TREE APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

Application No. DA2009/1166

Proposal Description: Removal of 3 trees & Pruning of 1 tree

Legal Address: Lot 1 DP 774980

Property Address: Lot 1/ Veterans Parade WHEELER HEIGHTS NSW 2097

| Assessment Officer: | Jason Goldstein |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Notification Required? | Yes (14 days) No |
| Applicable Controls: | EPA Act 1979 |
| | EPA Regulations 2000 |
| | WLEP 2000 |
| | ₩DCP |
| SEPPs: Applicable?: | □ _{Yes} ▼ _{No} |
| REPs: Applicable?: | Yes No |
| LEPs Applicable? | Yes No |
| WLEP | |
| Locality: | B6 War Veterans |
| 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:) | Compliant? |
| CL56 Retaining Unique Environmental Features on Site CL58 | Yes No |
| Protection of Existing Flora CL59 | Yes No |
| Koala Habitat Protection CL60 | Yes No |
| Watercourses & Aquatic Habitats | Yes No |
| CL63 | Yes No |
| Landscaped Open Space | Yes No |
| Schedules: Applicable? | Yes No |
| Schedule 8 Site analysis | Adequate Detail? |
| | Yes 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 | No 4 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Species | Callistemon Sp | Eucalyptus haemastoma | Casuarina Sp | Eucalyptus microcorys |
| Remnant/Planted/ Self sown | Р | Р | Р | Р |
| Special significance | | | | |
| Age class Y/S/M/O | М | М | M | 0 |
| Tree height (m) | 6 | 15 | 15 | 10 |
| Average crown diameter (m) | 6 | 10 | 4 | 8 |
| Crown condition 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Root zone | Ga, K, Pa | Gr | Ga, K, Pa | Ga |
| Defects | | D, F | | |
| Services/adjacent structures | | | Bu | |
| Failure potential 1, 2, 3, 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Size of defective part 1, 2, 3, 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Target rating 1, 2, 3, 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Hazard Rating (-/12) | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Recommendations | | | | |
| Remove Tree | Υ | N | Υ | Υ |
| Pruning | | Υ | | |
| Repair/replace surface | | | | |
| Root pruning/root barrier | | | | |
| Replanting required | Υ | | Y | Υ |
| Other | | | | |

Additional Comments: Tree 4 is an addition tree that was included on the application at time of inspection.

| SECTION 79C EPA ACT 1979 | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section 79C (1) (a)(i) – Have you considered a planning instrument? | all relevant provisions of any rele | evant environmental | Yes No |
| Section 79C (1) (a)(ii) – Have you considered environmental planning instrument | all relevant provisions of any pro | visions of any draft | Yes No |
| Section 79C (1) (a)(iii) – Have you considered development control plan | all relevant provisions of any pro | ovisions of any | Ves □ No |
| Section 79C (1) (a)(iiia) - Have you considered Draft Planning Agreement | d all relevant provisions of any P | lanning Agreement or | Yes No N/A |
| Section 79C (1) (a)(iv) - Have you considered | all relevant provisions of any Re | gulations? | Yes No |
| Section 79C (1) (b) – Are the likely impacts of the natural and built environment and social a | the development, including envir and economic impacts in the local | ronmental impacts on lity acceptable? | Yes No |
| Section 79C (1) (c) – It the site suitable for the | development? | | Yes No |
| Section 79C (1) (d) – Have you considered an EPA Regs? | y submissions made in accordar | nce with the EPA Act or | Yes No |
| Section 79C (1) (e) – Is the proposal in the pu | blic interest? | | Yes No |
| APPLICATION DETERMINATION | | | |
| Conclusion: | | | |
| The proposal has been considered again proposed development is considered to be | | sideration under S79C | of the EPA Act 1979 and the |
| Yes, subject to condition | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | |
| That Council as the consent authority | | | |
| GRANT DEVELOPMENT CONSI | ENT to the development appl | ication subject to: | |
| (a) the conditions detailed with(b) the consent lapsing within t | | | |
| REFUSE development consent | to the development application | on subject to: | |
| (a) the reasons detailed within | the associated notice of dete | ermination. | |
| "I am aware of Warringah's Code of Con- | duct and, in signing this repo | rt, declare that I do not | have a Conflict of Interest" |
| The application is determined under the | delegated authority of: | | |
| | | | |
| Jason Goldstein | Signed | Date | |

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 |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Tree No. | Must relate to the number on your site diagram |
| Species | May be coded – include a key to the codes; botanical names and common names in key. (eg Lc = Lophostemon confertus Brush Box) |
| Remnant/ Planted / Self sown | Self explanatory; of use when negotiating cost sharing for line clearing operations |
| Special Significance | A Aboriginal C Commemorative Ha Habitat Hi Historic M Memorial R Rare U Unique form O Other |
| Age Class | Y Young = recently planted S Semi mature (<20% of life expectancy) M Mature (20-80% of life expectancy) O Over-mature (>80% of life expectancy) |
| Height | In metres |
| Spread | Average diameter of canopy in metres |
| Crown condition | Overall vigour and vitality 0 Dead 1 Severe decline (<20% canopy; major dead wood 2 Declining (20-60% canopy density; twig and branch dieback) 3 Average/low vigour (60-90% canopy density; twig dieback) 4 Good (90-100% crown cover; little or no dieback or other problems 5 Excellent (100% crown cover, no deadwood or other problems) |

| Key | Criteria |
|----------------------------|--|
| 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) |
| | 3. High – numerous and/or significant defects present (eg cavity encompassing 30-50% of the circumference of the trunk, major bark inclusions) |
| | 4. Severe – defects are very severe (eg heart rot fruiting bodies, cavity encompassing more than 50% of the trunk) |
| 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. |
| | 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 |
| Target Rating* | Rates the use and occupancy of the area that would be struck by the defective part. |
| | 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. |
| | (NOTE: 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.) |