www.greentreeconsultancy.com.au
info@greentreeconsultancy.com.au
PO Box 762, Cronulla NSW 2230

Sutherland Shire Council

C/O – Andrew Whiteman | Aliro

Level 38, Gateway
1 Macquarie Place
Sydney NSW 2000

30th October 2024

Ref: Project Arborist RFI Response - DA23/0721 PAN-379298

Dear Sir/Madam,

This letter has been provided to detail Green Tree Consultancy's (GTC) response to the arboricultural aspects of the recent Request for Further Information (RFI) from Sutherland Shire Council (SSC) dated 3 May 2024.

The RFI relates to Development Application (DA) submission at 13 Endeavour Road Caringbah NSW 2229, reference number: DA23/0721.

GTC have been engaged by Aliro to act as the Project Arborist (PA) for the DA project and have been tasked with responding to the arboricultural aspects of the DA submission and associated RFI.

Documents utilised and referenced within this document have been detailed below in - *Table 1*:

Ref. No.	Document Title & Abbreviation	Author	Date
DA23/0721 PAN-379298	Request for Further Information (**RFI**)	SSC	3/5/2024
SLC – ALR	Arboricultural and Landscape Review (**ALR**)	Sydney Landscape Consultants (SLC)	18/6/2024
PTA	Preliminary Tree Assessment (PTA) report	GTC	2/7/2023
AIA-P107-V3.0	Arboricultural Impact Assessment (**AIA**)	GTC	25/10/2024
21366-005-Ver.D	Estate Masterplan (**EMP**)	Watson Young	18/10/2024
BDAR-Ver.3	Biodiversity Assessment report (**BDAR**)	écologique	17/10/2024
VMP-Ver.4	Vegetation Management Plan (**VMP**)	écologique	17/10/2024
LCP-Ver.0	Landscape Concept Plan (**LCP**)	Habit8	18/10/2024

Table 1 - Document Schedule

1. RFI Response Schedule

Table 2 - below details the RFI item(s) as listed in Councils RFI response letter dated 3/5/2024.

The table details the RFI item/concern and Councils recommended solution(s).

Below each item, the table includes a response summary, and document reference location for where GTC have responded to each recommendation/item.

RFI Item	Council Recommendations(s)	GTC Response Location
Landscaping & Trees		
Tree Removal The proposal seeks the removal of 459 trees on site, with proposed replacement planting of 337 new trees. The majority of this tree removal occurs as a result of the location of Building 3, Building 5 Blocks 1 and 2, Building 6 and various hardscape driveway and parking areas. The extent of this tree removal is significant, especially considering the low numbers of replacement planting, time taken for planted trees to reach maturity, extent of the hard surface area proposed for the site, and the likely impacts of urban heat island effect. Where vegetation is approved for removal, Council requires replacement planting at 8:1 for each mature tree removed. The proposal achieves a replacement ratio of 0.75:1, well below Council's mandated control. Whilst total compliance with the requirements of this part may not be possible, the current proposal's extent of non-compliance is not acceptable. The extensive amount of tree removal and lack of replacement planting results in a significant loss of the Greenweb Core, Support and Restoration. This is not supported and must be addressed in a revised application. Development must ensure a suitable transition to adjoining land, and limit impacts to adjoining wetlands, foreshore areas and threatened species. Under Chapter 39 (1.4(1)) of the Sutherland DCP 2015, the development must ensure that through its siting, design and landscape treatment, maximise habitat values and minimise disruption to connectivity through: a. continuous canopy and understorey planting along one boundary, or b. retention and revegetation of remnant bushland elements.	The proposal is to be revised to achieve greater tree retention and significantly increase additional tree planting consistent with the advice throughout this letter. Additionally, any forthcoming response must be accompanied by: • A Tree Management Plan and a site-specific tree masterplan; • Detailed plans for all landscaped areas. • A detailed plan for the pedestrian entry point of the site. Council's Landscape Officer has provided extensive comments on the proposal regarding the trees proposed for removal and has provided a detailed series of suggestions that would allow particular trees to be retained. These comments are provided at **Attachment 3** and are to be adopted where they do not conflict with a wider site design change responding to other comments.	AIA (Ver.3.0) Appendix-1 - of this document Appendix-2 - of this document

Table 2 - RFI response schedule

2. Appendix 1: Response to Attachment 3 of RFI - Council Landscape Officer Comments & Recommendations

Table 3 – below aims to provide a response to the comments and recommendations made by Councils Landscape Officer as detailed within Attachment 3 of the RFI response dated 3/5/2024.

