

# **Memorandum**



To: May Li – Senior Town Planner

From: Kerry Heatley – Assistant Manager, Open Space,  
Peter Maish – Tree Assessment Officer

Date: 11/10/11

Subject: DA 76-82 Gordon Crescent Bushland Comments on Hycorp submission  
to JRPP

CC:

Ref No: DA11/79

---

I have reviewed Hycorp's submission to the JRPP the DA for 76-82 Gordon Crescent.

1. **Hycorp claim – 'No STIF on Site, Not an EEC'**

- The development will result in the loss of major trees, including 14 trees which are part of the Threatened Turpentine-Ironbark Vegetation Community: 6 Turpentine (*Syncarpia glomulifera*), 5 Smooth barked Apples (*Angophora costata*) and 3 Pittosporum undulatum. In addition 3 Sydney Peppermints (*Eucalyptus piperita*) will be removed.
- In 2009 Storm Consulting was employed to map the vegetation communities in major reserves of the Lane Cove Municipality. The section of Batten reserve immediately south of the proposed development site was classified as Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest, an Endangered Ecological Community (NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995).
- In 2009 the Sydney Metropolitan Catchment Management Authority mapped the section of Batten Reserve immediately south of the proposed development site (report in draft), they also classified the area as Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest.
- In 2003 National Parks and Wildlife NSW produced maps of the native vegetation of the Cumberland Plain, which included Batten Reserve and surrounds. The actual development site was classified as part of a Turpentine-Ironbark Margin Forest vegetation community.

- There is strong evidence, based on the mapping by Storm Consulting, The Sydney Metro CMA and National Parks and Wildlife to support that the vegetation community on the development site is part of an Endangered Ecological Community.
- The Department of Environment and Heritage: Final Determination for Sydney Turpentine/Ironbark – ‘The structure of the Community was originally forest, but may now exist as woodland or remnant trees’. Therefore, the remnant trees on the development site are part of the Endangered Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Ecological Community in the adjacent Reserve.

### **Wildlife Corridor**

- The loss of trees will not be temporary as claimed by Hycorp. The Landscape Plan shows that 3 Turpentine, 2 Sydney Red Gums and 2 Sydney Peppermints will be planted on the property; by contrast there are plans to remove 6 Turpentine, 5 Sydney Red Gums and 3 Sydney Peppermints for the development. It will be many years before any replacement trees on the property reach the size of the current native trees.
- Lane Cove Council's Wildlife Habitat Corridor Study (1995) recognises the importance of Batten Reserve as a wildlife corridor to Willoughby Municipality.
- Recent fauna studies have indicated the presence of the Threatened Powerful Owl and Grey-headed Flying-fox in the adjacent Batten Reserve. The fauna Survey by A. Lothian emphasises the importance of trees on the blocks to the north of Batten reserve, as they increase the functional size of the reserve and provide additional feeding and roosting sites.

### **2. Hycorp claim – ‘If EEC, NO significant impact’**

- Hycorp have submitted a 7 part test for assessing the significance of the Endangered Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest. The result of the test will need to be assessed by Council.
- Although the STIF vegetation community on the development site is small, it is part of the EEC on Batten Reserve. The Lane Cove Council area has only a few remnant STIF vegetation communities and it is important to protect the remaining communities.

### **3. Hycorp claim – ‘Current tree situation is an extremely dangerous safety hazard**

- Hycorp's comment that the trees are in serious danger of collapse without further warning is exaggerated.

### **4. Hycorp claim – Most trees within Asset Protection Zone**

- It is not necessary to remove native trees from the APZ for the purposes of bushfire protection - native trees can be retained in asset protection zones, providing that the NSW RFS guidelines are followed.

- The NSW Rural Fire Service document: *Standards for Asset Protection Zones* states that 'the removal of significant native species should be avoided' when creating asset protection zones.
- The RFS recommends the following method of tree pruning when creating an APZ (Refer to NSW RFS - *Standards for Asset Protection Zones*):
  - Prune or remove trees so that you do not have a continuous tree canopy leading from the hazard to the asset
  - Separate tree crowns by two to five metres. A canopy should not overhang within two to five metres of a dwelling.
  - Native trees and shrubs should be retained as clumps or islands and should maintain a covering of no more than 20% of the area.

## 5. **Remnant Trees**

- Hycorps information, including a 1965 photograph of the subject allotment does not correlate with the archival photographic information council staff has relied upon. Photographic evidence of the subject sites show the stand of trees to be growing on site from 1943 through to the present time. Examination of the photograph taken in 1965 show the existing homes and the stand of trees, particularly in front of house No.78.
- Hycorp's comments that the useful life expectancy of the trees on this site is over: this statement is exaggerated.