

TREE APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

| Development Application Number: | DA2016/0965 | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Property Address: | 10 Coramba Street NORTH BALGOWLAH | |
| Legal Address | Lot 70 DP 11915 | |
| Proposal Description: | Tree Application | |
| Recommendation: | APPROVED with Conditions | |
| Notification Required? | No | |
| Applicable Controls: | EPA Act 1979, EPA Regulations 2000, WLEP 2011, V | VDCP |
| SEPPs: Applicable?: | No | |
| REPs: Applicable?: | No | |
| LEPs Applicable? | Yes | |
| Consideration of Warringah Local Env | rironmental Plan 2011 (WLEP2011) | |
| Land Use Zone | | Low density residential |
| Aims and Objectives consistent with t | he zone objectives | Yes |
| WLEP 2011 Permissible or Prohibited | Land Use | Permissible |
| Does the proposed development meet | the objectives of CL 5.9 WLEP 2011 "Preservation | Yes |

of Trees or Vegetation"

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

| Information Category | No.1 | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Species | Ulmus glabra | | |
| Remnant/Planted/ Self sown | ď | | |
| Special significance | | | |
| Age class Y/S/M/O | Σ | | |
| Tree height (m) | 0 | | |
| Average crown diameter (m) | 15 | | |
| Crown condition 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | Not in full leaf | | |
| Root zone | Ga | | |
| Defects | | | |
| Services/adjacent structures | ГVо | | |
| Failure potential 1, 2, 3, 4 | - | | |
| Size of defective part 1, 2, 3, 4 | - | | |
| Target rating 1, 2, 3, 4 | 3 | | |
| Hazard Rating (-/12) | 5 | | |

| Recommendations | No. 1 | |
|---------------------------|-------|--|
| Remove Tree | | |
| Pruning | ۲ | |
| Root pruning/root barrier | | |
| Replanting required | | |
| Other | | |

Consistent consideration of Warringah Development Control Plan 2011

| Report Section | Applicable – Yes or No |
|--|---------------------------|
| D1 - Landscaped Open Space and Bushland Setting | No |
| E1 - Private Property Tree Management | Yes |
| E2 - Prescribed Vegetation | Q |
| E3 - <u>Threatened species, populations, ecological communities listed under State or</u> <u>Commonwealth legislation, or High Conservation Habitat</u> | Yes |
| E6 - Retaining Unique Environmental Features on Site | No |
| E8 - Waterways and Riparian Lands | Yes |

| Consideration of Removal of Tree Test (WDCP Appendix 8) | Tree No.1 | | |
|--|-----------|--|--|
| Does the tree pose an unacceptable risk that cannot be adequately or appropriately managed by arboricultural treatment or other risk management measures? | ov | | |
| Is the tree in a diseased condition that cannot be corrected by pruning or other arboricultural treatment? And all possible options for managing the diseased condition have been considered prior to issuing consent for the removal of a tree. | 0 V | | |
| The remaining life expectancy of the tree has been identified to be less than 5 years therefore consent for the removal of the tree is justified subject to replacement planting. | oN | | |
| Is the tree likely to succumb to major injury as a result of public infrastructure work where all alternatives such as relocation or reconfiguration of the works have been considered? | No | | |
| Is the tree significantly affecting public or private property by way of its presence/location or growth? | No | | |
| Have all abatement options been considered and removal of the tree is the only option to avoid further conflict. | No | | |
| Is the tree likely to succumb to major injury as a result of public infrastructure work where all alternatives such as relocation or reconfiguration of the works have been considered? | N | | |
| Is the tree located in an area required for a Proposed Driveway Crossings, Private Structures or Works affecting Public Land? | Νο | | |
| Is Council satisfied that the proposal would maximize public benefit, that there is no reasonable alternative to removing the tree, and would not have any adverse heritage, pedestrian, streetscape or traffic impacts. | 0 Z | | |

| Consideration of Removal of Tree Test (WDCP Appendix 8) | Tree No.1 | | |
|---|-----------|--|--|
| Consideration of Tree Retention Assessment (WDCP Appendix 9) | Tree No.1 | | |
| Tree Retention Assessment: Applicable? | No | | |
| Is Council satisfied that the balance between economic imperatives of land development and the preservation of natural features is achieved? | Yes | | |
| Conclusion | Tree No.1 | | |
| Based on the above matters, the assessment against the Environmental Planning Instrument Provisions, and the Development Control Plan, is the removal of the Tree Warranted / Justified in the circumstances of the case? | No | | |

Section 79C Act 1979

| Section 79C (1) (a)(i) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any relevant environmental planning instrument? | Yes |
|---|-----|
| Section 79C (1) (a)(iii) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any provisions of any development control plan | Yes |
| Section 79C (1) (a)(iv) - Have you considered all relevant provisions of any Regulations? | Yes |
| 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 |

Additional Comments:

Tree 2, a Lagerstroemia indica was within 3 metres of the adjoining building and so under the WDCP 2011, Council approval is not required for the removal of a tree within 3 metres of a Building or a Structure.