The below table has utilised the same numbering as that detailed within attachment 3 of the RFI letter.

Item No.	Comments	Response Summary
2	**Exiting trees**	
2.1	**The Foreshore**	NA
2.2	**Building 2 (Existing)**	NA
2.3	**Building 3**	NA
2.4	**Building 4** "Trees 770 -782 are required to be removed to site the building and ancillary works. Of this group Trees 774 – 782 comprised of Meleleuca quinquenervia and Washingtonia robusta are worthy of retention. These trees are currently proposed for removal due to approximately 300mm of proposed 'Fill' and as the Arborist notes a proposed retaining wall. ***Recommendation:*** To see this stand retained, the fill proposed could be removed as it exists outside of the building footprint and within a designated landscape area. The retaining wall noted by the Arborist as a 'primary impact' and cause for removal of these trees finishes in line with the eastern edge of the building, so should not interfere with these existing trees. Refer Architectural plans (Sheet 400). The retention of these specimens around the new 16m high building will provide some immediate relief in scale, whilst the proposed landscaping establishes."	Trees 774-782 – are impacted by the proposed fill. GTC accepts that the fill extends into a landscaped area, however, GTC have been informed that this area of fill is associated with flood/stormwater requirements and proposed green link access from the foreshore.
2.5	**Building 5 (Block 1)** Trees 382 – 444 are a mix of well-established planted specimens forming boarders to the existing carparking including Cupaniopsis anacardioides and Banksia	Noted – Building redesign has not been incorporated; therefore the removal of these trees is still required/proposed

	integrifolia, these are the most botanically significant trees on site given the Greenweb 'Restoration' Zoning. Their location makes them unviable for retention when compared to the proposed built form. ***Should the Building require redesign the retention of this significant stand of trees should be prioritized.***	
2.6	**<u>Building 5 (Block 2)</u>** Trees 343 - 355 are a mix of native and exotic trees and palms. They exist as part of an established garden bed and rest area. Particularly native trees 343, 348 and 353 Cupaniopsis ancardioides 'Tuckeroo' provide great shade an amenity and exist on the periphery of the proposed built form. ***Recommendation:*** This stand exists in a garden bed surrounded by asphalt / concrete, so if the current extent of the garden bed were retained it would encompass the Tree Protection Zones of all 12 specimens. Fill is proposed to raise the FFL of the proposed building, but the trees could be retained at a lower level. It is recommended the hardstand and northwest corner of the building is redesigned to accommodate this group of trees. This group of trees could form a part of a 'Communal Open / Area' as is proposed at Building 5 (Block 1).	These trees are located within the center of the site proposed for cut/fill associated with the requirements of flood modeling/ stormwater infrastructure. To retain these trees within the center of the proposed bulk earthworks would require excessive tree sensitive construction methods and redesign of the proposed building footprint, infrastructure, and access roads. Considering that only one (1) tree is determined to be of medium retention value, with the remaining trees in the group determined to be of low retention value, the measures required to retain these trees is not considered reasonable.
2.7	**<u>Building 6</u>** Trees 122 – 146 & 209 – 302 are a significant stand of planted canopy trees and palms and sub canopy trees comprised of Magnolia grandiflora, Corymbia citriodora and Washingtonia robusta. This is the largest and most dense stand of trees onsite and provides great shade amenity. ***Recommendation:*** The proposed building footprint encompasses the entirety of this stand of trees currently. It is recommended that Building 6 is amalgamated with Buildings 7 & 8 to enable all or part of this stand to be retained. This group of trees exists in a garden bed surrounded by asphalt / concrete, so if the full or partial extent of the garden bed were retained it would encompass the Tree Protection Zones of all or part of the stand of trees. Should this stand of trees be retained as part of the proposal, its central location would make it an ideal gathering place for onsite occupants and visitors alike. The location addresses the Boulevard and is a central point providing access to Solander Fields and the the Foreshore. As the site is proposing retail tenancies and a café these could be accommodated in a smaller building(s) in this area amongst	The stand does currently offer shade and amenity to the existing surrounds. However, benefits of the associated shade and amenity are debatable as the stand is currently in situ within a car park only. Therefore, the reality is that the benefits of said features offer considerably limited value. If these trees were associated within a proposed residential development, those values may potentially be significant. However, within the context of the site and industrial usage, those values are somewhat redundant. Additionally, it is noted that most of the palm species within this area were observed to demonstrate characteristics symptomatic of Fusarium Wilt. As such they were allocated predominantly low retention value(s) and should be considered for removal. Regardless of the requirements of cut/fill and stormwater requirements, the proposal of undertaking extensive redesign here is considered to be unreasonable.

