

Rosamund Querton

Absolutely


POSITIVELY

HE HEKE KI PŌNEKE  
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL

Wellington

# WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL PROPOSED HERITAGE TREE INVENTORY

## 2010



WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL

PO Box 2199, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington 6140, New Zealand

Ph 64-4-499 4444, Internet [www.Wellington.govt.nz](http://www.Wellington.govt.nz)

# INDEX

1. 154 Barnard Street, Wadestown
2. 156 Barnard Street, Wadestown
3. 64 Broderick Road, Johnsonville
4. 18 Colway Street, Ngaio
5. Erskine, Island Bay
6. 29 Fitzherbert Tce, Thorndon
7. 41 Glenbirvie Tce, Thorndon
8. Glenmore Street, Thorndon
9. 22 Hatton Rd, Karori
10. 331 Karori Rd, Karori
11. 364 Karori Rd, Karori
12. 14 Moana Road, Kelburn
13. 36 Para St, Mirama
14. 39 (41) Pipitea St, Thorndon
15. 1 The Terrace, Central
16. 112 Tinakori Rd, Thorndon
17. 15 Trevor Tce, Newtown
18. Cnr Victoria & Dixon Street
19. 151 Wilton Rd, Wilton
20. 290 Willis St, Te Aro
21. 6 Woodmancote St, Khandallah

# 154 Barnard Street Wadestown



## *Nothofagus solandri* Black beech

## STEM Evaluation

STREET ADDRESS: 154 Barnard Street, Wadestown  
 BOTANICAL NAME: *Nothofagus solandrii*.  
 TREE OWNER: Not known at time of assessment  
 EVALUATING OFFICER: Bruce MacDonald  
 PHOTO TAKEN  LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS

HEIGHT (m): 18.0 SPREAD (m): 15.0 DBH (cm): 80cm Dia  
 COMMON NAME: Black Beech (native)  
 CONTACT DETAILS:  
 DATE: 24 February 2010  
 SINGLE SCORE: 159 GROUP SCORE:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form and structure	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Uncommon in central Wellington	21
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	In very good health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		9
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+	Maybe remnant tree	21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Large tree for species	15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							3
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Tree is a very tall specimen, with excellent form  
 Growing on private property below road, the full scale of the tree can not be fully appreciated by wider community  
 Little storm damage present  
 Usual small amount of dead wood  
 Fantastic tree

**Total Score: 159**



# 156 Barnard Street Wadestown



***Nothofagus solandri***  
**Black beech**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 156 Barnard Street, Wadestown

**HEIGHT (m):** 15.0 **SPREAD (m):** 13.0 **DBH (cm):** 66cm Dia

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Nothofagus solandrii*.

**COMMON NAME:** Black Beech (native)

**TREE OWNER:** Marjorie Carson

**CONTACT DETAILS:** (04) 938 8802

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 135 **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Double stem, tight union	15
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Uncommon in central Wellington	21
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Reasonable	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		9
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+	Maybe remnant tree	21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Moderately big tree for species	15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							3
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Tree is growing well below road and upper canopy is screened by garage  
 Can be seen from lower Thorndon but not a skyline tree  
 Large double leader originating at approx 1.5m above ground

**Total Score: 135**



# 18 Colway Street Ngaio



# Myoporum laetum Ngaio

## Stem Evaluation

**STREET ADDRESS:** 18 Colway Street, Ngaio      **HEIGHT (m):** 7.5    **SPREAD (m):** 11.0    **DBH (cm):** 75cm Dia  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Myoporum laetum*.      **COMMON NAME:** Ngaio (native)  
**TREE OWNER:** Not known at time of assessment      **CONTACT DETAILS:**  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 24 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 138      **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form and structure	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Very common species	9
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	In very good health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Large tree for species	9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Seen only along road	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	High amenity value to street	15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Low voltage network wires through canopy  
 Very good form  
 Excellent canopy cover  
 Gnarled stem and scaffolds are a feature of this tree  
 Some old pruning stubs  
 Canopy would be ruined if channel cut to accommodate power lines  
 Good rooting structure, although some recent excavation on west side of tree has severed minor roots  
 Loses points for smallish stature

