

# **Tree Management Report 11 Talbot Street, Forrest**

#### Date of report: 31 October, 2023

Client: Divya Sharma

Contact no: 0409 278 181 divyasharma108@gmail.com Contact: Matt Badham Senior Consulting Arborist Mobile: 0423 228 185 matt.badham@arbormanagement.net.au

Any use of this document outside the purpose of the report must be authorised by the consulting arborist.



Figure 1. Shows the proposed design and specifications of the installation and trees to be removed (in red).

## Purpose of the report

This impartial report was requested by Divya Sharma, lessee of 11 Talbot St, Forrest. The report was requested to accompany the minor works approval package and is to provide further details of three (3) trees (TREES A, B and C) noted in *Figure 1* (in red) that require removal for the current proposed design to proceed.

The site is currently a residential block, and it is proposed to be made into a large garden to complement the surrounds and provide additional landscaping features to the immediate block and surrounding area.

## Details of the trees proposed to be removed

Trees A-C are located within the lease and are within the proposed construction area, as shown in *Figure 1*. All three (3) trees are protected under the National Capital Authority (NCA) Tree Management Plan (TMP) and would require approval from the NCA for removal.

Trees A-C are privately planted small trees that at some , did add value to the landscape and theme of the garden. These trees are not considered to be historical or significant plantings, and as such are assessed more as 'fill-in' plantings of an old and aged garden.



Tree A

Tree B

Tree C

Tree A

Species	Height	DBH	Health	Condition	Recommendation
Eucalyptus leucoxylon	5m	25cm	Fair-poor	Poor	Remove
Significance rating	Significance	ELE	<b>Retention Value</b>	Protected	Date of report
(STARS)	Low	Short	Low	Yes (NCA)	31/10/23

Tree A was assessed as holding a low retention value, largely due to the poor form, dieback and being engulfed by a climbing vine. Two (2) of the smaller leaders have died and the trunk holds large wounds and is becoming structurally compromised. There is a reduced potential risk of harm from Tree A failing due to the small size of the material left in the tree and the reduced height. Tree A currently reduces the overall amenity value for the area and support is requested for its removal.

#### Tree B

Species	Height	DBH	Health	Condition	Recommendation
Prunus serrulata	3m	16cm	Fair	Fair	Remove
Significance rating	Significance	ELE	<b>Retention Value</b>	Protected	Date of report
(STARS)	Low	Medium	Medium	Yes (NCA)	31/10/23

Tree B was assessed as holding a medium retention value, largely due to the longer life expectancy of the species and form. Tree B is a suitable tree to consider for transplanting, either as part of the new landscape or in another suitable landscape.

The current design cannot be achieved with the retention of Tree B. Given the overall small size of Tree B, it is not visible from the streetscape or surrounding properties. Tree B currently adds value to the garden in place, however will impede the flow of the proposed design. Support is requested for its removal.

Tree C

Species	Height	DBH	Health	Condition	Recommendation
Koelreuteria paniculata	4m	19cm	Fair	Poor	Remove
Significance rating	Significance	ELE	<b>Retention Value</b>	Protected	Date of report
(STARS)	Low	Short	Low	Yes (NCA)	31/10/23

Tree C was assessed as holding a low retention value, largely due to its poor form and reduced life expectancy. Tree C is not a suitable tree for transplanting due to the poor form and lengths it would take to work in another part of the landscape or another garden.



The current design cannot be achieved with the retention of Tree C. Given the overall small size of Tree C, it is not a landscape feature that stands out from the streetscape. Tree C is currently an awkward shape, due to the poor form, and impedes complete access to the rear of the yard through the driveway gates. Support is requested for the removal of Tree C.

## **Discussion and findings**

The proposed landscape design has been specifically chosen for this location to increase the landscape value and overall user experience to the area. Several of the larger trees have been retained to assist with holding onto the established feel of the landscape and area. The design has incorporated several important view lines that can ultimately only be truly appreciated when inside the landscape.

When looking to retain these larger and feature trees to incorporate into the new landscape, these three trees (trees A, B and C) were assessed as either being not suitable or viable for the medium term (15-40 years), or their current species and location would end up detracting from the overall design. Trees A and C were assessed as holding a low retention value. Where trees are assessed as holding a low retention value, then the trees should be removed and replaced with a more suitable species of increased vitality and/or form.

Tree B was assessed as holding a medium retention value. When trees are assessed as holding medium retention values, then all effort should be undertaken to look at modifying the overall design and potential construction methods to retain the trees in the landscape. If the design cannot be modified to incorporate the tree into the design, then consideration should be given to transplanting the tree, where possible.