	the stand of trees, so it remains a viable use of space for the development. This area could also serve as the primary 'Open Space' for the onsite occupants and visitors allowing the removal of the two communal areas from within the dedicated VMP area.	
2.8	**Building 7**	NA
2.9	**Building 8** ***Recommendation:*** Trees 36-42 currently exist in a large turf area and if they were to be retained in the new scheme their locations would be within a designated landscape area. This landscaped area would encompass the tree protection zones of trees 36-42 with the rationalization of some parking spots. Fill is proposed to raise the FFL of the building, but the trees could be retained at a lower level and the hardstand could ramp up to meet the built form. The footprint of building 8 could be rationalized or amalgamated with Building 7 to retain trees 42-48 which would see the 16m high building mass setback further from the road and screened further with existing trees.	Retention of these trees would be optimal and has been reviewed by the design team from the inception of the concept design and delivery of the Preliminary Tree Assessment (PTA) report. However, tree retention is determined to be unfeasible due to the constraints of the design objectives and compliance requirements.
2.10	**Eastern Setback**	NA
2.11	**Central Roadway & Pedestrian Path**	NA
2.12	**Southern Setback** ***Recommendation:*** Despite the above there is potential to retain the cluster of palms 460-465 beside the entrance to provide some immediate amenity. Palms have small root balls and Tree Protection Zones <1m radius and are conducive for retention around development works. Again, the palms could be retained at a lower level and the hardstand be filled to a higher RL.	One of the palms in this group was assessed as being subject to Fusarium Wilt following the site assessment. Additionally, of the surrounding palms two (2) were observed to be of poor health and fair condition. Indicating there is the potential for the disease to have spread into those palms surrounding the infected tree. As such, it was determined that the palms were not suitable for retention, nor transplant.
2.13	**General Notes** **I**. Architectural redesign in conference with the site Arborist should be undertaken to prioritise the retention of the following tree and palm stands. Trees 774 – 782, 460-465, 343 – 355, 209 – 302 & 122 – 146 (All or part of stand) and 36 – 48. **II**. The site has a large number of Washintonia robusta and Magnolia grandiflora specimens. Both species are readily transplantable and could be managed during	GTC advise against the retention and or transplantation of palm trees within the vicinity of those observed to be symptomatic of Fusarium Wilt. Consideration may be given to the transplantation of Magnolia species subject to further investigation and in consideration with the staging of the works.

	different stages of construction and reincluded in the landscape design. The reuse of these specimen plantings at mature sizes would bring immediate shade amenity, scale to new buildings, and restore the pre-existing character. **III**. Trees stands in existing garden beds or bordered by concrete or asphalt hardstand are more conducive to tree retention as roots have unlikely spread outside of the garden bed. These trees can be retained at a lower level and fill can be placed around without hindering the trees health and vigour. **IV**. A Tree Management plan should be submitted with a revised application.	If determined to be feasible for transplantation, this can be conditioned within the final landscape plans prior to CC. However, considering the low retention value of the majority of the species, the logistical requirements, associated costing, and likely success rates of transplanting compared against replacement with advanced specimens is likely to result in a poor cost/benefit outcome.
3	**Proposed Landscape**	
	These items refer to landscape design & species selection – refer to the Landscape Concept Plan for additional info and response	
4	**Other Matters**	
	These items refer to landscape design & species selection – refer to the Landscape Concept Plan for additional info and response	

