

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Prepared For: Grand Noble Project 1 Pty Ltd
Site Address: 11-23 Rangers Ave,
MOSMAN, NSW, 2066

Inspection Dates: 7th March 2025
Report Date: 5th November 2025



Figure 1: An aerial image of the site.

Prepared by Gordon Blues
Diploma (Arboriculture) AQF5
0439 991122
GORDON@BLUESBROS.COM.AU



1	Contents	
1	Executive Summary.....	1
2	Introduction	2
2.1	Background	2
2.2	Definitions & Abbreviations:.....	4
2.3	Change log:.....	5
2.4	Disclaimers & Disclosures:	5
3	Methodology.....	6
3.1	Visual Tree Assessment.....	6
4	Results.....	7
4.1	Desktop Research	7
4.2	The Site.....	8
5	Proposed Development:	9
5.2	Residential Flat Building (RFB):	9
5.3	Driveway, Crossover & Layback:	9
5.4	Landscaping and Civil Works:.....	9
5.5	The Trees.....	10
6	Construction Impacts:	12
7	Conclusion.....	13
7.2	Review of Council Policy:	13
8	Recommendations:	14
8.1	Trees for removal	14
8.2	Trees for retention:.....	14
8.3	Construction Recommendations:	14
	Appendix 1 – Tree Data Summary	15
	Appendix 2 - Tree identification and incursion potentials.....	16
	Appendix 3 – Photographs.....	17
	About the Author	27



1 Executive Summary

- 1.1.1 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) has been prepared by Blues Brothers Arboriculture to accompany a State Significant Development Application (SSDA) for the residential development at 11 -23 Rangers Avenue, Mosman. The site is made up of seven lots. The legal description of the site is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1 Legal Description

Property Address	Title Description
11 Rangers Avenue	Lot 42/DP2509
13 Rangers Avenue	Lot 41/DP2509
15 Rangers Avenue	Lot 2/DP748842
17 Rangers Avenue	Lot 1/DP748842
19 Rangers Avenue	Lot 39/DP2509
21 Rangers Avenue	Lot 38/DP2509
23 Rangers Avenue	Lot 37/DP2509
Total site area	3,594m ²

- 1.1.2 This report has been prepared to address the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (**SEARs**) issued for the project (**SSD-96272465**).
- 1.1.3 This report concludes that the proposed residential development is suitable and warrants approval. There are no applicable mitigation measures suitable for the site as all of the relevant trees exist within the proposed construction footprint.



2 Introduction

2.1 Background

2.1.1 Blues Brothers Arboriculture has been engaged by the developer to inspect and report on trees for development purposes.

The construction of a residential flat building is proposed by SSDA.

2.1.2 The scope of works includes the assessment or identification of twenty-one (21) trees located within the immediate vicinity of proposed development.

2.1.3 Information supplied and relied upon in the preparation of this report included:

- Detail Survey produced by LTS Lockley; Reference 52571 001DT, Revision C, Dated 11/08/2025.
- Architectural suite of plans produced by Woods Baggott; Concept Issue, Received 4/10/2025, inclusive:
 - Site Plan,
 - Floor Plans,
 - Elevations,
 - Sections, and
 - Details.
- Before You Dig Australia (BYDA); Job 51412720, Requested 13/10/2025.
- Planning portal property report, Accessed 10/03/2025.

2.1.4 The use of these documents / sources is acknowledged with thanks.

2.1.5 The NSW Rural Fire Service online tool for determining eligibility under the '10/50' legislation was interrogated for the purposes of this report.

As at the date of this report, the property is not eligible to use the code of practice; clearing provisions do not apply to the property.



2.1.6 This report has been prepared in response to the requirements contained within the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) dated 14/10/2025 and issued for the SSDA (SSD-96272465). Specifically, this report has been prepared to respond to the SEARs requirement issued below.

