



4th February, 2003

WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANDWICK WILL BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, 90 AVOCA STREET, RANDWICK, ON TUESDAY, 11TH FEBRUARY, 2003 AT 6:00 P.M.

Committee Members: His Worship, the Mayor, Cr D. Sullivan, Crs Backes, Bastic (Chairperson), Greenwood, Schick, Seng and White (Deputy Chairperson) and Whitehead.

Quorum: Five (5) members.

NOTE: AT THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2000, THE COUNCIL RESOLVED THAT THE WORKS COMMITTEE BE CONSTITUTED AS A COMMITTEE WITH FULL DELEGATION TO DETERMINE MATTERS ON THE AGENDA.

1 Apologies

2 Minutes

CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 2002.

3 Addresses to Committee by the Public

4 Mayoral Minutes

5 Works

5.1 DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 2 01/2003 - 82 BROOME STREET, MAROUBRA - ARAUCARIA HETEROPHYLLA GROWING WITHIN PROPERTY.

5.2 DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 4 02/2003 - 2 ALKOO AVENUE, LITTLE BAY - ARAUCARIA HETEROPHYLLA (NORFOLK ISLAND PINE) GROWING WITHIN 2 ALKOO AVENUE, LITTLE BAY.

6 General Business

7 Notice of Rescission Motions

.....
GENERAL MANAGER



Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 01/2003

SUBJECT:	82 BROOME STREET, MAROUBRA - ARAUCARIA HETEROPHYLLA GROWING WITHIN PROPERTY
-----------------	--

DATE:	28 January, 2003	FILE NO:	P/016537
--------------	------------------	-----------------	----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

Council's Tree Management Officer Mr Bryan Bourke inspected the Araucaria heterophylla (Norfolk Island pine) growing within the front of the above property and advises as follows.

The tree is approximately 15 metres tall with a canopy spread of around six metres. It is in good health and is the dominant tree within this area of Maroubra.

There have been a number of reasons given for the removal of this significant tree and these are addressed chronologically.

- **Lifting and breaking the concrete walkway within the property** – there has been some minor cracking to the concrete path caused by the roots of the tree but this could easily be rectified if it were pried and beamed over any tree roots when and if it is reconstructed;
- **Falling needles blocking gutters and obstructing water flow** – this could be nullified with the installation of an inexpensive solid-plastic proprietary gutter guard-type product;
- **Branches growing into domestic service wires and interfering with TV reception** – this problem could be dealt with by pruning all branches growing within one metre of the service wires and TV antennae back to the trunk of the tree;
- **Needles impinging on the ability to grow turf in the front lawn area** – while there may be some maintenance required to remove fallen pine fronds from the affected area, this is certainly far less than is required with a variety of other tree species and is certainly not enough reason to justify the removal of this significant tree.

ISSUES:

The tree is situated approximately six metres from the two adjacent residences and there is no evidence that its roots are causing any structural damage to either of them. It is situated far enough away from them to never actually cause any significant damage to either.

Whilst this tree may be causing some minor nuisance to the property owners, the problems they have cited for wanting it removed could be addressed without the need to remove this significant tree asset.

This tree species requires very little maintenance compared to other species and they also suffer very few pest and disease problems.

CONCLUSION:

No legitimate nor compelling reason is presented to remove this tree and any approval granted to do so would compromise the intent and objective of Council's Tree Preservation Order – i.e., to prevent the indiscriminate and unnecessary removal of significant trees within the urban environment.

RECOMMENDATION:

That approval not be granted to remove the Araucaria heterophylla growing within the front of 82 Broome Street, Maroubra.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Nil

.....
FRANK ROTTA
ACTING DIRECTOR ASSET &
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
BRYAN BOURKE
TREE MANAGEMENT OFFICER



Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 02/2003

SUBJECT:	2 ALKOO AVENUE, LITTLE BAY - ARAUCARIA HETEROPHYLLA (NORFOLK ISLAND PINE) GROWING WITHIN 2 ALKOO AVENUE, LITTLE BAY.
-----------------	--

DATE:	7 January, 2003	FILE NO:	P/000329 xr D/0189/2001
--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

Mr A Kilcran of 2 Alkoo Avenue, Little Bay, requests that Council's decision not to grant consent for the removal of a large Araucaria heterophylla (Norfolk Island pine) growing within the front of the property be reviewed, with the view that there are legitimate and compelling grounds for the removal and replacement of the subject tree.