Table 3 -GTC Response to: Council Landscape Officer Recommendations

3. Appendix 2 - Response to Arboricultural & Landscape Review (ALR) of AIA Report

Subsequent to the Council RFI on the 3/5/2024, Council engaged an external arborist to undertake a review of and provide recommendations in response to the AIA report.

The external arborist review document is titled "Arboricultural & Landscape Review" (ALR) and was compiled by Craig Kenworthy of Sydney Landscape Consultants (SLC) dated 18/6/2024.

The ALR raised concerns relating to the proposal and AIA and provided comments on potential design improvement considerations.

Table 4 below provides a response to the comments and recommendations made by SLC report by GTC for consideration by Council as part of the proposed development submission.

The ALR included number references for headings only and comments/recommendations were absent of any numerical reference. Therefore, GTC's response(s) have been provided within the order with which the ALR was documented.

Where it was necessary to separate responses, responses have been ordered in a way that aims to best align with the ALR document.

Item	SLC Comment/ Concern	Response
1	**Island & Roundabout Entry off Captain Cook Drive (CCD)** SLC – Agree good outcome	NA - Agreed
2	**Trees 36-49: SE Cnr along CCD** …" *these trees are unviable under this proposal and impacted by building 8, pump house, sprinkler tank, carparking and internal roadway and are only recommended to be removed in the arborist report due to being 100% encroached by proposed works.* ***This is a poor outcome and building 8 and other infrastructure would require moving and or redesign."***	Retention of these trees was considered a priority following the completion of the PTA report and subsequent review by the design team. Due to the requirement for fire hydrant infrastructure to be located at the front of the site the result is the loss of approximately five (5) of these trees. Additional impacts include the location of proposed parking spaces to meet minimum parking requirements for the proposal. To achieve the successful retention of the remaining trees in this avenue the deletion of Building 8 would be required. As building footprints have been significantly adapted to accommodate the constraints of the site and associated compliance aspects, the deletion of Building 8 has been deemed non-viable from a commercial perspective by the client. Building 8 has been designed around a reduced footprint and associated minimal functionality to accommodate the above noted requirements.

3	**<u>Trees Bordering Solander Fields</u>** …" *The report comments on these trees having MAJOR encroachments to all Corymbia maculata within the site, yet comments on retention of these trees.* ***This is a poor outcome and the buildings 8 and 7 need to be pulled away from these trees TPZs, to ensure the trees can continue to prosper and accustomed to conditions, currently available to them. Remove roadway behind buildings."***	GTC agree with SLC comment that the trees are subject to a major encroachment. However, a major encroachment doesn't necessarily reflect a major impact. For example, where there are existing structures in place (as is the case here in the form of the existing areas of hard standing), tree root growth is likely constrained, and acclimated to the restricted conditions. The proposal seeks to retain the existing road alignment to the south and upgrade and replace with new in the same position following only minor fill to accommodate flood modelling requirements. SLC comment that the road should be removed from this area. However, the area already consists of large areas of hard standing. Therefore, the indication that the trees cannot be retained here is refuted. SLC further comments that the buildings need to be "pulled back" from the proposed location. However, the building(s) proposed location(s) have little to no encroachment to the majority of the trees. Therefore, the recommendation to relocate the buildings is not accepted as a necessary requirement. In addition to the above, the existing garden bed along the Solander Fields boundary is proposed to be widened under the proposed development. Considering the above, and the proposed implementation of detailed tree protection and tree sensitive construction methodologies provided for the trees along this boundary, GTC maintain the stance that the trees can be retained under the current proposal.
4	**<u>Tree Groups within existing car park to south of site</u>**	
4 (i)	<u>Area 1</u> *"Palms 201 – 215 are generally not in a good condition, with apical dieback, and most being in decline and several dead."* **…" *Of note, it has not been tested, I assume if these palms are affected by Fusarium wilt, but nonetheless, retention of this row of palms, I believe is futile."***	NA - Agreed
4 (ii)	<u>Area 2</u> *"Palms 216 – 227 in the location of proposed building 4, are also not in good condition with many in decline and*	NA - Agreed

