

4 July 2022

## Response to Additional Information Request - SSD-8903-MOD 4

| Company Name  | Department of Planning and Environment            |
|---------------|---|
| Attn:         | Lucinda Craig                                     |
| Date:         | 4 July 2022                                       |
| Re:           | Response to additional information request        |
| Project Name: | Ivanhoe Estate Stage 1 SS DA – MOD 4 Tree Removal |

Dear Lucinda,

As detailed within the Modification Application, an additional 7 trees are required to be removed to provide for the connection to Lyonpark Road approved as part of the Concept Masterplan and Stage 1 SSDA. The trees are located more than 2m above the proposed works footprint, however detailed design has revealed that excavation of the embankment adjacent to the crib wall is required to a depth of approximately 3m, which will result in significant impacts to the structural root zone of these trees. The trees have also grown over the crib wall and into the embankment within the Ivanhoe Estate site, compounding the impacts of the works required to deliver the new access to Lyonpark Road.

In response to the matters raised by the City of Ryde and the Environment and Heritage Group Advice, the following is provided:

## City of Ryde

- Existing condition B45 requires a construction soil and water management plan be prepared to manage soil and water impacts during construction. We understand the Council's concern regarding the stabilisation of the site and will ensure that the area is suitably stabilised during and post works. We understand existing condition B45 requires the same, and the proposal requires significant planting within the Shrimpton's Creek corridor more generally. We do not believe that further condition is required in this regard, however should the Department wish to clarify the stabilisation of this embankment in particular, no objection would be raised to an additional condition to clarify the matter.
- Further native vegetation is to be planted across the site with each progressive stage of the project, in accordance with condition B29 of the Concept Approval consent and the use of local provenance species in accordance with condition B47. The replacement ratio remains greater than 1:1 across the site, and therefore a further condition is not required.
- The works have been designed to comply with the requirements noted by Ryde City Council regarding the retaining wall being located entirely within private land. Notwithstanding this, Frasers Property Australia accept the prior to Construction Certificate and Prior to Occupation or commencement of use conditions as recommended by Ryde City Council.

## **Environment and Heritage Group**

- The Concept Development Application was submitted prior to a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) being required. A biodiversity assessment under the framework at the time of the lodgement of the Concept Development Application was undertaken and provided as part of that assessment. A BDAR has not been provided with this modification application as the removal of the seven trees will not result in a significant impact on biodiversity. This is supported by the assessment by Eco Logical provided at **Attachment A**, with following extract below.

The original biodiversity assessment for the Concept approval (SSD 8707) mapped this stand of trees as low condition Plant Community Type ME041 which included other native planted trees throughout the existing development. Ficus do not form part of this community, however the methodology (Framework for Biodiversity Assessment, OEH, 2014)) required allocation to a plant community type. Approximately 1.1 ha of this vegetation unit was approved to be removed. The proposed modification would result in an additional 0.05 ha (approx.) of removal, which is an increase of 5% of this vegetation zone. The removal of the 1.1 hectares did not require offsetting due to the poor condition of planted vegetation. Since the three exotic ficus dominate this particular area, the biodiversity loss would be negligible and should also not require offsetting.

The removal of the seven trees would not have a significant impact on biodiversity values and would not require offsetting under the original Framework for Biodiversity Assessment. Nor would it require offsetting under the new Biodiversity Assessment Method as they are planted vegetation.

- Trees were considered to have high retention value in the original Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) generally due to their environmental, cultural, physical and social values. In the case of Trees 936, 1016 and 1017, they were given a high retention value by the arborist due to the size and health of the trees. The high retention value noted within the submitted AIA does not relate to biodiversity values.
- Ecologists have been to site and confirmed that the subject trees do not contain nests, dreys or hollows. The presence of nests, dreys and hollows is also addressed as part of the endorsed Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) under Condition B47 of the Stage I consent. This BMP includes processes for the pre-clearance survey of vegetation and the replacement of removed hollows, as well as a Vegetation Management Plan for the long term management of vegetation, the use of local provenance species and monitoring and maintenance periods. The existing consent, therefore, has an appropriate framework in place for determining whether the trees contains nests, dreys, hollows etc, and providing compensatory hollows, in accordance with the Environment and Heritage Group's recommendations. A further condition of consent to this effect is not required.
- The subject trees do not contain hollows as noted above and therefore the use of these trees within the riparian area is not required.
- Further native vegetation is to be planted across the site with each progressive stage of the project, in accordance with condition A17 of the Concept Approval consent. The replacement ratio remains greater than 1:1 across the site, and therefore a further condition is not required.

We trust the above provides the Department of Planning an Environment sufficient information to finalise the assessment of the modification.

Yours sincerely,

**Jessica Saunders**Principal Planner