

21 February 2023

Our ref: 23WOL-7382

Via email: Gabrielle.Chidiac@colliers.com

Attention: Gabrielle Chidiac

The Maltings Redevelopment Modification Application & Development Application: Arboricultural Impact Assessment Addenda

ELA understands that Colliers proposes a modification application (s4.55) regarding redevelopment of the Maltings, located at 2 Colo Street, Mittagong. The modification application would apply to the Southern Sheds, M1, M2, Northern Shed and Malsters House. Furthermore, Colliers propose a development application for the alterations, additions, and adaptation of M3 and minor internal changes to M4, in addition a façade change.

Considering the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ELA, 2020) for the Maltings site is now over three years old, reassessment of relevant trees is necessary to ensure validity of this report to current conditions. ELA understands that no additional trees are proposed for removal, as there are no changes to the building footprint.

AQF Level 5 Consulting Arborist, David Bidwell, inspected trees impacted by the proposed works to the following buildings: Maltings 3, Maltings 4 and Malsters House (Figure 1 and 2). David completed the inspection on 16 January 2024, and his findings are summarised below. Individual tree assessments and measurements were not undertaken.



Figure 1: Location of re-assessed trees within proximity to Malsters House



Figure 2: Location of re-assessed trees within proximity to buildings M3 and M4

Trees within proximity to Malsters House

Trees 229-236 (Figure 3), 256, 257, 273 and 274 appeared in the same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.

The line of Trees numbered 237-253 (Figure 4) have experienced some losses since the 2020 inspection, particularly at the eastern end of the tree line. Some of these trees show signs of old stumps being ground out. The remaining trees are in varying states of health, with the following structurally compromised and in poor condition:

- Trees 261-267 have been heavily mulched and demonstrate fair to poor health, with some canopy thinning (Figure 5 & Figure 6).
- Trees 258 and 259 are in poor health, appearing structurally unsound (Figure 7).
- Trees 268-272 demonstrate very poor health (Figure 8), with trees 268-271 appearing to be virtually dead.

It is recommended that the retention values for these unhealthy trees be decreased where they were previously classified as high retention. Table 1 summarises the trees which require a decrease in retention value due to change in condition.

Six *Cupressus macrocarpa* located within close proximity to Malsters House were identified on the aerial image, which were not assessed as part of the original AIA (Figure 1 and Figure 9). These trees were likely excluded as the building was to be retained. If any works are required within the TPZ of these trees, tree protection measures must be in place during the works; including the marking out of the TPZ, fencing to surround the TPZ, and supervision by a suitably qualified Arborist.

Table 1: Malsters House tree condition changes

Condition	Relevant trees	Notes/recommendations
Fair to poor health	Trees 261-267	These trees have been heavily mulched and demonstrate some canopy thinning. Trees previously classified as high retention value should be decreased in value (Trees 261, 262, 263, 265, 266 and 267).
Poor health	Trees 258, 259	These trees appear structurally unsound. As they were previously classified as high retention value, this should be decreased in value.
Very poor health	Trees 268-272	Trees 268-271 appear to be virtually dead. Trees 270-272 were previously classified as high retention value, therefore should be decreased in value.

Trees within proximity to buildings M3 and M4:

Trees 285-289, 292-295 and 298 were in similar condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth (Figure 10). The retention value for these trees has been previously over-estimated (excluding 294 and 298, demonstrated in Figure 11 and Figure 12) and should be revised to 'Medium' due to the

relatively small size and lack of maturity. The structure of Tree 284 should be re-classified as 'poor' due to a large wound and hollow, combined with a lean on the shoulder trunk.

Table 2 displays all relevant tree information obtained during the original AIA (ELA, 2020), as well as the observations from this reassessment and recommendations for tree retention value revisions. Table 2: Re-assessed tree details from original AIA (ELA, 2020) with added observations and proposed retention value (Bidwell, 2024)

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9574 8712.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H Fabish', is centered within a light gray rectangular box.