Unfortunately, to have the desired impact on the area and the surrounding landscape, the overall design has specific requirements for it to be built and displayed as intended. Generally, when the proposed construction will have a longer and more meaningful impact on the landscape and users of the area than the current landscape (and trees) in situ, there is sufficient justification to support the removal of medium retention value trees.

Given the proposed design and required construction area, it is not feasible, nor possible to retain these trees (Trees A-C) in the landscape and achieve the installation of the proposed design.

While it could be challenged that the design could be modified to retain Tree B, it does not appear to be appropriate to modify the current design, given the overall landscape features and trees that are proposed to be planted. In short, Tree B is not significant in the landscape and its contribution can be easily replaced with a more appropriate species in the designated location.

**Recommendation:** Final recommendation is to seek approval for removal of Trees A-C and proceed with the current design.

## Additional notes for consideration:

While it is understood that the works area will have its own fencing, consideration should be given to additional tree protection measures, such as lower trunk and branch protection, as shown in *Figure 2*, and temporary fencing as tree protection fencing, shown in *Figure 3*.





*Figure 2. Shows trunk and low branching protection, as per the Australian Standard for Tree Protection on Development Sites AS 4978 – 2009* 



- To assist with continuity and to tree protection measures throughout the works, it is strongly recommended to appoint a site Arborist. The site Arborist should be a suitably qualified and experienced Arborist (holding a minimum certificate V in arboriculture AQF5 Arborist).
- Tree protection zones (TPZ's) should be as large as possible and set as a preferred minimum distance 2m from the dripline of the trees.
- Any works adjacent to or within the TPZ of the trees being retained should be overseen by the site Arborist.
- Any works within the TPZ's should be undertaken with care, and movement of soil taken by small amounts in a direction of away from the tree.
- Any roots damaged during these works shall be inspected by the site Arborist and can only be removed under instruction of the site Arborist by a suitably qualified Arborist (holding a minimum Certificate III in Arboriculture AQF3 Arborist).
- During any stage of the redevelopment that works are to be undertaken within the TPZ's, the site Arborist shall be on site to observe and provide recommendations. This will ensure that access to this construction area is only opened when required and still provides some level of protection zones for the trees to be retained.
- Protect the roots of the tree by providing a 'no-dig zone' within the TPZ's of the trees. The TPZ's for the trees shall be set to the dripline + 2m.
- In the event excavation is required within the TPZs, approval should be sought by the site Arborist prior to undertaking any such works. Where it is deemed appropriate to allow excavation within the TPZ, the following hydro-excavation specifications should be undertaken:
  - Pressure should be no greater than 2000psi
  - A fan shaped nozzle is to be used, and
  - The nozzle head must be 150mm away from the surface being sprayed.



The aim of these tree protection measures is to assist with the long term retention of the identified trees on the site. To assist with upholding the restricted areas all site users should be inducted into the site by the site Arborist, who is able to provide explanations of the tree protection zones, hold points and the requirements of tree protection for this site.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information or clarification about the report.

Thank you,

Agathe .

Matt Badham Director / Senior Consulting Arborist



## **Expertise of Consultant**

#### Education and experience:

- Diploma in Arboriculture, Ryde TAFE, Sydney NSW (2012)
- VALID Tree risk assessment training, Canberra ACT (2019)
- VALID Tree risk assessment workshop, Sydney NSW (2017)
- Tree Anatomy Workshop (Three-day workshop) training, Adelaide SA (2016)
- Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ), Melbourne VIC (2014)
- Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA) training, Melbourne VIC (2014)
- Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA), Visual tree inspection (VTA) training, Melbourne VIC (2014)
- Diploma in Horticulture, Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT), ACT (2006)
- Certificate III in Arboriculture, CIT, ACT (2008)
- Certificate IV in Horticulture, CIT, ACT (2004)
- Certificate III in Horticulture, CIT, ACT (2003)
- Two-day intensive tree hazard risk training with resistograph and quantifying structural strengths of defective trees, IML in Canberra, ACT (2012).
- Sixteen years' experience in tree assessments and administering required works for the Federal and ACT Government
- Twenty-six years' experience in the field of arboriculture, horticulture and maintenance works.

#### **Conferences attended:**

- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) 2017 Canberra, ACT
- Treenet 2016 Adelaide, SA
- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) 2015 Adelaide, SA
- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) 2011 Parramatta, NSW
- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) 2008 Brisbane, QLD
- Green X 2007 Penrith, NSW
- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) 2006 Launceston, TAS
- Treenet 2005 Ryde, NSW

## **Bibliography**

Draper, D. and Richards, P. *Dictionary for Managing Trees*, 2009. Pryor, L. and Banks, J. *Trees and Shrubs in Canberra*, 2001.

Web sites ACTmapi http://www.actmapi.act.gov.au/