ISSUES:

Council records indicate that a Development Application was lodged with Council on 9 March, 2001, by Mr Stephen Haigh, proposing to demolish all existing buildings on the site to erect a two-storey attached dual occupancy dwelling.

As part of the assessment of that DA, comments were sought from Council's Landscape department relating to the Norfolk Island pine tree within the front of the property and its health and significance.

A subsequent memorandum from that department recognised the significance of the subject tree and specified that two proposed driveways would have to be re-designed to allow for the retention of the tree.

Amended plans were then submitted to Council and the DA was approved on 23 May, 2001. It contained a number of tree protection measures designed to protect the Norfolk Island pine from any sort of damage during construction and to ensure its longevity and ongoing good health.

Construction of the dual occupancy dwelling then went ahead as per the stipulated conditions of DA approval and the final landscape inspection was undertaken by the appropriate Council officer on 19 September, 2002.

Application was then made to Council under the provisions of its Tree Preservation Order on 18 November, 2002, for approval to remove the tree.

The reasons given were that the tree was too close to the residence and that its roots would eventually cause structural damage, that it was already overhanging the residence even though it was not fully grown, that vehicles could not be parked in the driveway because of sap falling from the tree and that the owner feared for his family and property because of the possibility of falling branches.

This application to remove the tree was assessed by Council on 22 November, 2002, and was refused on the grounds that the tree was highly significant, that it was in good health and that it contributed to the surrounding landscape.

Approval was granted to deadwood the canopy of the tree and to prune all branches away from the residence to a distance of two metres.

CONCLUSION:

There were several reasons cited by the applicant for approving removal and these will be addressed chronologically.

- **The tree is located less than three metres from the residence** – the tree is actually three metres from the building and the building works were carried out without identifying any major roots in the vicinity of construction.

Simply because the tree is as close to the residence as it is does not mean that structural damage is inevitable. The tree is situated far enough away from structures to allow root pruning should it be required at any time in the future.

- **The canopy is already overhanging the roof** – branches could be pruned as required and the installation of a proprietary gutter guard-type product would minimise the accumulation of fronds and debris.
- **The roots will cause damage to the residence and driveway** – there is some possibility that this may occur but this is an issue that should have been dealt with prior to construction.

Root pruning would be a viable option should this occur and any future damage to either of the driveways could be rectified using pier and beam construction methods.

- **Fear of the tree or any of its branches falling** – this species of tree originates in one of the most wind-swept locations on the planet.

While there can be no guarantee given that it will not drop a branch in high winds, it is unlikely and the possibility of the tree falling is extremely remote at best.

- **Alleged allergies to the tree** – this is not a species of tree usually identified with allergies and there would need to be some sort of documentation provided to support this claim.
- **Cars cannot be parked under the tree** – there are two garages where cars could be parked as well as ample space in the street for parking as required.
- **Mealy bug infestation** – this is a seasonal concern that occurs for a very short time on an annual basis and certainly does not constitute a major issue. The bugs themselves are harmless and confine their presence to the tree itself.

The majority of issues raised as reasons to remove this tree should have been considered prior to the construction of these residences.

It could be argued that it is totally unreasonable to comply with conditions specifically established to protect this significant tree during the construction of a new residence and to then apply for its removal less than twelve months after building works have been completed.

Although there may be some minor inconvenience associated with this tree, no compelling reason for its removal has been presented. The roots of this species are relatively deep and may never cause any sort of significant damage to either the residence or the driveways.

Periodic hand excavation along the building alignment would allow any potential tree root intrusion to be identified and dealt with. Underpruning and the installation of a gutter guard-type product would nullify the issue of possible branch damage and the accumulation of fronds in guttering.

RECOMMENDATION:

That approval not be granted for removal of the Norfolk Island Pine tree growing in the front of No. 2 Alkoo Avenue, Little Bay.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Photos

.....
 FRANK ROTTA
 ACTING DIRECTOR ASSET &
 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
 BRYAN BOURKE
 TREE MANAGEMENT OFFICER









