Tree planting schedule: *Gleditsia triacanthos* (all varieties) is a **declared Noxious weed** (http://plantnet.rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au/cgibin/NSWfl.pl?page=nswfl&lvl=sp&name=Gleditsia~triacanthos, <u>http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/agriculture/pests-weeds/weeds/noxweed</u>) although admittedly up the coast and not around Sydney where there are areas the plants' persistence in streamside locations is a problem too big to get it declared noxious (costs of control are prohibitive). Why is its use being promoted in one of the most public avenues in Sydney? This is a totally unrealistic planting provided to us by a North American firm. Let us celebrate Australian trees – the token 57 Forest Red Gum (*Eucalyptus tereticornis*) is ridiculous – even more so they are listed as 'temporary trees'.

Is this why? PWP Landscape Architecture Project Landscape Architect Project Name 739 Allston Way, Berkeley, California 94710 Telephone 0011 1 510 849 9494 Email barangaroo@pwpla.com

Join the 21st century people! Celebrate the great Australian trees we should have all around us. Also, why shouldn't there be shade in that area in winter. After all, winter in Australia is barely a winter – our native climate doesn't produce deciduous trees because we have need for shade all year. There is the lawn if someone wants some sun.

Why not plant an avenue of Illawarra Flame Trees interspersed with Silky Oaks? Red and Gold – a great offset to the blue and green of the harbour. They are also somewhat deciduous and shed leaves at the end of winter – when the water needs are less and it's naturally a bit drier in Sydney. In addition, while one is native, and inclined at times to be weedy, at least it isn't covered in thorns from every stem that comes up from where the roots get damaged! Honey Locust trees are usually grafted onto a wild-type rootstock, and they have thorns on the branches and trunk up to 10cm long. Not a very appealing thing to sit under, or on.

Oh, by the way, the water use by either of the native trees over a full year is less than that of either of the imported exotics. Surely that should be taken into account also given the intent to meet ESD principles.

In page 67 of the document, where it refers to the considerations for sea level rise as a result of climate change, it states that the 'highest astronomical tide' in 2100 is predicted to be RL 1.975. However, no value against the relevant tide gauge (Fort Denison) is provided for the RL 0 value so all values and

information you provide is purely speculative. RL 0 is noted to be the mid point between the highest and lowest tides.

The data from Fort Denison shows a tidal range on the 14th of December, 2012 to be from a low water of 0.08m to a high water of 2.04m.

In many locations through the document, although I first noticed it on Page 25, the incorrect labelling of a measurement was given. The metre (a unit of measurement) is not the same as a meter (a device used for measuring). The fact that his document was constructed by Americans (Peter Walker of PWP Landscape Architecture) is very evident, and frankly, very disappointing. At the very least there should have been Australian spelling checked on their machines when compiling it for Australian use, and also, where is the quality of spell checking from the project managers. It's frankly surprising that the measurements weren't given in feet, inches and yards.

No wonder this is appearing more and more like a dog's breakfast!