Table 2 SEARs Requirements Item	Description of Requirement	Section Reference (this Report)
14. Trees and Landscaping	If the proposal involves impacts to trees, provide an Arboricultural Impact Assessment that assesses the number, location, condition and significance of trees to be removed and retained including • any existing canopy coverage to be retained on-site. • tree root mapping. if the proposal involves significant impacts to tree- protection zones of retained trees identified as being significant	Section 6

2.2 Definitions & Abbreviations:

- 2.2.1 **The Standard** refers to the Australian Standard AS4970:2025 – *Protection of trees on development sites*.
- 2.2.2 **The site** refers to the land within the vicinity of the proposed development.
- 2.2.3 An **Exempt Tree** is a tree that that does not meet Council's definition of a protected tree.
- 2.2.4 **A significant root** is defined as any woody root with a diameter of 30mm or larger.
- 2.2.5 **AGL** – Above Ground Level
- 2.2.6 **LGA** – Local Government Area.
- 2.2.7 **DSH** – Diameter at Standard Height; Approximately 1.4 metres above ground level measured in metres.
- 2.2.8 **DGL** – Diameter at Ground Level; Measured above the root flare / collar measured in metres.
- 2.2.9 **NRZ** – Notional Root Zone. Calculated per the standard:
$$NRZradius = 12 \times DSH$$

The NRZ should not be smaller than 2m, nor greater than 15m
- 2.2.10 **SRZ** – Structural Root Zone. Calculated per the standard:
$$SRZradius = (DGL \times 50)^{0.42} \times 0.64$$
- 2.2.11 **FFL**- Finished Floor Level.
- 2.2.12 **RL** – Reduced Level.
- 2.2.13 **SEPP** – State Environmental Planning Policy.
- 2.2.14 **BYDA** – Before You Dig Australia – Formerly DBYD
- 2.2.15 **FRP** – Fibre-reinforced Plastic. A commonly used engineered surface for boardwalks.
- 2.2.16 **RTK-GPS** – Real-Time-Kinematic Global Positioning Satellite. A 'corrected', survey grade spatial positioning system capable of providing centimetre level positional data.
- 2.2.17 **RPAS** – Remote Piloted Aerial System – Commonly known as a drone.
- 2.2.18 **NBR** – Neighbour or Neighbouring [with reference to property boundaries and tree ownership]



2.3 Change log:

2.3.1 Version 1 – Original.

2.4 Disclaimers & Disclosures:

- 2.4.1 This report is considered limited to what could reasonably be seen from ground level only and expresses no commentary on changes which may have, or will, impact the trees or their environment outside the scope of works.
- 2.4.2 The Arborist discloses they hold no conflicts of interest in the property, with the client, or interests otherwise with exception of that essential for the preparation of an unbiased opinion relating to the assessed trees.
- 2.4.3 The Arborist discloses this report has been prepared without the use of Generative AI in accordance with published Practice Notes from the NSW Land and Environment Court.

3 Methodology

3.1 Visual Tree Assessment

- 3.1.1 The trees were visually inspected from ground level only in accordance with VTA (Visual Tree Assessment); a methodology derived by Mattheck and Breloer (1994).
- 3.1.2 Canopy Assessment included foliage condition (volume and colour); the presence of pests and diseases, dieback, deadwood and epicormic growth.
- 3.1.3 Tree condition included assessment of structural stability, previous pruning and any damage/disturbance which may have occurred.
- 3.1.4 No destructive or aerial investigations occurred to any tree.
- 3.1.5 Accessible hollows, where found or suspected, were probed to ascertain their size and extent to assist in calculating ratios of notional cavity size and useful life expectancy.
- 3.1.6 In the absence of a detail survey at the time of assessment, the Arborist utilised RTK-GPS apparatus for the purposes of collecting attributed spatial data for the trees. This is later validated by the survey except for trees with an * designation.

The Arborist is not a registered surveyor. Spatial information in this report is subject to confirmation by a Registered Surveyor.
- 3.1.7 An existing tree numbering schedule was not found on any of the supplied documents. Tree numbers referenced in this report are based on spatial points of the Arborist's geo-located observations.

Tree tagging did not occur.
- 3.1.8 Access to neighbouring properties, was not obtained as part of the scope of works other than ungated, publicly accessible lands.
- 3.1.9 Tree data is displayed in Appendix 1.
- 3.1.10 Appendix 2 – Arboricultural mark-up including Tree identification, TPZ and SRZ zones and the degree of encroachment proposed by the development.
- 3.1.11 Tree height and canopy width were estimated with the assistance of a Leica Disto X4 (Laser Distometer).
- 3.1.12 A forestry Diameter tape was utilised in the measuring of trunk diameters of high significance trees.
- 3.1.13 Tree significance ratings were assessed using a the IACA STARS methodology for assessing tree significance & retention values¹.

