

Our Ref: 3521

02 March 2020

Attn: Oliver He
Hammond Care
Level 2 447 Kent Street,
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Oliver

As discussed, in regard to queries from Department of Primary Industry and Environment, the tree assessment in our Arboricultural Impact Assessment is based on an arboricultural assessment which does consider health and structural integrity of individual trees and may include contextual element(s) of assessment if streetscape, or screening or landscape amenity are additional factors.

In regard to tree specimens which may have local or regional weed status under the Biosecurity Act, there are some reasons why they may still be recommended for retention. The reasons why are noted against individual tree descriptions in the report.

As a further general comment using Camphor Laurel as an example, the management of these trees varies widely across different Local Government Areas in Sydney. For example, in The Inner West Council Area Camphor Laurels represent a percentage of the streetscape contributing to a low urban forest canopy percentage so their automatic removal based on weed status is not guaranteed.

Specifically, a review of our assessment follows:

Camphor Laurels on site: to be removed Tree (T) 8 impacting adjacent native fig, T32 small diameter low landscape amenity, T146 situated in location not prominent in landscape, T191 poor structural integrity, T192 & T248 poor form.

Camphor Laurels currently proposed for retention: T1 large diameter prominent in streetscape, T60 is mentioned but is *Angophora costata*, T61 moderate size in landscape and T67 & T68 provides screening to private property to south of site, T252 moderate size in landscape.

Chinese Tallow on site: T158 provides screening to site and T201 landscape amenity

Celtis: T112 and t147B some streetscape contribution

Indian Hawthorn: T239 is council managed tree and not located on site.

In summary, we are not opposing the proposal to remove weed species from the or adjacent to the site. We are however briefed to cover the other factors as described above as part of our assessment process. As the assessment of the proposal is merit based, if the perceived loss of screening, streetscape contribution or landscape amenity is considered to be able to be offset by replacement planting as the potential weed spread from those weed species is considered a higher priority; we can amend our report accordingly.

If you require any further information regarding the above, please contact the office.

Kind Regards



Craig Martin
Senior Associate

Post Grad Cert Wildlife Habitat Management (AQF8) 2006.
Diploma of Horticulture – Arboriculture; (AQF5) 2001,
Horticulture Certificate; (AQF4)1988

DISCLAIMER

The author and Redgum Horticultural take no responsibility for actions taken and their consequences, contrary to those expert and professional instructions given as recommendations pertaining to safety by way of exercising our responsibility to our client and the public as our duty of care commitment, to mitigate or prevent hazards from arising, from a failure moment in full or part, from a structurally deficient or unsound tree or a tree likely to be rendered thus by its retention and subsequent modification/s to its growing environment either above or below ground contrary to our advice.