposed features.

### 7.6. **Tree 12**

Is a mature mountain blue gum which is located just outside the western boundary of the subject property and on Council land adjacent to Charles Kay Drive.

This tree will experience a major and unsustainable tree protection zone (TPZ) encroachment of 39% from soil disturbance and level changes necessary for the installation of the proposed new driveway access and ramp structures.

The health and vigour of this tree is very likely to be adversely affected if the development proceeds as planned.

If the proposed excavation and soil disturbance in the TPZ is reduced to about 10% or less of the TPZ area, this tree may be protected and retained without being adversely affected.

If the development proceeds as is currently planned, this tree is likely to be adversely affected and may die, however, the structural root zone is not affected by any obvious features of the proposed design and it will not be structurally compromised.

### 7.7. Tree 14

Is a young swamp mahogany which is located just outside the western boundary of the subject property and on Council land adjacent to Charles Kay Drive.

This tree will experience a major and unsustainable tree protection zone (TPZ) encroachment of over 25% from soil disturbance and level changes necessary for the installation of the proposed new driveway access and vehicle access crossover (VAC) from Charles Kay Drive.

The encroachment includes the structural root zone (SRZ).

The health, vigour and potentially the structural integrity of this tree is very likely to be adversely affected if the development proceeds as planned.

If the proposed excavation and soil disturbance in the TPZ is reduced to about 10% or less of the TPZ area, this tree may be protected and retained without being adversely affected.

If the development proceeds as is currently planned, this tree is likely to be adversely affected and may die.

Potentially, the structural integrity of the tree may be compromised also and it will be necessary to remove this tree if the development proceeds as planned.

### 7.8. Tree 15

Is a mature mountain blue gum which is located near the western boundary of the subject property.

This tree will experience an unsustainable tree protection zone (TPZ) encroachment of 19% from soil disturbance necessary for the installation of the proposed new driveway access from Charles Kay Drive.

The health and vigour of this tree is very likely to be adversely affected if the development proceeds as planned.

If the proposed excavation and soil disturbance in the TPZ is reduced to about 10% or less of the TPZ area, this tree may be protected and retained without being adversely affected.

If the development proceeds as is currently planned, this tree is likely to be adversely affected and may die, however, the structural root zone is not affected by any obvious features of the proposed design and it will not be structurally compromised.

### 7.9. Tree 16

Is a mature camphor laurel which is located at the western boundary of the subject property.

This species is exempt from protection in the Central Coast local government area and all may be retained or removed at the discretion of the property owner.

This tree will experience an unsustainable tree protection zone (TPZ) encroachment of 18% from soil disturbance necessary for the installation of the proposed new driveway access from Charles Kay Drive.

The health and vigour of this tree is very likely to be adversely affected if the development proceeds as planned.

If the proposed excavation and soil disturbance in the TPZ is reduced to about 10% or less of the TPZ area, this tree may be protected and retained without being adversely affected.

If the development proceeds as is currently planned, this tree is likely to be adversely affected and may die, however, the structural root zone is not affected by any obvious features of the proposed design and it will not be structurally compromised.

All other trees not listed specifically in Section 7 will not be affected by the proposed development if protected in accordance with AS4970-2009.

## 8. General Tree Protection Instructions

All other trees not listed specifically here will not be affected by the proposed development if protected in accordance with AS4970-2009.

Basic tree protection measures have been recommended in this document however, more comprehensive and detailed tree protection specifications may be mandated by the consenting authority in the form of a tree protection management plan which is to be provided by an AQF5 arborist in cooperation with the project manager.

All tree protection measures must be installed before any phase of development related activity occurs (including demolition).

Tree protection measures must be assessed and certified in writing by an AQF5 consulting arborist with a sufficient time allowance to make physical adjustments to protection measures in order to ensure efficacy of tree protection before any works commence.

Any soil disturbance in the form of trenching or fill placement or tunnelling for the installation of infrastructure including but not limited to pipes for communications, electrical, drainage, water or sewer must be considered in relation to retained trees and advice shall be sought from an AQF5 consulting arborist if any infrastructure as described above is proposed to be installed within the TPZ radius for any tree to be retained.

Ground protection to protect the soil within the TPZ may be utilised as an alternative to erecting a fenced exclusion zone if the practicalities of the development process necessitates it.

If ground protection is used as an alternative to protective fencing, the ground surface within the TPZ is to be protected in accordance with Section 4.5.3 of AS4970 and a thick (200-300mm) layer of wood chip mulch is to be placed on the ground within the TPZ and load spreading plates, rumble boards or heavy timber planking is to be placed on top of the mulch and strapped together to prevent movement so as to spread the load and to prevent compaction of the soil.