	several dead. Again, the arborist report comments on these palms being possible victims of Fusarium wilt. ***Retention of these palms is futile*. "**	
4 (iii)	<u>Area 3</u> ***a)*** *…" The arborist report assesses the Corymbia citriodora as being of low landscape value and low landscape retention value. This maybe because of their close plantings.* ***I cannot agree and the possibility of thinning out several trees in poorer condition, to allow the trees in good condition to optimise the more open space and obtain larger canopies. This can also depend of stormwater/ flooding issues and raising of levels required?"*** ***b)*** *"The Magnolia grandiflora trees are located as current avenue planting that aligns the main roadway into the site, South – North. Again, they have been assessed as having a 100% encroachment from proposed infrastructure. Their condition rates as good with fair structure, but their plantings appear too close to one another in my opinion to have these trees capable of reaching heights at maturity, they are known for.* ***I believe retention is futile and a more suited species for the locale is recommended and planted further apart to obtain a true avenue planting. Appropriate soil volumes are required to have trees obtain large canopies, at maturity.***	**a)** GTC appreciates that despite the implementation of the methodology and best efforts of the assessor to eliminate subjectivity, there is likely to be an element of subjectivity and unconscious bias when completing the retention value assessment despite best efforts to avoid this. GTC accepts SLC's difference in opinion regarding the allocation of tree retention values and welcomes a joint review of the assigned retention values. However, given the debate is between low/medium retention value, the reality is that this doesn't change the outcome for the trees in these locations, as the extent of redesign required to mitigate the impacts would exceed any reasonable requirements for even a medium retention value tree(s). Comments regarding tree groups and proposed tree management recommendations of "thinning out" the trees to allow for retention of larger trees in the future is considered somewhat irrelevant and falls outside of the scope of a retention value assessment. GTC's assessment focused on the utilised methodology of a retention value assessment for the individual trees considering the health and condition at the time of assessment. It is important to maintain focus on this, or else exploration of potential scenarios that may increase/decrease the future retention value of the tree(s) becomes endless and is ultimately beside the point. **b)** NA – Agreed Refer to the VMP and LCP for detail, the client has worked closely with the ecologist and landscape architect to deliver a replacement planting schedule/species selection that reflects species suitable for the area and where feasible has a focus on species endemic to the locality.