¹ IACA, 2010, *IACA Significance of a Tree, Assessment Rating System (STARS)*, Institute of Australian Consulting Arboriculturists, Australia, www.iaca.org.au

4 Results

4.1 Desktop Research

4.1.1 Research from the NSW Planning portal revealed the following information for the properties:

- Zoning:
 - R3 – Medium Density Residential
- Scenic Protection Land
- Low & Mid-rise Housing Policy eligible land.²

4.1.2 Published directives of Mosman Council indicate a reliance on the State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021 applies for the management of pruning & removal of trees on private land³. As such, a protected tree is as follows:

- All trees which:
 - are 5m or more in height; or
 - have a circumference of 450mm or more measured 300mm above ground level; or
 - are listed on Council's Urban Forest Management Register; or
 - are 2m or more in height, only if located in a heritage conservation area, or if are a heritage item or form part of a heritage item.
- Tree ferns (*Cyathea australis* & *Cyathea cooperi*) which are 2m or more in height.

4.1.3 None of the assessed trees were located on Councils Significant tree register, Natural Heritage Register or listed under the Threatened species conservation Act 1995.

4.1.4 Interpretation of DBYD data indicates the property contains civil assets that may require additional works of protection (ie. Sewer encasement):

- *Sydney Water*:
 - Horizontally Directional Drilled sewer tunnel
 - Sewer Main and vent-shaft within the front of 19 Rangers Ave.

² <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/policy-and-legislation/housing/low-and-mid-rise-housing-policy> - Accessed 13/10/2025

³ Mosman Council Website: <https://mosman.nsw.gov.au/environment/Tree-management> - Accessed 13/10/2025

4.2 The Site

4.2.1 The site contains several individual dwelling lots, formally identified by:

- Lot 37, Section A, DP2509.
- Lot 38, Section A, DP2509.
- Lot 39, Section A, DP2509.
- Lot 1, DP748842.
- Lot 2, DP748842.
- Lot 41, Section A, DP2509.
- Lot 42, Section A, DP2509.

4.2.2 Located in the Southern extents of Mosman, the site presented with a modest southerly aspect influenced by elements of exposed bedrock.

4.2.3 Exposed rock shelves were visible across the site. This was particularly noticeable in the South-western corner of the site.

Soil depths are anticipated to be shallow across the development area.

4.2.4 The site is accessible by two street frontages:

- Rangers Avenue to the South, and
- Bloxsome Lane to the North.

Council's LEP maps indicated heritage items within the vicinity of the site. These are outside of the proposed development area.

4.2.5 Vehicular access to most of the existing lots occurs via Bloxsome Lane. A single property (13 Rangers Ave) has vehicular access on both frontages.

4.2.6 Vegetation about the site was varied from lot to lot. Some lots consisted of extensive hardscaped areas bounded by small shrubs; others contained small trees and cultivated gardens.

4.2.7 Lots adjoining the site did not appear to contain any significant vegetation or features likely to be influenced by development.

4.2.8 The site is not located within a region that is bushfire prone of significant from a biodiversity perspective.

5 Proposed Development:

5.1.1 The proposal consists of the following aspects:

- Demolition of all existing structures on the site
- Construction of a residential flat building. (RFB)
- Associated landscaping and civil works.

5.1.2 The extent of basement excavation will require the removal of all existing trees on the site.

5.2 Residential Flat Building (RFB):

5.2.1 A new residential flat building is proposed by SSDA consisting of 44 residential apartments and 10 affordable housing apartments.

5.2.2 The proposed dwelling is indicated to include:

- Split level basement
- Six & Seven-levels of residential apartments.

5.2.3 Bulk excavation of soils is indicated by sections and elevations. Excavation is likely to include either contiguous piling or concrete-reinforced rock-sawn basement shoring walls subject to engineering details.

5.2.4 Associated services (Rainwater Tanks, OSD, Substation, Waste room) are proposed to be integrated within the lower ground floor design.

5.2.5 The proposed design indicates the sole access to the site will occur via Rangers Avenue.

5.3 Driveway, Crossover & Layback:

5.3.1 Primary vehicular access is indicated via Rangers Avenue. Works will require the construction of a new driveway, crossover and layback to engineering details.