Hannah Fabish
Environmental Consultant



Figure 3: Trees 229-236



Figure 4: Trees 237-253



Figure 5: Trees 261-267



Figure 6: Heavy mulching of trees 261-267



Figure 7: Trees 258 & 259



Figure 8: Trees 268-272 in very poor health



Figure 9: Group of six trees not assessed in the AIA (ELA, 2020), in close proximity to Malsters House



Figure 10: Trees 285-289, 292-295 and 298



Figure 11: Tree 294



Figure 12: Tree 298

Table 2: Re-assessed tree details from original AIA (ELA, 2020) with added observations and proposed retention value (Bidwell, 2024)

Tree	Trees in group	Botanical name	Height (m)	Spread (m)	DBH (mm)	Health	Structure	Landscape significance	TPZ (m)	SRZ (m)	ULE	Retention value	TPZ Encroachment (%)	SRZ Impact	Calculated Impact	Proposed Impact	Observations of the reassessment (Bidwell, 2024)	Proposed Retention Value	Native Species
229	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	11	1500	Good	Good	High	15.0	3.9	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
230	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	18	12	900	Poor	Fair	High	10.8	3.2	Short (5-15 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
231	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	8	1000	Fair	Fair	High	12.0	3.3	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
232	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	8	1200	Poor	Fair	Medium	14.4	3.6	Short (5-15 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
233	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	9	700	Poor	Fair	Medium	8.4	2.9	Short (5-15 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
234	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	10	950	Fair	Fair	High	11.4	3.2	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
235	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	5	600	Fair	Fair	High	7.2	2.7	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
236	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	10	900	Good	Good	High	10.8	3.2	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
256	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	18	18	1100	Good	Fair	High	13.2	3.4	Long (>40 years)	High	5%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
257	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	7	650	Fair	Fair	High	7.8	2.8	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	No
273	1	<i>Acacia decurrens</i>	7	5	100	Fair	Fair	Medium	2.0	1.5	Short (5-15 years)	Medium	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	Yes
274	1	<i>Acacia decurrens</i>	6	5	150	Good	Good	Medium	2.0	1.5	Short (5-15 years)	Medium	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	Yes
237	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	10	1200	Good	Fair	High	14.4	3.6	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
238	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	13	1000	Fair	Fair	High	12.0	3.3	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
239	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	10	1400	Poor	Poor	High	15.0	3.8	Short (5-15 years)	High	0.8%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
240	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	16	2000	Fair	Poor	High	15.0	4.4	Long (>40 years)	High	6.4%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the	Medium	No

Tree	Trees in group	Botanical name	Height (m)	Spread (m)	DBH (mm)	Health	Structure	Landscape significance	TPZ (m)	SRZ (m)	ULE	Retention value	TPZ Encroachment (%)	SRZ Impact	Calculated Impact	Proposed Impact	Observations of the reassessment (Bidwell, 2024)	Proposed Retention Value	Native Species
																	line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.		
241	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	25	15	2000	Fair	Poor	High	15.0	4.4	Long (>40 years)	High	3.2%	Yes	Major Impact	High Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
242	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	15	1300	Fair	Poor	High	15.0	3.7	Medium (15-40 years)	High	2.8%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
243	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	7	400	Poor	Poor	High	4.8	2.3	Short (5-15 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
244	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	25	19	3000	Fair	Fair	High	15.0	5.3	Long (>40 years)	High	1.5%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
245	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	18	15	2000	Fair	Fair	High	15.0	4.4	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
246	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	15	1800	Good	Good	High	15.0	4.2	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
247	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	15	1100	Fair	Fair	High	13.2	3.4	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
248	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	15	1200	Fair	Fair	High	14.4	3.6	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
249	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	25	22	4000	Good	Good	High	15.0	5.9	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
250	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	12	6	750	Poor	Fair	High	9.0	2.9	Short (5-15 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
251	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	24	15	2500	Good	Fair	High	15.0	4.9	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
252	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	16	2500	Good	Fair	High	15.0	4.9	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No

