



UTS Ku-ring-gai Campus Tree Assets

Tree assets were evaluated on-site and rated using the six criteria listed below. Aerial photographs and views into areas were used to support the findings. Canopy cover is depicted on the plan. The locations of individual trees are not shown.

The vegetation cover of the site is rated according to the condition of the trees it contains. Final ratings (shown in the coloured areas) reflect the percentage of retainable trees in the area. Trees considered suitable for retention are those that could probably be managed to provide a safe, useful life expectancy of upwards of 10 years in areas of regular human use. Areas containing trees and/or vegetation that are in poor or moderate condition but which are considered valuable for their landscape amenity are distinguished as highly significant.

The criteria used to evaluate the tree assets on-site were:

- 1. Trees subject to Ku-ring-gai Council's Tree Preservation Order.** Trees of at least 5 metres in height with a canopy spread of 4 or more metres were evaluated. Council's Tree Management Policy classes trees as significant if they are substantial specimens (trees that are "prominent in the landscape; healthy and stable; have a trunk diameter of more than 250mm; and/or are rare or uncommon species").
- 2. Potential risks to people's safety.** Structurally sound trees in good health rated the highest. The use of the area containing the trees was considered. Structurally unsound trees in areas of proposed frequent use by people rated lowest.
- 3. Environmental services provided by trees.** Large, healthy trees that improve the health and/or preservation of resources such as soil, water, and air, and contribute positively to the area in terms of micro-climate, shading and windbreaks rated highest. Mature trees that contribute to carbon sequestration rated highly.
- 4. The health, integrity and long-term viability of the ecosystem.** Trees in weed-free, species-diverse vegetation were rated as high. The presence of, or potential use of the area by, threatened species was included. Fire requirements of the ecosystem were taken into account. It is noted that most of the vegetation on the site depends on bushfire for its long-term viability.
- 5. Potential need for tree management to protect infra-structure and property.** Trees with structural problems, dead limbs and decay were given a low rating. Trees that require remedial work, such as the removal of dead limbs, but otherwise appeared sound and healthy were given a medium rating.
- 6. Contributions to landscape amenity.** Healthy, well-positioned trees of good form and scale that provide landscape services such as screening, shade, visual interest, spatial definition and/or interest rated highest. Trees in dense stands and unable to achieve suitable form or dimensions due to competition were rated as low.

Summary of the assessment criteria for trees

1. The requirements of Ku-ring-gai Council's Tree Preservation Order
2. Structural soundness, health and vigour
3. Contributions to natural resources (soil, air, water and biodiversity) and to the area in terms of micro-climate, shading and windbreaks
4. Value, condition and viability of the ecosystem context, including potential use by endangered species
5. Level of management and maintenance needed to achieve a safe, useful life expectancy of at least ten years
6. Contributions to landscape amenity (screening, shade, visual interest and spatial definition)

The vegetation ratings are on the basis of the number of trees in the area that have high values on all or most criteria and could therefore be retained and managed to provide valuable specimens for a useful period. The rating process takes into account whether the existing substantial trees could be managed to achieve high ratings in the future.

The plan is indicative only; accurate tree surveys and detailed assessments are required to make determinations about individual trees on the site.

This plan and accompanying report are based on assessments of trees conducted between January 16th and March 24th 2004. They relate to living organisms whose condition changes in time and in response to variations in environmental conditions. A site visit was conducted on October 1st 2007 to assess whether the information the plan contains is still valid and to review the amended lay-out in relation to tree assets. Based on this visit, it was noted that both positive and negative changes in the condition of the tree assets have occurred since the assessment was documented. In particular, areas where healthy young trees were present in 2004 now contain increased numbers of healthy semi-mature to mature trees and areas where large numbers of declining trees were previously noted contain increased numbers of dead trees. However, these changes are not significant in terms of the categorization of tree assets in most parts of the site and the footprint of the amended proposal does not warrant further amendment as a result of any changes in the condition of tree assets since 2004.

- More than 75% of trees are significant
- 50 to 75% of trees are significant
- 25 to 50% of trees are significant
- Less than 25% of trees are significant
- Highly significant landscape area
- No tree cover
- Asset Protection Zone (AZP) for bushfire management
- Existing bushland outside AZP
- Significant habitat for threatened species
- Boundary

Project


UTS Ku-ring-gai Campus Rezoning Assessment

Tree Assets Plan

Environmental Arboricultural Consultant

BioDesign

BioDesign & Associates Pty Ltd
PO Box 1685
Rozelle NSW 2039
phone: 02 9810 5500
fax: 02 9810 5599
sus.hobley@biodesign.com.au
www.biodesign.com.au



Client University of Technology Sydney

Project Manager CRI Australia Pty. Ltd.

Urban Planner DEM

Scale 1:1000 @ A1

Drawn PS

Checked

Drawn No

Job No 0048

Date 15:06:04

Release Date 03:10:07

Notes
Do not scale this drawing, use figured dimensions only.
Refer to BioDesign for all variations and discrepancies.
This drawing is checked and approved only if signed.
This drawing remains the property of BioDesign & Associates.
Any reproduction, complete or in part, infringes copyright.

North