**Total Score: 138**

# 64 Broderick Road Johnsonville



*Sophora microphylla*  
Kowhai

## Stem Evaluation

**STREET ADDRESS:** 64 Broderick Street, Johnsonville  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Sophra tetraptera*  
**TREE OWNER:** Emma Palamidas  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**HEIGHT (m):** 7.0    **SPREAD (m):** 18.0    **DBH (cm):** 48cm  
**COMMON NAME:** Kowhai  
**CONTACT DETAILS:** palamidas@xtra.co.nz  
**DATE:** 22 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**     **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**     **SINGLE SCORE:**    **GROUP SCORE:** 138

Note: Questions 1 – 5 are used to assess single trees. Questions 1 – 6 are used to assess groups of trees.  
 GPS co-ordinates: E 174.8014' - S 41.22380

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen		9
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		9
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent		15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Approximate height is 7.0m	9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Visible from far away hills but noticed only within immediate area	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Would be somewhat missed if removed	15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		3
b) Feature							9
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Three Sophora growing in close proximity assessed as a single canopy  
 East tree has large basal cavity  
 Co-dominant middle tree  
 West trees has best form and function, very good visual specimen  
 Normal amount of dead wood present, no evidence of poor health or decline

**Total Score: 138**



# The Erskin Island Bay



***Metrosideros excelsa* x6**

Pohutukawa

***Araucaria heterophylla***

Norfolk Island Pine

***Liquidamber styraciflua***

Liquidamber

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Erskine, Island Bay      **HEIGHT (m):** 15.0    **SPREAD (m):** 17.0    **DBH (cm):** 220cm @ GL  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excelisa*      **COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa  
**TREE OWNER:**      **TREE ID:** Tree No: 201  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 25 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**     **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**     **SINGLE SCORE:** 189    **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen		21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent		21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		9
b) Feature							3
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

- Excellent feature tree on corner of wood lot
- Often used in wedding photos
- Grand specimen that is well known to Erskine visitors

**Total Score: 189**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Erskine, Island Bay

**HEIGHT (m):** 18.0    **SPREAD (m):** 18.0    **DBH (cm):** 146cm @ 20cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excelsa*

**COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa

**TREE OWNER:**

**TREE ID:** Tree No: 202

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 25 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**

**LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 189

**GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	4x main leader stems	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent		21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yts+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		9
b) Feature							9
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**  
 Excellent character pohutukawa

**Total Score: 189**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Erskine, Island Bay

**HEIGHT (m):** 18.0    **SPREAD (m):** 16.0    **DBH (cm):** 153cm @ 40cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excel*

**COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa

**TREE OWNER:**

**TREE ID:** Tree No: 203

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 25 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 195

**GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	10x main leader stems	27
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent		21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		9
b) Feature							9
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

One of the best pohutukawa in the region

**Total Score: 195**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Erskine, Island Bay      **HEIGHT (m):** 30.0    **SPREAD (m):** 20.0    **DBH (cm):** 126cm  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Araucaria heterophylla*      **COMMON NAME:** Norfolk Island Pine  
**TREE OWNER:**      **TREE ID:** Tree No: 204  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 25 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 237      **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Tree is considered premium	27
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Excellent for age, no trunk bleed	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Iconic landmark tree	27
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	The tallest tree of the stand.	27
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Easily seen from across valley and neighbouring surrounds	21
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		9
b) Feature							9
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

- Very tall with excellent form
- Fantastic specimen tree
- Has hardware nailed into stem
- Remnants of an old fort at about 6m high
- Growing very close to a concrete block retaining type wall that is likely being pushed out due to root expansion

**Total Score: 237**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Erskine, Island Bay      **HEIGHT (m):** 20.0    **SPREAD (m):** 20.0    **DBH (cm):** 203cm @ 40cm  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excelsa*      **COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa  
**TREE OWNER:**      **TREE ID:** Tree No: 205  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 25 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 195      **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	10x main leader stems	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent		21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Only just missed next category of stature	15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Best view from hill side across valley	15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		9
b) Feature							9
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Large lignified aerial roots  
 Most visible from across valley  
 Very tall and spreading tree

**Total Score: 195**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Eirskine, Island Bay      **HEIGHT (m):** 20.0    **SPREAD (m):** 16.0    **DBH (cm):** 154cm @ 40cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excelsa*

**COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa

**TREE OWNER:**

**TREE ID:** Tree No: 206

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 25 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**

**LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 189

**GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS				COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>						
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	5x main leader stems 15
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+	21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>						
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Tall tree just missed next category of stature 15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Best view from hill side across valley 15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		9
b) Feature							9
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Another excellent pohutukawa  
Visible from across valley  
Very tall with excellent form

**Total Score: 189**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Erskine, Island Bay      **HEIGHT (m):** 17.0      **SPREAD (m):** 13.0      **DBH (cm):** 60cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Liquidamber styraciflua*      **COMMON NAME:** Sweet gum, liquidamber

**TREE OWNER:**      **TREE ID:** Tree No: 207

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 25 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 135      **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS				COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>						
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Average form due to suppression 9
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	9
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+	15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>						
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Narrow crown habit, reasonably tall 15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	9



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Appears to have sound branch attachments, not typical of the expected tight unions associated with species  
 One large broken limb present  
 May have large crack on west side of stem at a height between 1.2 – 2.4  
 Well suppressed by much taller and spreading pohutukawa

**Total Score: 135**

### STEM EVALUATION

**STREET ADDRESS:** The Erskine, Island Bay      **HEIGHT (m):** 22.0    **SPREAD (m):** 18.0    **DBH (cm):** 134cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excelsa*

**COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa

**TREE OWNER:**

**TREE ID:** Tree No: 213

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 25 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**

**LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 195

**GROUP SCORE:**



RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	8-10 main leader stems	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent		21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Likely the tallest tree of the stand	21
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Easily seen from across valley and neighbouring surrounds	15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	Distinct	Regional	National	International		9
b) Feature							9
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							9
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a


**General Comments:**

Very tall with excellent form (only pohutukawa to score 21 for stature)  
 Unlike other trees it has not had any maintenance  
 Large and numerous deadwood present  
 Growing very close to an old stone wall and surprisingly there is no damage to this wall caused by root expansion

**Total Score: 195**



# 29 Fitzherbert Terrace Thorndon



Aesculus sp.  
Chestnut

**Stem Evaluation**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 29 Fitzherbert Terrace, Thondon

**HEIGHT (m):** 7.0 **SPREAD (m):** 9.0 **DBH (cm):** 70cm **Dia @ 40cm**

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Aesculus sp.*

**COMMON NAME:** Chestnut

**TREE OWNER:** Road reserve outside American Embassy

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 132 **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS				COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>						
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Reasonable shape 9
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Not overly common in Wellington 15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Appears stressed 9
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Softens harsh immediate environment 21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+	15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>						
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Small tree 3
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Single tree in area devoid of scale vegetation 27
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Solitary tree on motorway exit 21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	3

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Basal wound on road side of tree  
 Good screening tree  
 Old stub cuts present  
 Slow wound wood development


**Total Score: 132**

**Tree has scored low due to stature and form, but is otherwise a reasonably good specimen providing high amenity value.**





# 41 Glenbirvie Terrace Thorndon



*Quercus robur*  
Oak

## Stem Evaluation

**STREET ADDRESS:** 41 Glenbervie Tce, Thorndon

**HEIGHT (m):** 18.0\* **SPREAD (m):** 18.0 **DBH (cm):** 110cm Dia est\*

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Quercus robur*

**COMMON NAME:** English oak

**TREE OWNER:**

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**

**LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 177

**GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form and structure	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	In very good health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+	One of the oldest trees in the locality	27
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Tree canopy hangs well below trunk origin due to growing on bank	15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Prominent from Tinakori hill	15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS				COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21		
<b>3. STATURE</b>						
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International	
b) Feature	3					3
c) Form						n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>						
a) Age 100 years +	3					3
b) Association	3					3
c) Commemoration						n/a
d) Remnant						n/a
e) Relic						n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>						
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major	n/a

**General Comments:**

Growing on apex of step embankment at end of narrow cul-de-sac  
 Branches hanging well below trunk origin  
 Suppression on eastside due to adjacent sycamore, birch and lesser oak  
 Smothered in creeper vine  
 Excellent character tree

**Total Score: 177**

Note: DBH was not taken due to hazardous approach to stem and steep embankment, DBH is an estimate



