

TREE APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

Application No. DA2009/1181

Proposal Description: Removal of 1 tree

Legal Address: Lot 19 DP 231693

Property Address: 20 Roselands Avenue FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086

Assessment Officer:	Jason Goldstein
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:	C1 Middle Harbour Suburbs
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 Retaining Unique Environmental Features on Site CL58 Protection of Existing Flora CL59 Koala Habitat Protection CL60 Watercourses & Aquatic Habitats CL63 Landscaped Open Space	Compliant? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ 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
Species	Melaleuca linearfolia
Remnant/Planted/ Self sown	P
Special significance	
Age class Y/S/M/O	O
Tree height (m)	10
Average crown diameter (m)	6
Crown condition 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3
Root zone	Ga
Defects	
Services/adjacent structures	Bu
Failure potential 1, 2, 3, 4	1
Size of defective part 1, 2, 3, 4	1
Target rating 1, 2, 3, 4	2
Hazard Rating (-/12)	4
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)(iia) – 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) – Is 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**

- ☒ **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.

“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:

Jason Goldstein

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
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. 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)
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
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. (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.)