

Planning Panels Victoria
Casey Planning Scheme Amendment C231

54-60 MANUKA ROAD, BERWICK

PREPARED FOR JINGUANG PAN
INSTRUCTED BY INTERISE LEGAL
SITE INSPECTIONS: 5 SEPTEMBER & 22 NOVEMBER 2017

Expert Witness Report - Addendum

PREPARED BY

Michael Rogers
John Patrick Landscape Architects Pty Ltd

March 2018

1 NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE EXPERT

- 1.1 Michael Rogers
324 Victoria Street
Richmond Victoria 3121

2 REASONS FOR ADDENDUM

- 2.1 In light of new historical information introduced in the statement of evidence prepared by Dr. Christina Dyson on behalf of the City of Casey it is necessary to adjust the report submitted to the Panel in January 2018.
- 2.2 The addendum presented here acknowledges factual information introduced in Dr. Dyson's statement (namely historical aerial photographs) which shed new light on elements of the site addressed in my previous assessment.
- 2.3 The statements that follow should be read in conjunction with my original evidence report, and supersede that report to the limited extent that those two documents are inconsistent.

3 IDENTITY OF THE PERSON WHO PREPARED THIS ADDENDUM

- 3.1 Michael Rogers is the author of this addendum, assisted by Mr. Michael Cook, a landscape architect and heritage consultant in the office of John Patrick.

4 A SUMMARY OF THE OPINIONS OF THE EXPERT

Tree Age Estimate

- 4.1 Aerial photographs introduced in Dr. Dyson's evidence, specifically the photo from 1960 (114, Run 033n102, Vic1085, Melbourne, Local History Collection, Casey Cardinia Libraries) are certainly of value when trying to estimate the age of trees within the subject site.
- 4.2 The 1960 aerial photograph shows very clearly that there are very few mature trees at the front of the property. However, what could be interpreted as Trees 18, 26, 38, 40, 44, 54, 91, 99 and 100 appeared to be present in the photo.
- 4.3 In the 1939 aerial (Land.vic.gov.au, Photo Mosaics, Aerial Survey – Cranbourne B1, 1939) these same trees appear to also be present.
- 4.4 There is no evidence of new replacement plantings between 1939 and the present day. This would suggest that these trees may be older than originally estimated based on the inspections of September and December 2017. However, in my view, the size and condition of these trees does not suggest to me that they are of the age indicated by the aerial photography.
- 4.5 Below is the adjusted table from my original Expert Witness Report, 12.1 with additional column with new 'Estimated Decade of Planting based on comparisons between the 1939 and 1960 aerial photos. Some trees are older and some trees are younger than estimated previously.

ADJUSTED DECADE OF PLANTING ESTIMATE (TREES HIGHLIGHTED HAVE A CHANGE OF DECADE)

Tree No.	Botanic Name	Size (m)	DBH (cm)	Age	Health	Structure	ULE (Yrs.)	Arb. Value	Estimated decade of planting	Amended Estimated year of Planting
91	Quercus rubra	17 x 26	50, 50, 81, 90, 100	Over mature	Good	Poor / Hazardous	5-10	High	20s	20s
99	Pinus radiata	10 x 12	150	Over mature	Poor	Poor	0	Low/Remove	20s	20s
54	Juniperus virginiana	10 x 7	50	Over mature	Poor	Poor	0-5	Low	40s	Pre 39
100	Hesperocyparis macrocarpa	20 x 8	80	Mature	Fair	Fair	10-20	Medium	50s	Pre 39
18	Pinus radiata	18 x 14	80	Mature	Good	Good	20+	Medium	60s	Pre 39
26	Pinus radiata	20 x 18	120	Mature	Good	Good	10-20	Medium	60s	Pre 39
38	Ulmus Xhollandica	22 x 12	80, 50	Mature	Good	Good	20+	High	60s	Pre 39
40	Hesperocyparis macrocarpa (x17)	26 x 8	80 (average)	Maturing	Fair	Fair	5-10	Medium	60s	Pre 39
44	Eucalyptus radiata	20 x 13	120	Mature	Poor	Poor	5-10	Low	60s	Pre 39
48	Hesperocyparis macrocarpa	22 x 18	120	Mature	Fair	Fair	10-20	High	40s	40s
51	Hesperocyparis arizonica var. glabra	13 x 8	55, 30	Over mature	Good	Poor	5-10	Low	40s	40s
53	Quercus robur	18 x 17	70	Mature	Good	Good	20+	High	40s	40s
80	Hesperocyparis macrocarpa	25 x 18	170	Over mature	Good	Poor	5-10	Low	40s	40s
32	Quercus robur	16 x 15	90	Mature	Good	Fair	20+	High	60s	40s
46	Populus xcanadensis	22 x 15	150	Over mature	Fair	Poor	5-10	Low	60s	40s
47	Populus xcanadensis	22 x 10	85	Over mature	Fair	Poor	5-10	Low	60s	40s
60	Metasequoia glyptostroboides	20 x 8	60	Over mature	Fair-Poor	Fair	5-10	High	50s	50s
61	Metasequoia glyptostroboides	20 x 12	70	Mature	Good	Fair	10-20	High	50s	50s
86	Ulmus minor 'Variegata'	20 x 20	80	Mature	Good	Good	20+	High	50s	50s
87	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'	20 x 16	85	Mature	Good	Poor	10-20	High	50s	50s
88	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'	18 x 8	60	Maturing	Fair	Good	20+	Medium	50s	50s
89	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'	20 x 16	105	Mature	Good	Fair	20+	High	50s	50s
90	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'	18 x 14	70	Maturing	Good	Fair	20+	Medium	50s	50s
49	Brachychiton xroseous	16 x 12	60	Mature	Good	Fair	20+	High	60s	50s
58	Grevillea robusta	22 x 10	70	Mature	Fair	Poor	5-10	Medium	60s	50s
70	Populus nigra 'Italica'	22 x 4	80	Mature	Fair	Fair	10-20	Medium	60s	50s
75	Pyrus sp.	18 x 12	60	Over mature	Fair	Fair-Poor	0-5	Low	60s	50s
77	Metasequoia glyptostroboides	20 x 5	40	Mature	Fair	Fair	20+	Medium	60s	50s
97	Picea pungens	12 x 6	50	Mature	Fair-Poor	Fair	5-10	Low	60s	50s

