

Sydney Olympic Park Authority

Master Plan 2030

SIGNIFICANT TREE REGISTER

CONTENTS

Methodology

- Process
- What Follows
- Exclusions

Criteria for Significance

- Size
- Heritage
- Functionality
- Form / Aesthetics
- Health

Tree Significance Rating

Significant Tree Survey (Drawing)

METHODOLOGY

PROCESS

A mapping base was prepared using SOPA information current in late February 2007. It consisted of an air photograph, overlaid with precinct boundaries and potential development sites, taken from the draft 2025 Master Plan. The range of the tree survey is the area covered by the Master Plan. This base was then used in the field to locate, identify and inspect trees.

Trees or tree groups were given a location identification that refers back to the mapping base;

DS – tree located in proposed development site

PG – tree located in precinct other than in a development site

A – tree located adjacent to the precinct

The letters which precede the number in the tree identification, are the initials of the precinct in which that tree occurs. The species of each tree was recorded.

The trees or tree groups were then rated under five criteria, as explained below. The highest score (1) indicates the best response to that criterion, and the lowest (4), the worst.

A tree or tree group had to achieve a score of 1 under at least one of the criteria for it to be recorded as a significant tree.

Addition across the criteria scores to derive a total is not part of the process – all trees on the list are significant and the individual criterion ratings for each tree are an aid to developing an appropriate management strategy, in the context of proposed development.

WHAT FOLLOWS

A tree or tree group identified here as significant will have to have its needs studied and a management strategy approved where a development is proposed which will impinge on an area calculated using the tree canopy radius, multiplied by 1.5. That is $\text{Area} = (\text{tree canopy radius} \times 1.5)^2 \times \pi$. The management plan will be developed by a member of the *Australian Consulting Arborists Association*.

Management strategies may cover a range from preservation in-situ, to transplantation or removal, but will need to be justified on reasonable grounds in all cases.

EXCLUSIONS

Trees within the Abattoir Offices Site (TC4) are afforded protection under the Conservation Management Plan and are excluded from this survey.

CRITERIA FOR SIGNIFICANCE

Size

A big tree – if healthy and of appropriate species – is generally considered of greater worth than a small tree. A big tree,

- Represents an investment in time,
- Is likely to be part of the character of a place
- Is likely to break up favourably the visual bulk of large buildings,
- Provides shade, shelter and habitat

A tree taller than 6m has received the top score under this criterion, since this height means that the tree is effectively competing with building bulk being as high as two storeys.

The high proportion of Figs at Sydney Olympic Park does also mean that breadth characterises several important trees. If a tree can have a strong impact on an open space, such as a road corridor, its size becomes important. A suggested benchmark for breadth is 6m radius, being equivalent to two roadway lanes.

Heritage

If the three major phases of Homebush Bay's development are

- Pre-invasion
- Abattoirs/brickworks
- 2000 Olympic Games

then trees which are markers of these phases would be significant.

It is only the latter two phases which will have surface evidence in the Master Plan area. Where a tree is a part of the purposeful design intent of the Abattoirs or Olympic phases, or where it was less purposeful but was retained because of its utility (for example, Figs in paddocks to shelter stock), then it achieves the highest score.

Functionality

The usefulness of a tree is a function of the tree's intrinsic values and qualities, and of the land uses which go on around it and which derive benefit from it. Usefulness – or functionality – can only therefore be judged in the context of current uses – and this is how the current ratings have been derived. A proposed alternative land use may affect a tree's usefulness and this could only be judged on a case by case basis.

Form/Aesthetics

If an individual tree or tree group is an important part of a larger ensemble, then its significance is heightened – and the negative impact of its demise would also be greater.

The highest score will reflect the fact that the tree or group is part of formal ensemble. A lower score will reflect its contribution to an informal or 'naturalistic' design grouping. The scoring would also reflect the intactness, or otherwise of the grouping.

Health

A tree in obvious poor health should have its significance reduced whether or not it rates well in other areas.

The health score is based on a visual inspection made in early March 2007 – a time of good rainfall and high humidity.