# Glenmore Street Thorndon



**Fraxinus excelsior 'aurea'**  
**Golden Ash**

**STEM ELVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** Glenmore Street, Thorndon

**HEIGHT (m):** 9.0    **SPREAD (m):** 13.0    **DBH (cm):** 64cm @ 1.10m  
68cm @ 0.60m

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Fraxinus excelsa 'aurea'*

**COMMON NAME:** Common Ash

**TREE OWNER:** Wellington City Council

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 23 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**     **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 132    **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates: E 174.758089 - S 41.286278

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Average form for species	15
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Not common in Wellington	15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Good health	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	High amenity appeal in lawn area	21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Road side amenity value	15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Exposed surface roots, all with evidence of mower damage  
 Some side suppression on northern side  
 Minor dead wood present, old breakages evident  
 Close proximity to network power wires  
 Good all round specimen.

**Total Score: 132**





# 22 Hatton Street Karori



**Castania sativa**  
**Sweet/Spanish Chestnut**

**STEM ELUVATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 22 Hatton Street, Karori      **HEIGHT (m):** 12.0    **SPREAD (m):** 22.5    **DBH (cm):** 118cm  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Castania safiva*      **COMMON NAME:** Spanish chestnut  
**TREE OWNER:** Riko Kell      **CONTACT DETAILS:**  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 22 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 204      **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates: E 174.744254 - S 41.281108

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Very spreading form	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Not very common species	21
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Very healthy	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Has association with old house	21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Minor screening from adjacent trees	21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		3
b) Feature							9
c) Form							15
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		15


**General Comments:**

- Excellent form and very good structure
- Appears to have been over thinned for light access due to abnormally open canopy
- Good vigour and wound wood development
- Possible basal wounding from lawn mowers
- Many pruning wounds
- No conflict
- Tree highly recommend for Notable status**

**Total Score: 204**



# 331 Karori Road Karori



**Fagus sylvatica 'purpurea'**  
**Purple beech**

**Tilla x europaea**  
**Common Lime**

**STEM ELUVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 331 Karori Rd, Karori

**HEIGHT (m):** 10.0    **SPREAD (m):** 11.0    **DBH (cm):** 103cm @ 40cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Fagus Sylvatica 'cuprea'*

**COMMON NAME:** Copper beech

**TREE OWNER:** Cooper

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 26 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**     **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 159

**GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Typical multi stemmed tree	15
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Very healthy	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Has association with old house	15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Road side visibility	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							3
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a


**General Comments:**

- Excellent tree
- Great association with adjacent garage, old house and neighbouring linden
- Large basal wound
- Doubt over whether the tree is causing structural damage to brick work within garage

**Total Score: 159**







**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 331 Karori Rd, Karori      **HEIGHT (m):** 9.0    **SPREAD (m):** 14.0    **DBH (cm):** 150cm @ 40cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Tilia x europaea*      **COMMON NAME:** Common Linden

**TREE OWNER:** Cooper      **CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 26 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**     **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**     **SINGLE SCORE:** 153    **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form and spread	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Not very common species	21
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Very healthy	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Has association with old house	15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Road side visibility	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							3
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

- Excellent tree
- Great example of branch grafting
- Gas and sewer below root plate
- Very large base
- Reasonable wound wood development
- Some very ugly flush cuts

**Total Score: 153**



# 364 Karori Road Karori



***Tilia x europaea***  
**Common lime**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 364 Karori Rd, Karori  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Tilia x europaea*  
**TREE OWNER:** Anthony Thyne  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**HEIGHT (m):** 9.0    **SPREAD (m):** 11.0    **DBH (cm):** 62cm  
**COMMON NAME:** Common Lindon Lime  
**CONTACT DETAILS:**  
**DATE:** 23 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**     **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**     **SINGLE SCORE:** 183    **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates: E - S


RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Not consistent with natural form	9
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rate	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Good health	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		9
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		

**General Comments:**

- Abnormally dense crown, inconsistent with natural form
- Very close proximity to network power wires
- Multiple service wires through tree
- Large proportion of crown is overhanging neighboring property

**Total Score: 183**





# 14 Moana Road Highbury



# Agathis australis Kauri

**STEM ELVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 14 Moana Rd, Kelburn      **HEIGHT (m):** 22.0m      **SPREAD (m):** 7.0      **DBH (cm):** 51cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Agathis australis*      **COMMON NAME:** Kauri