The level of soil protection and materials to be used within the TPZ will vary depending on the plant proposed to be utilised and specific protection measures will need to be discussed and agreed upon in writing by the project manager and an AQF5 qualified arborist before works commence.

## 9. Tree protection zone information

- TPZ- (Tree protection zone) the tree protection zone (TPZ) is the principal means of protecting trees on development sites. The TPZ is a combination of the root area and crown area requiring protection. It is an area isolated from construction disturbance, so that the tree remains viable.
- SRZ- (Structural root zone) The SRZ is the area required for tree stability. A larger area is required to maintain a viable tree.
- Any trees recorded within the scope of this assessment that are to be retained shall be protected by a physical TPZ exclusion zone to the radius from the trunk calculated in accordance with section 4 of AS 4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites (Provided at Appendix 3) Tree survey data table) and in consultation with the project arborist.
- It is strongly recommended that a copy of this standard is obtained by the project manager as a reference before any work commences on site.
- Tree protection zones shall be established in accordance with Section 4 of AS 4970-2009 before commencement of any other demolition or construction work. This will include trunk, branch and ground protection if considered necessary by the project arborist and also placement of appropriate and compliant TPZ signage to the physical TPZ fence.
- The TPZ shall remain until the completion of all demolition and construction related activity.
- Any pruning and tree works recommended are to be conducted by a certificate 3 (minimum) qualified and experienced arborist and work is to be conducted according to AS4373: Pruning of Amenity Trees.
- Consent to prune trees may be required from the tree owners and Council.
- Establishment and erection of tree protection zone and signage should be inspected and certified by the project arborist to ensure compliance with the standard.
- Unless approved by the project arborist beforehand, no activity as detailed in section 4.2 of AS 4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites and Section 10 of this document is to occur within the TPZ.

## 9.1. Activities prohibited within the Tree Protection Zone

- Modification of existing soil levels
- Excavations and trenching
- Cultivation of the soil
- Mechanical removal of vegetation
- Soil disturbance
- Movement of natural rock
- Storage of materials, plant or equipment
- Erection of site sheds
- Affixing of signage or hoarding to the trees
- Preparation of building materials
- Disposal of waste materials and chemicals
- Lighting fires
- Refuelling
- Movement of pedestrian or vehicular traffic
- Temporary or permanent location of services, or the works required for their installation
- Any other activities that may cause damage to the tree.

## References

- NSW Rural Fire Service 10/50 Vegetation Clearing Code of Practice
- Central Coast Consolidated DCP 2022\_3.5 Tree and Vegetation Management
- Central Coast Council Undesirable Species List
- <https://maps.six.nsw.gov.au/>
- Standards Australia (2009) "AS4970: Protection of trees on development sites"
- Standards Australia (2007) "AS4373: Pruning of Amenity Trees"
- [http://www.treetec.net.au/TPZ\\_SRZ\\_DBH\\_calculator.php](http://www.treetec.net.au/TPZ_SRZ_DBH_calculator.php)
- [http://www.proofdocs.com/arborist\\_report\\_template/tpz\\_incursion\\_calculator/](http://www.proofdocs.com/arborist_report_template/tpz_incursion_calculator/)
- Mattheck, C., Breloer, H (1994) The Body Language of Trees- A handbook for failure analysis . HMSO, London.

## Qualifications and experience (Michael Shaw)

Practising AQF level 5 consulting arborist from 2009 - present

Senior Tree Risk Assessment Officer (Central Coast Council) Sep 2015- Dec 2017

Part time consultant contractor as a Tree Management Officer at Lane Cove, Strathfield and Hornsby Councils between 2013 - 2015

Tree Assessment and Vegetation Management Officer Port Stephens Council from September 2009 - Dec 2011

AQF level 5 Diploma of Horticulture (Arboriculture)

Licensed QTRA practitioner (quantitative tree risk assessment)

Licensed VALID Tree Risk assessment practitioner April 2021

ISA Tree risk assessment qualification (TRAQ) October 2013

ISA conference Canberra 2017

VTA (visual tree assessment) workshop March 2011 and March 2013

ISA 87th annual Conference delegate, Parramatta NSW July 2011.