Tree No.	Botanic Name	Size (m)	DBH (cm)	Age	Health	Structure	ULE (Yrs.)	Arb. Value	Estimated decade of planting	Amended Estimated year of Planting
66	Quercus macrocarpa	20 x 20	100	Mature	Good	Fair	20+	High	40s	60s
85	Quercus macrocarpa	20 x 20	92	Mature	Good	Good	20+	High	40s	60s
37	Quercus robur	12 x 12	30, 30	Maturing	Good	Poor	20+	Medium	60s	60s
39	Ulmus Xhollandica	15 x 14	60	Mature	Good	Fair	10-20	Medium	60s	60s
41	Cupressus sempervirens (x4)	16 x 3	40	Mature	Fair-Good	Fair	20+	High	60s	60s
59	Betula pendula	6 x 7	50	Over mature	Good	Fair	5-10	Low	60s	60s
63	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'	22 x 10	45	Maturing	Fair	Fair	20+	Medium	60s	60s
64	Acer palmatum (x3)	7 x 7	30	Mature	Fair	Fair	10-20	Medium	60s	60s
72	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'	18 x 10	50	Mature	Poor	Poor	15-10	Low	60s	60s
76	Prunus laurocerasus	15 x 15	25, 25, 25, 25	Mature	Good	Fair	10-20	Medium	60s	60s
81	Ulmus glabra 'Lutescens'	22 x 22	82	Mature	Good	Fair	20+	High	60s	60s
82	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'	18 x 16	75	Mature	Fair	Poor	5-10	Low	60s	60s
96	Cupressus sempervirens (x5)	10 x 3	35	Maturing	Good	Fair	20+	Medium	60s-80s	60s-80s

4.6 From the new estimates based on the aerial photos the following 15 trees are older than previously estimated. This has not altered my view of the trees arboricultural value.

Tree No.	Botanic Name	Arb. Value	Estimated decade of planting	Amended Estimated year of Planting
54	Juniperus virginiana	Low	40s	Pre 39
100	Hesperocyparis macrocarpa	Medium	50s	Pre 39
18	Pinus radiata	Medium	60s	Pre 39
26	Pinus radiata	Medium	60s	Pre 39
38	Ulmus Xhollandica	High	60s	Pre 39
40	Hesperocyparis macrocarpa (x17)	Medium	60s	Pre 39
44	Eucalyptus radiata	Low	60s	Pre 39
32	Quercus robur	High	60s	40s
46	Populus xcanadensis	Low	60s	40s
47	Populus xcanadensis	Low	60s	40s
49	Brachychiton xroseous	High	60s	50s
58	Grevillea robusta	Medium	60s	50s
70	Populus nigra 'Italica'	Medium	60s	50s
75	Pyrus sp.	Low	60s	50s
77	Metasequoia glyptostroboides	Medium	60s	50s

4.7 The 1960 photo does not show the following 2 Oak trees, suggesting that these trees are younger than originally thought.

Tree No.	Botanic Name	Arb. Value	Estimated decade of planting	Amended Estimated Year of Planting
66	Quercus macrocarpa	High	40s	60s
85	Quercus macrocarpa	High	40s	60s

4.8 In conclusion there appears to be 15 trees that are older than originally estimated, nine of which appeared to be present in the 1939 and present photos, even though their size and condition would suggest that these are not the same trees. There is no evidence of replacement planting of these trees but there is a small window of opportunity in the early 40s where they may have been replaced. The apparent inconsistency may be attributed to supplementary watering and a high standard of maintenance.

4.9 The 1960 photo supports the majority of my original age estimates for the site.

4.10 Only two large oaks are younger than first thought as they do not appear to be present in the 1960 photo.

5 PROVISIONAL OPINIONS.

5.1 None.

6 INACCURACIES AND ADDITIONAL MATTERS.

6.1 To my knowledge, there are no inaccuracies in this report or matters related to landscape assessment and design which fall outside my expertise.

6.2 I have made all the enquiries that I believe are desirable and appropriate and no matters of significance, which I regard as relevant, have to my knowledge been withheld from the Panel.



Michael Rogers

John Patrick Landscape Architects Pty Ltd