

TREE APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

Development Application Number: DA2014/1358

Planner: Tree Officer

Property Address: Lot 14/ Blackbutts Road FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086

Legal Address Lot 1229 DP 752038

Proposal Description: Tree Application

Recommendation: APPROVED with Conditions

Notification Required? No

Applicable Controls: EPA Act 1979, EPA Regulations 2000, WLEP 2011, WDCP

SEPPs: Applicable?: No

REPs: Applicable?: No

LEPs Applicable? Yes

Consideration of Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 (WLEP2011)

1

Land Use Zone Low density

residential

Aims and Objectives consistent with the 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"

WARRINGAH COUNCIL



Consideration of Warringah Development Control Plan (Adopted on 8/6/2010 and effective as of 9/12/2011)

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

| under WLEP 2011: Applicable |
|-----------------------------|
| t Form Controls |

| Recommendations | All recommendations in accordance with the Tree Risk Assessment Report prepared by Perfect Outdoors Pty Ltd dated 25 August 2014 and Duffys Forest Ecological Community Assessment of Significance prepared by Alphitonia Environmental Construction Services dated 23 February 2015. |
|---|--|
| Consideration of Removal of Tree Test (WDCP Appendix 8) | |
| Conclusion | |
| Based on the above matters, the assessment against the Environmental Planning Instrument Provisions, and the Development Control Plan, is the removal / pruning of the Tree Warranted / Justified in the circumstances of the case? | Yes All proposed tree work (tree removal, tree pruning and further testing of trees) to be in accordance with the Tree Risk Assessment Report prepared by Perfect Outdoors Pty Ltd dated 25 August 2014 and Duffys Forest Ecological Community Assessment of Significance prepared by Alphitonia Environmental Construction Services dated 23 February 2015. |



| 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)(ii) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any provisions of any draft environmental planning instrument | N/A |
| Section 79C (1) (a)(iii) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any provisions of any development control plan | Yes |
| Section 79C (1) (a)(iiia) - Have you considered all relevant provisions of any Planning Agreement or Draft Planning Agreement | N/A |
| 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 |
| Section 79C (1) (c) – It the site suitable for the development? | Yes |
| Section 79C (1) (d) – Have you considered any submissions made in accordance with the EPA Act or EPA Regs? | Yes |



Additional Comments:

- Reference is made to Tree Risk Assessment Report prepared by Perfect Outdoors Pty Ltd date 25
 August 2014 and Duffys Forest Ecological Community Assessment of Significance prepared by
 Alphitonia Environmental Construction Services dated 23 February 2015.
- No objections are raised to the proposed development. All tree work (tree removal, tree pruning and further tree testing) to be in accordance with the Tree Risk Assessment Report prepared by Perfect Outdoors Pty Ltd dated 25 August 2014 and Duffys Forest Ecological Community Assessment of Significance prepared by Alphitonia Environmental Construction Services dated 23 February 2015
- 3. Alternative approach for consent With respect to carrying out tree work on the property in the future, as an alternative to submitting a 7 Part Test and relying upon Council to be the consent authority, consent from the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) under the State Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (Part 5 Assessment) may be considered.

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 Warringah'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

Date

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 | 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 | This may require specialist knowledge |
| 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 | 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. 1. Low – defects are minor (eg dieback of twigs, small wounds with good wound wood development) 2. 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) | 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 | |



| Key | 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 | Bs Bus stop Bu Building within 3m HVo High voltage open-wire construction HVb High voltage bundled (ABC) LVo Low voltage open-wire construction LVb Low voltage bundled (ABC) Na No services above Nb No services above ground Si Signage SI Street light T Transmission lines (>33KV) U Underground services O Other | More than one of these may apply |