Matheny & Clark "Arboriculture" Seminar. Melbourne November 2009

Specialising in arboriculture and tree assessment from Feb 2008

Certificate 3 Horticulture (Parks and gardens)

Working in horticultural industry from April 2004

## Appendix 1 Tree AZ

### Category Z: Unimportant trees not worthy of being a material constraint

Local policy exemptions: Trees that are unsuitable for legal protection for local policy reasons including size, proximity and species

Z1	Young or insignificant small trees, i.e. below the local size threshold for legal protection, etc
Z2	Too close to a building, i.e. exempt from legal protection because of proximity, etc
Z3	Species that cannot be protected for other reasons, i.e. scheduled noxious weeds, out of character in a setting of acknowledged importance, etc

High risk of death or failure: Trees that are likely to be removed within 10 years because of acute health issues or severe structural failure

Z4	Dead, dying, diseased or declining
Z5	Severe damage and/or structural defects where a high risk of failure cannot be satisfactorily reduced by reasonable remedial care, i.e. cavities, decay, included bark, wounds, excessive imbalance, overgrown and vulnerable to adverse weather conditions, etc
Z6	Instability, i.e. poor anchorage, increased exposure, etc

Excessive nuisance: Trees that are likely to be removed within 10 years because of unacceptable impact on people

Z7	Excessive, severe and intolerable inconvenience to the extent that a locally recognised court or tribunal would be likely to authorise removal, i.e. dominance, debris, interference, etc
Z8	Excessive, severe and intolerable damage to property to the extent that a locally recognised court or tribunal would be likely to authorise removal, i.e. severe structural damage to surfacing and buildings, etc

Good management: Trees that are likely to be removed within 10 years through responsible management of the tree population

Z9	Severe damage and/or structural defects where a high risk of failure can be temporarily reduced by reasonable remedial care, i.e. cavities, decay, included bark, wounds, excessive imbalance, vulnerable to adverse weather conditions, etc
Z10	Poor condition or location with a low potential for recovery or improvement, i.e. dominated by adjacent trees or buildings, poor architectural framework, etc
Z11	Removal would benefit better adjacent trees, i.e. relieve physical interference, suppression, etc
Z12	Unacceptably expensive to retain, i.e. severe defects requiring excessive levels of maintenance, etc

NOTE: Z trees with a high risk of death/failure (Z4, Z5 & Z6) or causing severe inconvenience (Z7 & Z8) at the time of assessment and need an urgent risk assessment can be designated as ZZ. ZZ trees are likely to be unsuitable for retention and at the bottom of the categorisation hierarchy. In contrast, although Z trees are not worthy of influencing new designs, urgent removal is not essential and they could be retained in the short term, if appropriate.

### A Category A: Important trees suitable for retention for more than 10 years and worthy of being a material constraint

A1	No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care
A2	Minor defects that could be addressed by remedial care and/or work to adjacent trees
A3	Special significance for historical, cultural, commemorative or rarity reasons that would warrant extraordinary efforts to retain for more than 10 years
A4	Trees that may be worthy of legal protection for ecological reasons (Advisory requiring specialist assessment)

NOTE: Category A1 trees that are already large and exceptional or have the potential to become so with minimal maintenance, can be designated as AA at the discretion of the assessor. Although all A and AA trees are sufficiently important to be material constraints, AA trees are at the top of the categorisation hierarchy and should be given the most weight in any selection process.



## Appendix 2 Landscape significance and tree retention determination

### Tree Significance - Assessment Criteria



#### 1. High Significance in landscape

- The tree is in good condition and good vigour;
- The tree has a form typical for the species;
- The tree is a remnant or is a planted locally indigenous specimen and/or is rare or uncommon in the local area or of botanical interest or of substantial age;
- The tree is listed as a Heritage Item, Threatened Species or part of an Endangered ecological community or listed on Councils significant Tree Register;
- The tree is visually prominent and visible from a considerable distance when viewed from most directions within the landscape due to its size and scale and makes a positive contribution to the local amenity;
- The tree supports social and cultural sentiments or spiritual associations, reflected by the broader population or community group or has commemorative values;
- The tree's growth is unrestricted by above and below ground influences, supporting its ability to reach dimensions typical for the taxa *in situ* - tree is appropriate to the site conditions.

#### 2. Medium Significance in landscape

- The tree is in fair-good condition and good or low vigour;
- The tree has form typical or atypical of the species;
- The tree is a planted locally indigenous or a common species with its taxa commonly planted in the local area
- The tree is visible from surrounding properties, although not visually prominent as partially obstructed by other vegetation or buildings when viewed from the street,
- The tree provides a fair contribution to the visual character and amenity of the local area,
- The tree's growth is moderately restricted by above or below ground influences, reducing its ability to reach dimensions typical for the taxa *in situ*.