4 (iv)	<u>Area 4</u> *"Again, the Corymbia citriodora trees have been planted in a row sequence and hence their tall, slender form and habit. The arborist report assesses the Corymbia citriodora as being of low landscape value and low landscape retention value, yet medium ELE, being 15 – 40 Life Expectancy. This maybe because of their close plantings.* ***I cannot agree and the possibility of thinning out/ remove several in poorer condition, to allow the trees in good condition to optimise the more open space and obtain larger canopies, maybe an option. This can also depend of stormwater/ flooding issues and raising of levels required? Just because they have been planted, does not devalue their retention or canopy presence in the landscape."***	As per ***Section 4 (iii) a)*** above, GTC acknowledge that SLC challenges the retention value ratings and accept that there are subjective aspects of the assessment that can produce different results and welcome a joint assessment where required. GTC can confirm that the assigned retention value was allocated considering the closely planted nature of the stand that renders the trees a lower retention value when assessing their individual significance. This aspect has already been addressed and detailed within ***Section 6.4 of the AIA report***. However, as discussed previously, the challenge relates to the allocation of low/medium retention values only, and therefore the end result for these trees under the current design would likely remain the same. Ultimately the proposed removal of these trees is attributed to the extensive cut/fill of the area associated with flood modelling and stormwater requirements.
4 (v)	<u>Area 5</u> ***a)*** *"The 5th area and row of trees in the existing car park are trees generally from 174 – 190 (45 deg angle) and in the proposed location between buildings 6 and 4, car parking and main roadway. All trees in this row are Corymbia citriodora trees and generally in fair health and structure, yet with medium ELE, being 15 – 40 years life expectancy remaining.* ***The possibility of thinning out/removing several in poorer condition, to allow the trees in good condition to optimise the more open space and obtain larger canopies, maybe an option. This can also depend of stormwater/ flooding issues and raising of levels required? Just because they have been planted, does not devalue their retention or canopy presence in the landscape."***	**a)** As per ***Section 4 (iii) a)*** above, GTC acknowledge that SLC challenges the retention value ratings and accept that there are subjective aspects of the assessment that can produce different results and welcome a joint assessment where required. GTC can confirm that the assigned retention value was allocated considering the closely planted nature of the stand that renders the trees a lower retention value when assessing their individual significance. This aspect has already been addressed and detailed within ***Section 6.4 of the AIA report***. **b)** GTC have been through extensive consultation with the design team from our initial engagement and provision of the Preliminary Tree Assessment (PTA) report, through design review, to the delivery of the AIA report(s). A multitude of redesign, tree sensitive design & construction recommendations have been considered throughout the design process. Whilst the relocation of buildings, infrastructure and landscaping can appear an "obvious" solution, the final design is a reflection of the collaboration between all disciplines, working to align and include all compliance requirements to ensure a suitable and commercially viable proposal for the site and proposed industrial usage.

	b) ***"Has all options from the architects/ developers, in collaboration with the landscape architect/ arborist, been exhausted?"***	
5	**<u>Trees Adj. to Solander Fields</u>** "*The trees along the Eastern boundary fence adjoining Solander fields are from tree 71 – 168. Proposed building affecting these trees are building 6, rear roadway and parking to the North of Bldg 6. Several trees are located within the Solander field area. This long narrow planted strip is at a higher grade than the car park and comprise of several medium retention trees in accordance with the arborist report.* *Several High significance trees have been assessed in this location and are located within the playing fields adjacent. The arborist report assesses the majority of trees aligning this Eastern fence line as having high to very high encroachment percentages, and these incursions, cannot be supported.* ***I believe this longitudinal strip along the fence requires retention and protection and a redesign of building 6 pushed further West, roadway behind removed and carpark, to provide very similar conditions that currently exist, while infrastructure proposed is at a low level of incursion***."	Design here has been modified to remove the previously proposed hardstand between Building 6 and Solander Fields. The revised design looks to retain and expand the garden bed parallel to Solander Fields with only minor encroachments from proposed landscaping works. Establishment of tree protection zones prior to construction combined with arborist supervision of all landscaping works within the TPZ(s) of these trees will mitigate the potential for incidental damage throughout development. SLC comments regarding the relocation of Building 6 are deemed inappropriate as the proposed building footprint imposes little to no encroachment into the TPZ(s). GTC maintain the stance that these trees are viable for retention provided tree sensitive construction methods are utilised and tree protection measures implemented under the guidance of the project arborist.
6	**<u>Internal Avenue of Magnolia trees</u>** *Avenue trees being the Magnolia grandiflora trees aligning the main roadway into the site are generally in good to fair condition, yet planted too close together. The Arborist Report only assess trees 316/317 as being of medium significance and I would have to agree. These two (2) medium significances trees are located within*	NA - Agreed