TREE SIGNIFICANCE RATING

Rating Scale 1(best) – 4 (worst)

Location	Tree ID	Species	Size	Functionality	Health	Heritage	Formal/ Aesthetic
Boundary Creek							
BC1 group	A	<i>Araucaria cunninghamiana</i>	2	1	2	1	1
BC2 group	PG	<i>Corymbia maculata</i> & <i>Eucalyptus citriodora</i>	3	1	2	3	2
BC3 group	PG	<i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i>	3	3	3	1	3
BC4 group	A	<i>Livistona australis</i>	2	3	2	1	2
Tennis							
T1 group	PG	<i>Casuarina glauca</i>	1	2	1	1	1
T2	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	3	1	3	3
T3,T4 group	PG, A	<i>Eucalypts</i> + Grasses	3	3	1	3	1
T5 group	PG	<i>Casuarina glauca</i>	2	1	1	3	1
T6	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	3	1	3	3	2
Southern Sports							
SS1 group	PG	<i>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</i> & <i>Eucalyptus citriodora</i>	3	3	3	1	3
SS2 group	A	Refer BC1					
SS3 group	A	Refer SE					
SS4 group	DS	<i>Platanus hybrida</i>	3	3	3	4	1
SS5 group	DS	<i>Livistona australis</i>	2	3	1	2	1
Sports + Education							
SE1 group	A	Refer BC1					
SE2	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	2	2	1	2	1
SE3 group	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	1	2	1	1
SE4a group	DS	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	1	1	2	1
SE4b group	DS	<i>Livistona australis</i>	2	2	1	2	1
SE4c group	DS	<i>Phoenix canariensis</i>	1	2	1	1	2
SE4d group	DS	<i>Eucalypts sp.</i>	2	1	2	1	2
SE4e group	DS	<i>Ficus microcarpa var. Hillii</i>	1	2	1	2	1
SE5 group	PG	<i>Corymbia maculata</i> & <i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	3	2	3	1	1
SE6 group	DS	<i>Phoenix canariensis</i>	2	2	2	2	1
SE7 group	DS + PG	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i> & <i>Eucayptus sp.</i>	3	1	2	2	2
SE8	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	2	1	1	2	1
Major Events							
ME1 group	PG, A	Refer SE5					

Location	Tree ID	Species	Size	Functionality	Health	Heritage	Formal/Aesthetic
Haslams							
H1 group	A	Refer SE5					
H2 group	A	<i>Corymbia maculata</i>	3	3	2	1	2
H3 group	DS	<i>Casuarina glauca</i> + <i>Eucayptus sp.</i>	2	1	2	4	3
H4 group	PG	Refer H2					
Parkview							
P1 group	A	<i>Casuarina glauca</i>	2	2	2	3	1
P2 group	DS	<i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> , <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> <i>Eucayptus sp.</i> <i>Cupaniopsis anacardioides</i>	3	1	1	4	1
P3 group	PG	<i>Phoenix canariensis</i>	1	2	1	2	1
P4 group	PG	<i>Lophostemon confertus</i>	2	2	2	1	1
P5	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	1	3	1	1	1
P6	A	<i>Corymbia maculata</i> & <i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	2	2	2	1	1
P7, 8, 9, 10	DS	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	3	2	1	2
P11	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	2	3	1	1
P12	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	2	2	4	1	2
P13 group	PG	<i>Corymbia maculata</i>	2	2	1	4	1
P14	DS	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	1	2	1	4	2
P15	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	3	3	1	2
P16	DS	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	1	2	1	1	1
P17	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	3	4	3	3
P18	DS	<i>Corymbia maculata</i> & <i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	1	1	2	4	2
P19	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	3	4	3	3
P20	PG	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	1	2	1	4	3
P21	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	2	2	1	2	2
P22, P23	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	2	1	2	2
P24	PG	<i>Casuarina cunninghamiana</i>	2	2	1	3	1
Showground							
S1	A	<i>Corymbia maculata</i>	1	1	2	1	1
S2	A	<i>Corymbia maculata</i> + <i>Eucalyptus paniculata</i>	1	2	3	1	2
S3	A	<i>Ficus microcarpa var. Hillii</i>	1	1	2	1	2
S4 group	DS	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i> + <i>Eucayptus sp.</i>	1	1	2	4	2
S5 group	DS	<i>Corymbia maculata</i> + <i>Syncarpia glomulifera</i>	1	1	2	4	2
S6	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	1	2	2	1
S7	PG	<i>Phoenix canariensis</i>	1	2	1	1	1
S8	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	1	2	1	1
S8a	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	1	3	1	1
S8b	PG	<i>Ficus microcarpa var. Hillii</i>	1	1	2	1	1
S8c	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	2	1	2	1