5.3.2 Vehicular access will occur at the Lower-Ground floor level with an internal ramp down to ground floor residential parking

5.4 Landscaping and Civil Works:

5.4.1 Landscaping and Civil Works plans have not been supplied for consideration in this report. Regardless, the development requires the removal of all trees in the vicinity.

5.4.2 Architectural plans indicate areas of deep soil will be provided for replacement planting in the North-eastern and North-western corners of the site, plus along the southern boundary.

5.4.3 New communal open space is proposed for level 1, at grade for the northern perimeter of the site. This is likely to be utilised for a new landscape design subject to future detail. Limited soil volumes in this region will likely restrict the ability for replacement tree plantings.

5.5 The Trees

- 5.5.1 21 trees were assessed as part of the scope of works. All of the trees were located within the site perimeter. They are categorised as follows:

Table 3: A summary of trees assessed categorised by Significance Value

Significance Value	Number of Trees
High	2
Medium	3
Low	11
Exempt	5

- 5.5.2 The following trees are considered *exempt species* under Council's DCP:

- PT2 Sweet Jessamine hedge (<5m Height)
- PT3 Alexander Palm (<5m Height)
- PT6 Crepe Myrtle (<5m Height)
- PT8 Cumquat (Listed Exempt Species)
- PT20 Glossy Privet (Listed Exempt Species)

These trees are not described further.

- 5.5.3 Scores of Tree health and condition across the mature cohort were mostly good.

Values of landscape significance were mostly *Low* or *Moderate* – Two trees (PT16 & PT17 – Broadleaf Paperbark) with *High Significance* were identified.

- 5.5.4 Evidence of previous pruning across the cohort appeared minor in nature. Many trees did not appear with any evidence of pruning; others had been pruned of their lower limbs.

- 5.5.5 Evidence of pests, disease, or biotic factors were limited to a handful of trees. Conditions associated included evidence of decay & chlorotic foliage.

One tree was seen with terminal dieback (early retrenchment), another was seen with live branch failure. These conditions presented only on the high significance trees.

- 5.5.6 PT1 – Orchid Tree was seen with bark inclusions, epicormic growth and foreign objects embedded in the trunk.

- 5.5.7 Tree PT16 was found within a masonry planter box with a near-zero offset to the neighbouring boundary wall which appeared in a failed state (root pressure). Complete assessment of this tree was not possible due to dense vegetation.

This tree has suffered previous live branch failures. This is uncharacteristic of the species which is generally resilient.



- 5.5.8 PT17 was seen in a similar location to PT16 and within the vicinity of the failed masonry retaining wall. This tree presents with decay of the primary trunk at about 2m above ground level. Assessment of this tree was limited by dense surrounding vegetation.
- 5.5.9 Other trees within 21 Rangers Avenue were planted specimens not locally found.
- 5.5.10 Further commentary and observations regarding trees not mentioned above can be found within Appendix 1 – Tree Data Summary.

6 Construction Impacts:

- 6.1.1 All of the assessed trees lie within the proposed construction footprint.

These trees are not retainable under the proposed development.

- 6.1.2 Trees PT4 (Southern Magnolia) and PT5 (Sweet Jessamine) are located within a region of proposed deep soil, bounded by new retaining walls.

Despite a potential to amend plans to further permit retention, the health and (low) significance of these trees does not warrant design amendments to permit tree retention as both trees present with existing deficiencies and are of a commonly available cultivar.

- 6.1.3 The location of high significance trees (PT16 & PT17) is within the centre of the developable land. Design amendments to retain these trees is not possible.

As mentioned above, both trees were observed to have pre-existing structural defects with one tree likely to be impacted by future remedial works (replacement of a failed boundary retaining wall).

7 Conclusion

- 7.1.1 Seventeen trees were assessed or identified as part of the scope of works. They were seen with mostly good health and varying landscape significance.
- 7.1.2 The proposed development represents a significant change to the site as permissible under the NSW Government LMR policy.
- 7.1.3 Trees recommended for removal are those which are either exempt or lying within the construction footprint.