	proposed building 5. All existing Magnolias are varying in height, form and condition. ***I would support removal of these trees and have the main avenue widened and then to have an endemic tree Spp, planted far enough apart to ensure these trees into the long term can obtain heights that favour an iconic avenue tree in this location.***	
7	**<u>Woolooware shore line under power line easement, with tree numbering of 742 – 781, to the corner of Solander fields</u>** *…" The majority of trees that are within the site and close to the Northern boundary adjacent to the shoreline are proposed for retention, except for several larger trees that are closely planted and suppressed by each other. Proposed impacts as mentioned in the arborist report are from retaining walls and fill. Of note a new shared pathway connection from the shoreline footpath to the centre of the site traverses through these larger trees.* ***I believe a redesign of building 4s NE corner could allow retention of several of the larger trees, instead of removing them due to having high to very high encroachments. Possible thinning out of some of the poorer conditioned trees?"***	GTC have provided extensive feedback to the design team regarding the redesign/alignment of buildings and infrastructure to accommodate the retention of high(er) value trees on site. The final design is a result of the design consultation process and careful consideration of all recommendations by the design team from provision of the Preliminary Tree Assessment (PTA) report, through the design phase and development of the various AIA revisions. The AIA has been completed based off the final design provided to GTC by the client and reflects the constraints of the design imposed by all discipline(s) and compliance aspects. As previously stated, thinning out of trees to allow for a potential future increase in retention value falls outside of the scope of a retention value assessment. This may be considered as a potential recommendation within the AIA. However, in the context of the site, trees and development proposal, this is deemed to be irrelevant. GTC's allocated retention values were determined based off the assessment of the individual tree at the time of assessment only. Options to increase/decrease retention value are irrelevant within the context of the AIA report.
8	**<u>Trees between Buildings 3 & 4</u>**	
a)	**<u>Trees between Buildings 3 & 4</u>** *"The stand of trees between bldg. 3 and 4 comprises of several medium significant trees, worthy of retention, with good form, habit and condition. A creek or stream is evident in this location and appears to leave the site to the North to the Bay.*	The proposed layout here is constrained by the Ausgrid Access Pathway and vehicular access road. Linkage to the foreshore has now been included in this location and replacement planting suitable for the locations added. Refer to the VMP and LCP for additional detail.

	This is an area between buildings and a good opportunity to separate the footprints and continue with a green linkage canopy into the site, to soften the bulk and scale. Redesign bldg. 3 and 4 to cater for an open creek like area for passive use for occupants."	
b)	*"The 1st longitudinal stand of trees are 710 – 741, with the majority being Callistemon viminalis, possibly planted small trees and two (2) medium significant trees being Angophora costata trees at around the 14/15m heights. Both medium significant trees are encroached 100% by B3.* ***It would be a good opportunity to retain these two (2) if possible and redesign Bldg 3 and include additional green linking from the foreshore into the site."***	As above
c)	*"The 2nd longitudinal stand of trees are 704 down to 685 and not one tree has been awarded a medium significance, with all being of low significance. All of this vegetation comprises of palms, with a high majority being Syagrus romanzoffiana, Cocos Palm, being an exempt Spp.* ***I would support removal of these palms and with a redesign of building 3, an opportunity exists to replant between 2 and 3 to again, provide a green link into the site, to soften the bulk and scale of this development."***	Agreed, removal and replacement planting suitable for the location proposed

9	**<u>Building 5 Trees</u>** ***a)*** *"The two (2) rows of planted trees/palms comprise of a row of Washingtonia palms (333 – 341) with potential Fusarium wilt and all in fair condition and a row of Corymbia citriodora trees of medium retention value (322 – 332). All Corymbia citriodoras are 100% encroached by development hence why recommended for removal by the author of Arborist report.* ***Yet is there a possibility of breaking up bldg. 5 to create a green corridor, halving bldg. 5 North - South?, to create a passive space between buildings?"*** ***b)*** *"The stand of trees, South of proposed building 5 has the one (1) medium significant tree (T343), amongst several smaller suppressed trees, not worthy of retention.* ***Having a redesign of building 5, for the one (1) medium significant tree, I believe is a futile exercise. Alternatives around Bldg 5, need reviewing for open landscaped areas."***	**a)** This is really addressing two (2) separate issues, tree removal, and the matter of replacement planting opportunities. As GTC and SLC agree that the trees should be removed, it leaves the matter of replacement planting opportunities. Replacement planting numbers have been increased since the original proposal and have been addressed by the landscape architect and ecologist. Refer to the VMP & LCP **b)** NA - Agreed
10	**<u>Building 5 – Cont.</u>** *"Building 5 - South, comprises of trees that align a roadway, street avenue and small car park area, with a large lawn area in between. Approx 13 medium retention trees exist (blue dots), with the majority of trees being of low retention value would require removal.* ***I can't support the assessment in the arborist report of many of these Melaleuca quinquenervia trees (433 – 441) lining the current side service road, as being of low retention and removal based on being 100% encroached. Has all opportunities been exhausted for***	As per ***Section 4 (iii) a)*** above, GTC acknowledge that SLC challenges the retention value ratings and accept that there are subjective aspects of the assessment that can produce different results and welcome a joint assessment where required. However, as discussed previously, the challenge relates to the allocation of low/medium retention values only, and therefore the end result for these trees under the current design would likely remain the same. Ultimately the proposed removal of these trees is attributed to the extensive cut/fill of the area associated with flood modelling and stormwater requirements.

