

27 October 2025



SUMMITCARE

c/o Centurion Project Management – Robert Poon
Level 25, 88 Phillip St,
Sydney, NSW 2000

ARBORICULTURAL RESPONSE – SUMMITCARE JAMISONTOWN

Dear Robert

We refer to your recent email and the feedback and comments that have been received from DPHI regarding Tree Retention. The comments are reproduced below for completeness and clarity.

Trees at the north-western corner of the site should be prioritised for retention (i.e. T66, T67, T68, T69, T70 and T79). Only T66 is proposed to be retained, however these trees have established as a group of trees (excluding T79) and should be retained as such. The trees have intertwined canopies and root systems which will be damaged in the removal of individual trees, affecting the long-term health of the only tree proposed to be retained (T66).

These established trees provide high landscape value and reduces the impact of urban heat. The trees also provide a green buffer to the proposed built form.

Additional tree retention will require appropriate building, basement and infrastructure (stormwater, paving, etc) setbacks from the trees, as well as tree protection measures during demolition and construction works to ensure the trees can be retained in good health.

We provide the following comments and observations with regard to the above given feedback.

1. We acknowledge and agree with the comments that the trees noted have grown as a group and that they do currently provide worthwhile screening and urban canopy. However, given their current forms and the species we refute that they should be considered as 'high' value trees. They are certainly 'moderate' value trees and their retention values were noted accordingly and were conveyed to the overall design team very early in the design process. Throughout all initial discussions with authorities, the client, and others, the trees currently shown to be removed have been noted as moderate retention value trees. They have also been shown as requiring removal given the current designs.
2. T66 was identified as one of the only trees in the group that could be successfully retained with minimal impacts from the removal of the other trees, given its current canopy form and position on the site. Its retention was also achievable given the desired and proposed building design and the proposed site disturbances, as presented to Arterra. As the comments point out, many of the trees have grown intertwined with each other.
3. To successfully retain more of the trees would necessitate the retention of most, if not all the trees within this north-western group, given their intergrown nature. We concur with the comments on this point. However, given the size of the trees, (particularly 67 and 69 (*Populus deltoides*)) and their required TPZ radius and their overhead canopy spreads, retaining the trees would have a great impact on the location and extent of both the building and basement locations and would require substantial re-design to now accommodate their retention. That re-design, if undertaken, would need to involve consideration of both the above ground and below ground components of the trees.
4. The retention of T79 (*Schinus areira*), as suggested in the comment, was always considered highly problematic given the tree's large trunk diameter and its resultant extremely large nominal TPZ. It is also located on the crest of a distinct level change along this frontage which would prove highly problematic to the achievement of the various levels required for access to the building and the

basement and driveway. Its retention was therefore considered impractical, given the large area of the site that would largely be rendered undevelopable if it was retained. As outlined in the arboricultural impact assessment, the removal of trees has not been taken lightly, however the tree related constraints have to be weighed up against many other relevant development opportunities and constraints. The retention of the trees on the site must also consider economic, social, environmental, construction and practical realities.

5. From very early during the site planning and building design the difficulty of retaining the trees noted in the above comments was acknowledged and discussed, however it was determined by the wider project team that other urban design, engineering and architectural requirements were needed to be accommodated ahead of the retention of the trees noted. T66 was recognized as being one of the only trees capable of being successfully retained in this area of the site given these other requirements.
6. In our professional experience, we refute the comment that removing the other trees is not possible without injuring T66. It is very common on similar development sites to remove trees that are in close proximity to other trees to be retained. With appropriate techniques and oversight the other trees in our opinion could be removed while still retaining T66 with minimal impacts. The other trees can be removed without injury to the remaining tree (T66) due to its position on the northern end of the row and its lower and more spreading canopy.
7. The existing trees are exotic and deciduous species and, on balance, it was considered appropriate to remove most of these trees to achieve the required built forms and then ultimately replace them with new evergreen trees that can provide improved screening and longevity, particularly along this western aspect. The new trees could also be positioned and spaced to achieve ultimately desirable and suitable forms and within improved soil and overall growing conditions.
8. Based on the issues noted above, retention all of the trees, as suggested, would require a very fundamental change in the currently designed building envelope and site servicing strategies and can't be easily achieved through minor changes.
9. The removal of the trees on the site has been well compensated through the proposed landscape design and the specification of a diverse selection of additional trees that respond to the new building designs and are of more appropriate and climate adaptive species. Many of the new trees, particularly in the street frontages are also Australian native trees. The sites existing canopy cover is proposed to be increased from a modest 14% to a 'best practice' target of greater than 30%.

We trust that these responses help to address the comments and issues that have been raised.

Regards



Robert Smart AAILA, ISA, AA, IACA

Director / Registered Landscape Architect (054) / Registered Consulting Arborist (1804)

rsmart@arterra.com.au