Tree	Trees in group	Botanical name	Height (m)	Spread (m)	DBH (mm)	Health	Structure	Landscape significance	TPZ (m)	SRZ (m)	ULE	Retention value	TPZ Encroachment (%)	SRZ Impact	Calculated Impact	Proposed Impact	Observations of the reassessment (Bidwell, 2024)	Proposed Retention Value	Native Species
253	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	13	1000	Poor	Poor	High	12.0	3.3	Short (5-15 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	This line of trees (237 to 253) have undergone some losses, particularly at the eastern end of the line, where there are signs of old stumps being ground out.	Medium	No
261	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	13	1400	Fair	Fair	High	15.0	3.8	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Tree has been heavily mulched, canopy thinning observed, in fair to poor health. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
262	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	6	800	Fair	Fair	High	9.6	3.0	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Tree has been heavily mulched, canopy thinning observed, in fair to poor health. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
263	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	19	16	600	Fair	Fair	High	7.2	2.7	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Tree has been heavily mulched, canopy thinning observed, in fair to poor health. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
264	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	17	1	200	Poor	Poor	Low	2.4	1.7	Remove (<5 years)	Low	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Tree has been heavily mulched, canopy thinning observed, in fair to poor health. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
265	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	10	1300	Good	Good	High	15.0	3.7	Long (>40 years)	High	16.7%	No	Major Impact	Medium Impact	Tree has been heavily mulched, canopy thinning observed, in fair to poor health. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
266	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	22	10	1000	Good	Fair	High	12.0	3.3	Medium (15-40 years)	High	17.1%	No	Major Impact	Medium Impact	Tree has been heavily mulched, canopy thinning observed, in fair to poor health. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
267	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	17	11	1500	Good	Fair	High	15.0	3.9	Medium (15-40 years)	High	20.7%	No	Major Impact	High Impact	Tree has been heavily mulched, canopy thinning observed, in fair to poor health. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
258	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	16	7	550	Fair	Fair	High	6.6	2.6	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Tree in poor health, appears structurally unsound. Decrease retention value.	Medium	No
259	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	18	7	600	Fair	Fair	High	7.2	2.7	Medium (15-40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Tree in poor health, appears structurally unsound. Decrease to retention value.	Medium	No
268	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	16	5	700	Poor	Fair	Medium	8.4	2.9	Short (5-15 years)	Medium	8.4%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	Very poor health. Tree is virtually dead.	Medium	No
270	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	20	15	1500	Fair	Fair	High	15.0	3.9	Medium (15-40 years)	High	13.6%	No	Major Impact	Medium Impact	Very poor health. Tree is virtually dead, decrease retention value.	Medium	No
271	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	18	10	550	Poor	Poor	High	6.6	2.6	Short (5-15 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Very poor health. Tree is virtually dead, decrease retention value.	Medium	No
272	1	<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	19	13	1500	Good	Good	High	15.0	3.9	Long (>40 years)	High	9.6%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	Very poor health. Tree is virtually dead, decrease retention value.	Medium	No
285	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	6	5	200	Good	Good	Medium	2.4	1.7	Long (>40 years)	High	57.6%	Yes	Major Impact	High Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.	Medium	Yes
284	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	16	12	1400	Good	Fair	High	15.0	3.8	Medium (15-40 years)	High	8.2%	No	Minor Impact	Low Impact	Re-classify the ‘structure’ of this tree to ‘poor’, due to a large wound and hollow, combined with a lean on the shoulder trunk.	High	Yes
286	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	7	6	200	Good	Good	Medium	2.4	1.7	Long (>40 years)	High	39.8%	Yes	Major Impact	High Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously	Medium	Yes

Tree	Trees in group	Botanical name	Height (m)	Spread (m)	DBH (mm)	Health	Structure	Landscape significance	TPZ (m)	SRZ (m)	ULE	Retention value	TPZ Encroachment (%)	SRZ Impact	Calculated Impact	Proposed Impact	Observations of the reassessment (Bidwell, 2024)	Proposed Retention Value	Native Species
																	over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.		
287	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	6	5	200	Good	Fair	Medium	2.4	1.7	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.	Medium	Yes
288	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	10	5	150	Good	Good	Medium	2.0	1.5	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.	Medium	Yes
289	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	10	6	200	Good	Good	Medium	2.4	1.7	Long (>40 years)	High	18.1%	Yes	Major Impact	High Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.	Medium	Yes
292	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	8	7	200	Good	Good	Medium	2.4	1.7	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.	Medium	Yes
293	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	6	4	200	Good	Good	Medium	2.4	1.7	Long (>40 years)	High	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.	Medium	Yes
294	1	<i>Acacia decurrens</i>	9	11	250	Good	Fair	Medium	3.0	1.9	Short (5-15 years)	Medium	0%	No	No Impact	No Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	Medium	Yes
295	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	9	5	200	Good	Fair	Medium	2.4	1.7	Long (>40 years)	High	100%	Yes	Major Impact	High Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth. Previously over estimated retention value, revise to medium retention value.	Medium	Yes
298	1	<i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>	30	22	1800	Good	Good	High	15.0	4.2	Long (>40 years)	High	23.5%	No	Major Impact	High Impact	Appears to be in same condition as previous inspection, allowing for natural growth.	High	Yes