#### 3. Low Significance in landscape

- The tree is in fair-poor condition and good or low vigour;
- The tree has form atypical of the species;
- The tree is not visible or is partly visible from surrounding properties as obstructed by other vegetation or buildings,
- The tree provides a minor contribution or has a negative impact on the visual character and amenity of the local area,
- The tree is a young specimen which may or may not have reached dimension to be protected by local Tree Preservation orders or similar protection mechanisms and can easily be replaced with a suitable specimen,
- The tree's growth is severely restricted by above or below ground influences, unlikely to reach dimensions typical for the taxa *in situ* - tree is inappropriate to the site conditions,
- The tree is listed as exempt under the provisions of the local Council Tree Preservation Order or similar protection mechanisms,
- The tree has a wound or defect that has potential to become structurally unsound.

##### Environmental Pest / Noxious Weed Species

- The tree is an Environmental Pest Species due to its invasiveness or poisonous/ allergenic properties,
- The tree is a declared noxious weed by legislation.

##### Hazardous/Irreversible Decline

- The tree is structurally unsound and/or unstable and is considered potentially dangerous,
- The tree is dead, or is in irreversible decline, or has the potential to fail or collapse in full or part in the immediate to short term.

**The tree is to have a minimum of three (3) criteria in a category to be classified in that group.**

Note: The assessment criteria are for individual trees only, however, can be applied to a monocultural stand in its entirety e.g. hedge.

Table 1.0 Tree Retention Value - Priority Matrix.

		Significance				
		1. High Significance in Landscape	2. Medium Significance in Landscape	Significance in Landscape	3. Low Environmental Pest / Noxious Weed Species	Hazardous / Irreversible Decline
Estimated Life Expectancy	1. Long >40 years					
	2. Medium 15-40 Years					
	3. Short <1-15 Years					
	Dead					
Legend for Matrix Assessment						
		<b>Priority for Retention (High)</b> - These trees are considered important for retention and should be retained and protected. Design modification or re-location of building/s should be considered to accommodate the setbacks as prescribed by the Australian Standard AS4970 <i>Protection of trees on development sites</i> . Tree sensitive construction measures must be implemented e.g. pier and beam etc if works are to proceed within the Tree Protection Zone.				
		<b>Consider for Retention (Medium)</b> - These trees may be retained and protected. These are considered less critical; however their retention should remain priority with removal considered only if adversely affecting the proposed building/works and all other alternatives have been considered and exhausted.				
		<b>Consider for Removal (Low)</b> - These trees are not considered important for retention, nor require special works or design modification to be implemented for their retention.				
		<b>Priority for Removal</b> - These trees are considered hazardous, or in irreversible decline, or weeds and should be removed irrespective of development.				

## Appendix 3 Tree survey data table

Significantly affected trees requiring removal or trees proposed for removal in red text

Tree ID	Botanical and common name	DBH cm / TPZ m / SRZ m	Height x radial canopy spread m	Age	Estimated life expectancy	Landscape significance (STARS)	Retention value (STARS)	Vigour and health (% of live canopy)	Tree AZ	Features/Comments
1	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	65cm _7.8m_2.8m	25x16	Mature	Long >40 years	High	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	In very close proximity to proposed construction envelope. Major and unsustainable TPZ encroachment. Removal necessary. Dead Eucalypt 3m NE of this tree
2	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	40cm_4.8m_2.4m	20x15	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Subordinate 20cm diameter leader at SW base. Not affected by obvious features shown in the preliminary design. Pruning of canopy is likely to be required to accommodate above ground features of the proposed structure.

Tree ID	Botanical and common name	DBH cm / TPZ m / SRZ m	Height x radial canopy spread m	Age	Estimated life expectancy	Landscape significance (STARS)	Retention value (STARS)	Vigour and health (% of live canopy)	Tree AZ	Features/Comments
3	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	40cm_4.8m_2.4m	20x10	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A2 Minor defects that could be addressed by remedial care and/or work to adjacent trees	Large diameter deadwood in upper canopy (previous leader). Directly within proposed construction envelope. Removal necessary.
4	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	40 20 20cm_6m_2.6m Measured above junction at 1.4m	17x12	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Unsustainable 20% TPZ encroachment from proposed nearby structure. Removal necessary.
5	<i>Cinnamomum camphora</i> (Camphor laurel)	40cm_4.8m_2.4m	10x10	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	"Z3 Species that cannot be protected for other reasons, i.e. scheduled noxious weeds, out of character in a setting of acknowledged importance, etc"	Undesirable species. Exempt. May be removed without consent. Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary.