Location	Tree ID	Species	Size	Functionality	Health	Heritage	Formal/ Aesthetic
S8d	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	2	1	1	1
S8e	PG	<i>Eucalyptus saligna</i>	1	1	1	1	1
S8f	PG	<i>Eucalyptus saligna</i> , <i>Ficus microcarpa</i> var. <i>Hillii</i> , <i>Lophostemon confertus</i>	1	1	2	1	1
S8g	PG	<i>Eucalyptus saligna</i> , <i>Ficus microcarpa</i> var. <i>Hillii</i> , <i>Lophostemon confertus</i> , <i>Erythrina</i> X <i>sykesii</i> , <i>Populus deltoides</i>	1	1	1	1	1
S9 group	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	1	1	1	1	1
S10	PG	<i>Platanus hybrida</i>	3	1	3	4	1
S11 group	PG	<i>Livistona australis</i>	1	2	1	2	1
S12 group	PG	<i>Pyrus ussuriensis</i> , <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	1	2	1	2	1
S13 group	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	1	1	2	2
S14 group	PG	<i>Araucaria cunninghamiana</i>	2	2	1	1	1
S15	DS	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	3	1	2	1
S16	PG	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	2	1	2	1
S17	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	2	3	2	2	1
S18	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	2	2	3	2	1
S19	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	2	3	1	1	2
S20	PG	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	2	1	2	1	1
Town Centre							
TC1 group	PG	<i>Corymbia maculata</i>	2	3	3	1	1
TC2 group	PG	<i>Eucalyptus citriodora</i> , <i>Eucalyptus saligna</i> , <i>Jacaranda mimosifolia</i> ,	1	2	1	2	2
TC2a group	PG	<i>Olea europaea</i>	2	2	1	1	1
TC3 group	PG	<i>Pyrus ussuriensis</i> ,, <i>Jacaranda mimosifolia</i>	3	2	2	1	1
TC4 group		<i>Abbatior Buildings</i>					
TC5 group	DS	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	1	2	1	2	1
TC6 group	A	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i> <i>Corymbia maculata</i>	2	2	1	1	1
TC7	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	1	3	1	1	3
TC8	PG	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	1	2	1	2	2
TC9 group	PG	<i>Casuarina glauca</i> , <i>Eucalyptus</i> sp. <i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	1	2	1	2	2
TC10 group	DS	<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>	1	2	1	4	2
TC11 group	PG	<i>Lophostemon confertus</i>	2	2	2	1	1
TC12	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	3	2	2	1
TC13	DS	<i>Ficus macropyhlla</i>	1	3	1	2	1
TC14	DS	<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	1	3	3	1	2
TC15 group	A	<i>Ficus microcarpa</i> var. <i>Hillii</i>	2	2	2	1	1
TC16	DS	<i>Phoenix canariensis</i>	1	3	1	2	2



LEGEND

- Precinct name and boundaries
- Proposed development site
- Groups of significant trees
- S6 Significant tree/tree group I.D number

REV	DATE	BY	CHK	APP
P3	02.04.20	BB	BB	PK
P2	25.03.20	BB	BB	PK
P1	06.03.20	BB	BB	PK

REVISIONS

REV	DATE	BY	CHK	APP

COPYRIGHT
 All rights reserved. This document is the property of Kirk & Partners Landscape Architects Pty Ltd. It is to be used for the purposes of the project it was prepared for and no part of it may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system without the prior written permission of Kirk & Partners Landscape Architects Pty Ltd.

KIRK & PARTNERS LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
 A/NZ 28 503 472 338
 5 145 HARBOUR STREET | SYDNEY NSW 2007
 TEL: 02 9551 7599 FAX: 02 9551 7595
 EMAIL: kirk@kirkpartners.com.au

PROJECT
SOPA MASTERPLAN 2030 SIGNIFICANT TREE REGISTER

DRAWING
SIGNIFICANT TREE SURVEY

SCALE
 1:2500 @ A4

DATE
 07/09

REV
 P3