Development will require the removal of all trees within the site perimeter with most being of Low landscape significance

- 7.1.4 There are no neighbouring trees within the vicinity of the site which are likely to be impacted to any significant degree.
- 7.1.5 The Arborist supports the proposed development application.
- 7.1.6 The prevalence of shallow soils (restricted soil volume) on the site is the likely reason for a limited number of existing large trees on the site.

This is likely to cause significant limitations for the replacement planting of canopy species which are unlikely to be planted with sufficient soil volume to flourish and meet *standard* sizes.

7.2 Review of Council Policy:

- 7.2.1 Council policy seeks to retain *prescribed trees*, and those which Council considers having *High retention values* as part of the consideration of development applications (DAs).
- 7.2.2 This development is mostly compliant with Council policy since trees proposed for removal are those with Low significance values, or *exempt species*.

The two high significance trees of the assessment exist with pre-existing structural concerns and are located within the centre of the development envelope.

- 7.2.3 The undertaking of the proposed development will require the loss of all trees on the site.



8 Recommendations:

8.1 Trees for removal

- 8.1.1 It is recommended that *all trees* on the site are removed as part of the proposed development.
- 8.1.2 Trees denoted as *exempt species* (and located within the site boundary) may be removed at any time without Council approval irrespective of the development.

8.2 Trees for retention:

- 8.2.1 There are no remaining trees to be retained.

8.3 Construction Recommendations:

- 8.3.1 The appointment of a project arborist for this project is not required to oversee the development.



Appendix 1 – Tree Data Summary

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.
PLEASE SEE NEXT PAGE.

Tree Data Summary - 13-23 Rangers Ave, Mosman - Assessed 07/03/2025																			
Tree ID	Species	Height (m)	Canopy dims n/s in metres	DBH (cm)	DGL (cm)	Foliage condition	Trunk Type	Maturity	Trunk lean	Canopy Balanced	Past Pruning	Stability	Pests & Disease	Vigour	Canopy deadwood	Significance value	Notes	TPZ (M) Radius	SRZ (M) Radius
PT1	Bauhinia purpurea (Orchid Tree)	6	9	60	90	Good	Single	Mature	Upright	Yes	Lower limbs	Appears Stable	Minor decay	Good	0-5%	Moderate	Bark inclusions of 2nd order scaffold limbs, minor epicormic growth. Foreign objects embedded in trunk (partially obscured)	7.2	3.2
PT2	Murraya paniculatum (Sweet Jessamine)	4	2	15	16	Good	Multi	Mature	Upright	Yes	Hedged	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Hedge consisting of 7 individual plants each seen without remark	1.8	1.5
PT3	Archontophoenix alexandrae (Alexander Palm)	3	4	20		Good	Triple	Mature	Upright	Yes	Not Apparent	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Small palm growing in firm contact with BDY masonry wall. Minor linetrimmer damage.	2.4	0.0
PT4	Magnolia grandiflora (Southern Magnolia)	5	8	22	25	Good	Single	Mature	Upright	Yes	Lower limbs	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Epicormic shoots of interior branches. Sparse upper canopy	2.6	1.8
PT5	Murraya paniculatum (Sweet Jessamine)	4	7	27	25	Good	Multi	Mature	Upright	Yes	Lower limbs	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Appearing as a large screening plant otherwise without comment	3.2	1.8
PT6	Lagerstroemia indica (Crepe Myrtle)	4	4	9	10	Good	Single	Mature	Upright	Yes	Not Apparent	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Small tree appearing un-influenced by people since planting	1.1	1.3
PT7	Pyrus calleryana (Callery Pear)	7	6	22	25	Good	Single	Mature	Upright	Yes	Raised	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Proximity to neighbouring guttering. Tree has compromised branch attachment characteristics (weak unions) of 2nd-3rd order limbs slightly above the primary junction	2.6	1.8
PT8	Citrus hindsii (Cumquat)	6	5	20	25	Good	Twin	Mature	Bias South	Bias South	Lower limbs	Appears Stable	Decay, chlorotic foliage	Good	0-5%	Low	Escaped pot plant	2.4	1.8
PT9	Plumeria sp (Frangipani)	3	6	18	22	Good	Twin	Mature	Upright	bias south	Lower Limbs	Appears Stable	Minor decay	Good	0-5%	Low	Growing behinf masonry retaining wall.	2.2	1.8
PT10	Magnolia figo (Port Wine Magnolia)	6	6	30	34	Good	Quad	Mature	Upright	Yes	Lower limbs	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Minor scarring from previous mechanical injury - on the way to full recovery.	3.6	2.1
PT11	Eucalyptus sp (Amplifolia)	6	3	12	15	Good	Single	Juvenile	Upright	Yes	Not Apparent	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	5-10%	Low	Small tree, not conclusively ID'ed	1.4	1.5
PT12	Eucalyptus sp (Amplifolia)	5	2	4	5	Good	Single	Juvenile	Upright	Yes	Not Apparent	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low		0.5	0.9
PT13	Eucalyptus sp (Amplifolia)	5	1	5	7	Good	Single	Juvenile	Upright	Yes	Not Apparent	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low	Epicormic shooting about base	0.6	1.1
PT14	Eucalyptus sp (Amplifolia)	5	3	5	7	Good	Single	Juvenile	Upright	Yes	Not Apparent	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low		0.6	1.1
PT15	Murraya paniculatum (Sweet Jessamine)	6	5	27	33	Good	Single	Mature	Upright	Yes	Not Apparent	Appears Stable	Nil	Good	0-5%	Low		3.2	2.1