**TREE OWNER:**      **CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 26 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 144      **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Typically good form for ricker	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Excellent vigour and health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Tall tree	21
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Seen from across the valley	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Growing among other large scale trees	9
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Growing in bush like location  
 Excellent health and form  
 Base of tree within 4.0m of house and canopy within 1.0m

**Total Score: 144**



# 36 Para Street Miramar



**Metrosiderous excelsa  
Pohutukawa**

**Araucaria heterophylla  
Norfolk Island Pine**

**Quercus ilex  
Holm Oak**

**Metrosiderous excelsa  
Pohutukawa**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 36 Para St, Miramar

**HEIGHT (m):** 14.0    **SPREAD (m):** 18.0    **DBH (cm):** 240cm @ GL

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excelsa*

**COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa (located on northwest corner)

**TREE OWNER:**

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 138

**GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Typical multi stemmed tree 6x leaders	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Most common large scale amenity tree is Wellington	3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Very healthy	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Has association with old house	9
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		3
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							3
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Mirror significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Excellent spreading pohutukawa  
6x main leader stems

**Total Score: 138**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 36 Para St, Miramar      **HEIGHT (m):** 21.0    **SPREAD (m):** 15.0    **DBH (cm):** 1.26m  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Araucaria heterophylla*      **COMMON NAME:** Norfolk Island Pine  
**TREE OWNER:**      **CONTACT DETAILS:**  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 24 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 156      **GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Typically excellent form, single apical dominance	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		9
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Good health and vigour	15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		21
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		3
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							3
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

- Excellent scale tree
- No conflicts but has significant encroachment over neighbouring property
- Hose attachment nailed to base of tree

**Total Score: 156**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 36 Para St, Miramar      **HEIGHT (m):** 12.0    **SPREAD (m):** 10.0    **DBH (cm):** 1.01m @ 20cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Quercus ilex*

**COMMON NAME:** Evergreen oak, Holm oak

**TREE OWNER:**

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 156

**GROUP SCORE:**

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	3x stems @ 5m, good structure not affected by wind	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	Uncommon species	21
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Good health and vigour	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		9

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		3
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							3
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Tree has retained good form and not been sculptured by wind  
 Uncommon tree species  
 Three main leaders at 5m

**Total Score: 156**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 36 Para St, Miramar

**HEIGHT (m):** 12.0    **SPREAD (m):** 14.0    **DBH (cm):** 250cm @ GL

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Metrosideros excelsa*

**COMMON NAME:** Pohutukawa (located on southwest boundary)

**TREE OWNER:**

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 156

**GROUP SCORE:**



RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Typical multi stemmed tree 7x leaders	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rate	Very Rare	Most common large scale amenity tree is Wellington	3
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Very healthy	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		15
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Provides shade to neighbouring kindy	9

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		3
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							3
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

- Excellent branching structure
- 7x main leader stems
- Hole in east side of canopy, possibly a result of pruning
- Crown conflict with adjacent lesser pohutukawa
- Magnificent specimen

**Total Score: 156**



# 41 Pipitea Street Thorndon



**Ficus microphylla**  
**Rubber tree**

**STEM ELVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 39 Pipitea Street, Thorndon      **HEIGHT (m):** 9.0    **SPREAD (m):** 16.0    **DBH (cm):** 204cm  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Ficus microphylla*      **COMMON NAME:** Morton Bay fig, Rubber tree  
**TREE OWNER:** Brian Bargh      **CONTACT DETAILS:**  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 22 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 225      **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates: E 174.779203 - S 41.27560

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Very healthy	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Will become a large specimen	9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Stand alone tree	27
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		21



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International	Immediate street appeal	3
b) Feature							15
c) Form							15
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Excellent form and very good structure  
 Well pruned to enhance form and light access to adjacent building, and service wire clearance  
 Typical spreading surface roots  
 Little or no pavement damage  
 Electricity and plumbing (gas?) has been re-routed over roots to prevent sub-terrain root conflict