APPLICATION DETERMINATION

Conclusion:

The proposal has been assessed against the relevant matters for consideration under Section 79C of the EP&A Act 1979. This assessment has taken into consideration the submitted plans, Statement of Environmental Effects, all other documentation supporting the application and public submissions, and does not result in any unreasonable impacts on surrounding, adjoining, adjacent and nearby properties subject to the conditions contained within the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVAL with Conditions

That Council as the consent authority:

GRANT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT to the development application subject to:

The conditions detailed within the associated notice of determination; and

"I am aware of Council's Code of Conduct and, in signing this report, declare that I do not have a Conflict of Interest"

The application is determined under the delegated authority of:

Signed

Tree Assessment Officer

Explanatory Criteria for Tree Inspection Schedule within Assessment Report

Note: The detail below is general and is provided in good faith as a guide to assist persons reviewing the assessment report understand and interpret the assessment and a determination which may include the removal of a tree outside the criteria set can be for reasons beyond technical consideration and can be based on the expertise of the Council Officer conducting the assessment. If you require clarification or have any questions, please contact Council's Planning and Development Tree Assessment Officer.

| Key | Criteria | Comments |
|---|--|--|
| Tree No. | Must relate to the number on your site diagram | |
| Species Remnant/ Planted / Self sown | May be coded – include a key to the codes; botanical names and common names in key. (eg Lc = Lophostemon confertus Brush Box) Self explanatory; of use when negotiating cost sharing for line clearing operations | |
| Special Significance | AAboriginalCCommemorativeHaHabitatHiHistoricMMemorialRRareUUnique formOOther | This may require specialist knowledge |
| Age Class | YYoung = recently plantedSSemi mature (<20% of life expectancy) | |
| Height | In metres | |
| Spread | Average diameter of canopy in metres | |
| Crown condition | Overall vigour and vitality Dead Severe decline (<20% canopy; major dead wood Declining (20-60% canopy density; twig and branch dieback) Average/low vigour (60-90% canopy density; twig dieback) Good (90-100% crown cover; little or no dieback or other problems Excellent (100% crown cover, no deadwood or other problems) | This requires knowledge of species |
| Failure Potential | Identifies the most likely failure and rates the likelihood that the structural defect(s) will result in failure within the inspection period. Low – defects are minor (eg dieback of twigs, small wounds with good wound wood development) Medium – defects are present and obvious (eg cavity encompassing 10-25% of the circumference of the trunk) High – numerous and/or significant defects present (eg cavity encompassing 30-50% of the circumference of the trunk, major bark inclusions) Severe – defects are very severe (eg heart rot fruiting bodies, cavity encompassing more than 50% of the trunk) | This requires specialist knowledge |
| Size of Defective Plant | Rates the size of the part most likely to fail. The larger the part that fails, the greater the potential for damage. 1. Most likely failure less than 150mm in diameter 2. Most likely failure 150-450mm in diameter 3. Most likely failure 450-750mm in diameter 4. Most likely failure more than 750mm in diameter | |

| Кеу | Criteria | Comments |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Target Rating* | Rates the use and occupancy of the area that would be struck by the defective part. 1. Occasional use (eg jogging/cycle track) 2. Intermittent use (picnic area, day use parking) 3. Frequent use, secondary structure (eg seasonal camping area, storage facilities) 4. Constant use, structures (eg year-round use for a number of hours each day, residences) | |
| Hazard Rating* | Failure potential + size of part + target rating. Add each of the above sections for a number out of 12. | The final number identifies the degree of risk. The next step is to determine a management strategy. A rating in this column does not condemn a tree but may indicate the need for more investigation and a risk management strategy. |
| Root Zone | C Compaction D Damaged / wounded roots (eg by mowers E Exposed Roots Ga Trees in Garden Bed Gi Girdled Roots Gr Grass K Kerb close to tree L+ Raised soil level L - Lowered soil level M Mulched Pa Paving / concrete / bitumen Pr Roots pruned O Other | More than one of these may apply |
| Defects | B Borers C Cavity D Decay PF Previous Failures I Inclusions L Lopped M Mistletoe / Parasites S Splits / cracks T Termites F Fungi E Epicormics MD Mechanical Damage O Other | More than one of these may apply |
| Services / adjacent structures | BsBus stopBuBuilding within 3mHVoHigh voltage open-wire constructionHVbHigh voltage bundled (ABC)LVoLow voltage open-wire constructionLVbLow voltage bundled (ABC)NaNo services aboveNbNo services above groundSiSignageSIStreet lightTTransmission lines (>33KV)UUnderground servicesOOther | More than one of these may apply |