[illegible]



Appendix 2 - Tree identification and incursion potentials

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.
PLEASE SEE NEXT PAGE.





W-B
WOODS BAGOT

Client
Eterno.

Project

11-23

Blues Bros
ARBORICULTURE

Blues Brothers Arboriculture
PO BOX 4,
TERREY HILLS, NSW, 2084

0439991122
www.bluesbros.com.au
gordon@bluesbros.com.au

Title:
Encroachment LG

Project:
11-23 Rangers Avenue SSDA.dwg

Revision:

01

Plot Date:

05/11/2025

Key:

- Notional Root Zone (NRZ)
- Structural Root Zone (SRZ)
- Canopy Spread
- Encroachment Area



W-B
WOODS BAGOT

Client
Eterno.

Project

11-23

Blues Bros
ARBORICULTURE

Blues Brothers Arboriculture
PO BOX 4,
TERREY HILLS, NSW, 2084

0439991122
www.bluesbros.com.au
gordon@bluesbros.com.au

Title:
Encroachment L1+

Project:
11-23 Rangers Avenue SSDA.dwg

Revision:
01

Plot Date:
05/11/2025

Key:
Notional Root Zone (NRZ)
Structural Root Zone (SRZ)
Canopy Spread
Encroachment Area

Appendix 3 – Photographs



Image 1: PT1 & PT2.



Image 2: PT3.



Image 3: PT4 & PT5.



Image 4: PT16.



Image 5: Failure of a boundary masonry wall adjacent to PT16.



Image 6: PT17



Image 7: Decay within PT17.



Image 8: PT11-PT15 were all planted specimens.



Image 9: Existing dwellings were built directly on bedrock.



Image 10: PT18



Image 11: PT20 seen adjacent to exposed bedrock.



Image 12: PT19 with respect to the existing dwelling.



About the Author

Personal Details

Address: PO BOX 4, TERREY HILLS, NSW, 2084

Phone: 0439991122

Email: gordon@bluesbros.com.au

Current Position

2014-present: Sole Trader:

Currently self employed as a Consulting Arborist (AQF 5).
Servicing the Greater Sydney Area and Surrounds

Part Time – Margot Blues Consulting Arborist

Education

2024 ISA
ISA TRAQ Re-certification.

2019-present ISA
ISA TRAQ (Tree Risk Assessment Qualification)
ISA Professional Member

2017 TAFE Top Ryde,
NSW
Diploma Arboriculture (AQF 5)

2011 TAFE Brookvale,
NSW
Diploma of IT (Networking)

Past Experience

Involvement with the preparation of Numerous Arboricultural
Impact Assessment reports across the Greater Sydney Basin
and beyond.

Involvement with the undertaking of tree health assessment
reporting for trees relating to ongoing management not limited
to the undertaking of Risk assessment and destructive testing.

NSW Land and Environment Court as an Expert Witness in the
Arboricultural field as part of Class 1 development application
appeals.

Extensive on-site experience as a Project Arborist. Personal
experience in a former family business has provided valuable
insight into the possibilities of excavation and implementation
of developments.