TREE APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

Application No. DA2009/0345 Proposal Description: Tree Removal X 4 Legal Address: Lot B DP 395193 Property Address: Federal Parade BROOKVALE NSW 2100

Assessment Officer:	Antonio De Abreu
Notification Required?	Yes (14 days) No
Applicable Controls:	EPA Act 1979
	EPA Regulations 2000
	WLEP 2000
	WDCP
SEPPs: Applicable?:	□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}
REPs: Applicable?:	└ _{Yes} ✓ _{No}
LEPs Applicable?	▼ _{Yes} No
WLEP	
Locality:	F4 Brookvale Valley
Category of Development	Category 2 (other works)
Desired Future Character Consideration:	
Is the development considered to be consistent with the Locality's Desired Future Character Statement?	✓ Yes □ No
Built Form Controls: Applicable?	└ _{Yes} ✓ _{No}
General Principles of Development Control (GP's): Applicable?	Yes No
(Relevant GP's are:) CL56	Compliant?
Retaining Unique Environmental Features on Site CL58	Yes No
Protection of Existing Flora CL59	Yes No
Koala Habitat Protection	✓ Yes □ No
CL60	
Watercourses & Aquatic Habitats CL63	Yes 🗖 No
Landscaped Open Space	Ves 🗖 No
Schedules: Applicable?	
	Yes No
Schedule 8 Site analysis	Adequate Detail?
	Ves No

Clause 31 (How can Council make Tree Preservation Orders (TPO)?)

Does the proposed development meet the objectives of the TPO?

✓ Yes , subject to condition [□] No

To use this inspection criteria: Bold highlight denotes code, where there is no bold, check the accompanying notes and use the appropriate code or insert the necessary information.

Information Category	No 1	No 2	No 3
Species	Eucalyptus saligna	Eucalyptus robusta	Casuarina spp
Remnant/Planted/ Self sown	Р	Р	Р
Special significance			
Age class Y/S/M/O	М	Μ	М
Tree height (m)	30	28	23
Average crown diameter (m)	18	19	8
Crown condition 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	5	5	3
Root zone	Ga	Ga	Ga
Defects	-	-	-
Services/adjacent structures	0	0	0
Failure potential 1, 2, 3, 4	1	1	1
Size of defective part 1, 2, 3, 4	1	1	1
Target rating 1, 2, 3, 4	4	4	4
Hazard Rating (-/12)	6	6	6
Recommendations			
Remove Tree	N	N	Y
Pruning	Y	Y	-
Repair/replace surface	-	-	-
Root pruning/root barrier	-	-	-
Replanting required	N	Ν	Y
Other			

Additional Comments: All the trees are approximately 3-5 metres from boundary fence. Tree 2 has been given permission to prune first scaffold in order to maneuver demountable classroom on to oval.

Information Category	No 4
Species	Lophostemon confertus
Remnant/Planted/ Self sown	Р
Special significance	
Age class Y/S/M/O	М
Tree height (m)	15
Average crown diameter (m)	8
Crown condition 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	4
Root zone	Ga
Defects	I
Services/adjacent structures	Nb, T
Failure potential 1, 2, 3, 4	1
Size of defective part 1, 2, 3, 4	1
Target rating 1, 2, 3, 4	4
Hazard Rating (-/12)	6
Recommendations	
Remove Tree	Y
Pruning	-
Repair/replace surface	-
Root pruning/root barrier	-
Replanting required	Y
Other	

Additional Comments:

SECTION 79C EPA ACT 1979

Section 79C (1) (a)(i) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any relevant environmental planning instrument?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (a)(ii) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any provisions of any draft environmental planning instrument	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (a)(iii) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any provisions of any development control plan	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (a)(iiia) - Have you considered all relevant provisions of any Planning Agreement or Draft Planning Agreement	□ _{Yes} □ _{No} ▼ _{N/A}
Section 79C (1) (a)(iv) - Have you considered all relevant provisions of any Regulations?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (b) – Are the likely impacts of the development, including environmental impacts on the natural and built environment and social and economic impacts in the locality acceptable?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (c) – It the site suitable for the development?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (d) – Have you considered any submissions made in accordance with the EPA Act or EPA Regs?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (e) – Is the proposal in the public interest?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}

APPLICATION DETERMINATION

Conclusion:

The proposal has been considered against the relevant heads of consideration under S79C of the EPA Act 1979 and the proposed development is considered to be:

Yes, subject to condition

Unsatisfactory

Recommendation:

That Council as the consent authority

 \checkmark

 \Box

GRANT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT to the development application subject to:

- (a) the conditions detailed within the associated notice of determination; and
- (b) the consent lapsing within three (3) years from operation.

REFUSE development consent to the development application subject to:

(a) the reasons detailed within the associated notice of determination.

The application is determined under the delegated authority of:

Antonio De Abreu

Signed

Date

Tree Assessment Officer