	designing and retention of medium retention trees and trees of good condition that are prominent in the landscape, as several are, in this location."	
11	**<u>CCD Boundary</u>** *"I don't believe the proposal to have this huge lawn removed and car parking pushed very close to the boundary of the site, is a good outcome. Additionally, the proposal caters for new tree plantings within car parking spaces and is a poor long-term solution. Furthermore, planting opportunities are lost by way of a very small deep soil remaining against the boundary fence.* ***I believe a better solution would be to provide a minimum of 10-15m garden bed width around this area inside the boundary, to cater for existing trees on site, cater for those trees of high(green dots) and medium landscape significance (blue dots) that exist on the existing corner, whilst having the ability to plant taller trees to enable the site and proposed buildings to be softened by the tree and landscape screening, into the future.*** ***By moving the carparking/ roadway further from the boundary (10 – 15m), a redesign of building 5 – South would be required and possibly aling with the section further towards Woolworths area?"***	The proposed design complies with the provision of a 3m landscape as prescribed within the Sutherland Shire Council DCP (2015). Proposed carparking has been introduced to meet the compliance requirements associated with minimum required spaces for the proposal.

Table 4 - Response to: Council Arborist Review of AIA Report & Associated Concern/comments

Summary

1) The final design is a result of the design consultation process and careful consideration of all recommendations by the design team from provision of the Preliminary Tree Assessment (PTA) report, through the design phase and development of the various AIA revisions.

   A multitude of redesign, tree sensitive design & construction recommendations have been considered throughout the design process.

   The AIA has been completed based off the final design provided to GTC by the client and reflects the constraints of the design imposed by all discipline(s) and compliance aspects.

2) Replacement planting will require detailed tree pit design to achieve a successful outcome over the long term.
   i) This will be particularly relevant to planting locations proposed within, adjacent to areas of hard standing to ensure that the tree pits provide adequate deep soil volume(s) below and beyond the extremities of the pit boundaries at finished level.
   ii) Implementation of *Stratavault* systems and the like will need to be considered to ensure that tree pits within areas of hard standing can achieve engineering/load bearing requirements, whilst also allowing for sub grade soil volume suitable for the proposed planting species at maturity.
   iii) The incorporation of sub grade tree pits below areas of hard standing will need to be developed in consultation with the civil engineer to ensure that the required soil volume can be achieved in accordance with the required fill proposed on site associated with flood modeling/stormwater requirements.
   iv) Tree pit grates and surrounds should be avoided to minimise potential conflict of the tree trunks at maturity with the pit surrounds.

3) Following approval of the development inclusive of any conditioned design amendments, review of the final approved plans and associated tree protection requirements should be completed by the project arborist in the form of a site-specific Tree Protection Plan & Specification (TPP).

Please get in touch via the contact details below if you have any queries regarding this document.

Kind Regards,

Joe Floyd | AQF Level 5 Consulting Arborist

M: 0416 697 550

E: Joe@greentreeconsultancy.com.au

W: www.GreenTreeConsultancy.com.au