Tree ID	Botanical and common name	DBH cm / TPZ m / SRZ m	Height x radial canopy spread m	Age	Estimated life expectancy	Landscape significance (STARS)	Retention value (STARS)	Vigour and health (% of live canopy)	Tree AZ	Features/Comments
6	<i>Cinnamomum camphora</i> (Camphor laurel)	35cm_4.2m_2.3m	10x10	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	"Z3 Species that cannot be protected for other reasons, i.e. scheduled noxious weeds, out of character in a setting of acknowledged importance, etc"	Undesirable species. Exempt. May be removed without consent. Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary. Dead Eucalypt 2m south of this tree.
7	<i>Casuarina glauca</i> (Swamp she oak)	40cm_4.8m_2.4m	10x8	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Bifurcated at 2m. Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary.
8	<i>Cinnamomum camphora</i> (Camphor laurel)	20 20cm_3.6m_2.1m	10x10	Young mature (mature but still young)	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	"Z3 Species that cannot be protected for other reasons, i.e. scheduled noxious weeds, out of character in a setting of acknowledged importance, etc"	Co dominant leaders from 1m. Undesirable species. Exempt. May be removed without consent. Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary. Dead 30cm DBH Eucalypt 1.5m south of this tree
9	<i>Eucalyptus saligna</i> (Sydney blue gum)	40cm_4.8m_2.4m	18x12	Young mature (mature but still young)	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary.



Tree ID	Botanical and common name	DBH cm / TPZ m / SRZ m	Height x radial canopy spread m	Age	Estimated life expectancy	Landscape significance (STARS)	Retention value (STARS)	Vigour and health (% of live canopy)	Tree AZ	Features/Comments
10	<i>Cinnamomum camphora</i> (Camphor laurel)	15 15 10 10cm_3m_2m	10x8	Young mature (mature but still young)	Long >40 years	Low	Medium	Good(80-100% live foliage)	"Z3 Species that cannot be protected for other reasons, i.e. scheduled noxious weeds, out of character in a setting of acknowledged importance, etc"	Multiple leaders from base. Undesirable species. Exempt. May be removed without consent. Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary.
11	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	40 35cm_6.6m_2.7m	25x10	Young mature (mature but still young)	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A2 Minor defects that could be addressed by remedial care and/or work to adjacent trees	Two trunks from 1.5m. Northernmost leader has been struck by lightning in the past and possesses a vertical wound along most of the leader from the top of the leader and is dead. Main leader appears healthy.  Several unrecorded and unsurveyed Camphor laurel saplings in the vicinity of this tree. Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary.

Tree ID	Botanical and common name	DBH cm / TPZ m / SRZ m	Height x radial canopy spread m	Age	Estimated life expectancy	Landscape significance (STARS)	Retention value (STARS)	Vigour and health (% of live canopy)	Tree AZ	Features/Comments
12	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	65cm _7.8m_2.8m	25x14	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Co dominant leaders from 1.5m. Major and unsustainable 39% TPZ encroachment from proposed nearby vehicular access infrastructure. Removal necessary.
13	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	70cm _8.4m_2.9m	25x16	Mature	Long >40 years	High	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Bifurcated at 2m. Directly within proposed construction footprint. Removal necessary.
14	<i>Eucalyptus robusta</i> (Swamp mahogany)	20cm_2.4m_2.0m	8x4	Semi mature (not quite mature)	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Street tree. Unsustainable TPZ encroachment from proposed nearby vehicular access works.
15	<i>Eucalyptus deani</i> (mountain blue gum)	60cm _7.2m_2.8m	25x12	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Bifurcated at 10m. Unsustainable 19% TPZ encroachment from proposed nearby vehicular access works.

Tree ID	Botanical and common name	DBH cm / TPZ m / SRZ m	Height x radial canopy spread m	Age	Estimated life expectancy	Landscape significance (STARS)	Retention value (STARS)	Vigour and health (% of live canopy)	Tree AZ	Features/Comments
16	<i>Cinnamomum camphora</i> (Camphor laurel)	Multiple leaders from below 1m. Estimated diameter at base_110cm_13.2m_3.5m	20x16	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	"Z3 Species that cannot be protected for other reasons, i.e. scheduled noxious weeds, out of character in a setting of acknowledged importance, etc"	Multiple leaders from 1m. Undesirable species. Exempt. May be removed without consent. Unsustainable 18% TPZ encroachment from proposed nearby vehicular access works.
17	<i>Eucalyptus pilularis</i> (Blackbutt)	60cm _7.2m_2.8m	25x16	Mature	Long >40 years	Medium	High	Good(80-100% live foliage)	A1 No significant defects and could be retained with minimal remedial care	Not affected by obvious features shown in the preliminary design.







This page intentionally left blank