**Tree highly recommend for Notable status**

**Total Score: 225**



# 1 The Terrace Thorndon



*Ulmus procera*  
English Elm

## STEM Evaluation

<b>STREET ADDRESS:</b> 1 The Terrace, Central  <b>BOTANICAL NAME:</b> <i>Ulmus procera</i>  <b>TREE OWNER:</b>  <b>EVALUATING OFFICER:</b> Bruce MacDonald  <b>PHOTO TAKEN</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	Tree 1 westside <b>HEIGHT (m):</b> 14.0m <b>SPREAD (m):</b> 15.0 <b>DBH (cm):</b> 108cm Tree 2 middle 14.0m 12.0m 74cm Tree 3 eastside 12.0m 8.0m 61cm  <b>COMMON NAME:</b> Common Elm  <b>CONTACT DETAILS:</b>  <b>DATE:</b> 24 February 2010  <b>SINGLE SCORE:</b>	<b>LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>GROUP SCORE:</b> 186  <b>SINGLE SCORE:</b>
---	--	---

### Group assessment for three trees with singular canopy.


RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS				COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>						
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Average form as individuals 15
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Moderate, some die back 15
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Incredibly high amenity value 27
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+	21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>						
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Located within very prominent part of wellington city 27
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Trees growing on a busy corner 21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Offers some shading to adjacent building 15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		3
b) Feature							3
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

As a collection, the three trees are a very valuable stand.  
 It is the singular canopy of the three trees that gives them their high value.  
 Individual canopies are all very unbalanced  
 Stems give high amenity appeal  
 Very windy location, trees show signs of wind stress  
 Busy pedestrian area  
 Some large dead wood present in canopies

**Total Score: 186**



# 15 Trevor Terrace Newtown



**Sophora tetraptera**  
**Kowhai**

**STEM ELVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 15 Trevor Tce, Newtown

**HEIGHT (m):** 6.5 **SPREAD (m):** 7.0 **DBH (cm):** 37cm Dia @ 60cm

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Sophora tetraptera*

**COMMON NAME:** Kowhai

**TREE OWNER:**

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 23 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 120

**GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form and shape	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rate	Very Rare	Common tree	9
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Great health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Nice garden ornamental	9
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		9
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Small tree, but reasonable for species	3
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		3
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Singular tree, at end of cul-de-sac	27
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Offers high amenity value to neighbourhood	15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

- Excellent form
- Nice specimen at end of cul-de-sac
- Encroachment towards house
- Feed wire contact and close proximity to network wires
- Will eventually cause structural damage to block and stone retaining wall
- Tree is nice garden ornamental

**Total Score: 120**



# Victoria & Dixon Street Te Aro



**Ulmus glabra var 'Lutescens'**  
**Golden Elm**

**STEM ELVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** Cnr Victoria & Dixon Streets

**HEIGHT (m):** 8.0m **SPREAD (m):** 17.0 **DBH (cm):** 78cm Dia

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Ulmus glabra var. lutescens*

**COMMON NAME:** Golden Elm

**TREE OWNER:** WCC

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald

**DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**  **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**

**SINGLE SCORE:** 225 **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form and structure	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare	reasonably common species	15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	In excellent health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Very important tree within inner city	21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		15
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Large tree for species	15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Immediately seen from four corners	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Stand alone specimen	27
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Exceptionally high amenity value	27
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Moderate shade usage	15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		15
b) Feature							15
c) Form							9
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

- Notable values included
- Double leader at 1.5 – 1.8m (not considered serious)
- Excellent location of high prominence
- Extremely high amenity appeal
- Excellent health
- Perfect tree in location
- Very little service's or other conflict

**Total Score: 225**

**Highly recommend tree as a Notable item**



# 151 Wilton Road Wilton



**Fagus sylvatica 'cuptea'**  
**Copper beech**

**STEM EVALUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 151 Wilton Rd, Wilton      **HEIGHT (m):** 14.0    **SPREAD (m):** 12.0    **DBH (cm):** 61cm Dia  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Fagus sylvatica 'cuprea'*      **COMMON NAME:** Copper beech  
**TREE OWNER:**      **CONTACT DETAILS:**  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 23 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 156      **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Excellent form and shape	21
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rate	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	Great health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major	Grand residential tree	21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +	Reasonably sizable beech	9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary	Large tree surrounded by few smaller trees	21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	Offers high amenity value to neighbourhood	15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Excellent form and shape  
 Low voltage service line rubbing on large stem  
 A few old pruning stubs present  
 Excellent character tree

Growing on neighbouring boundary with half canopy overhanging both properties  
 Lower parts of tree obscured by camellia and rhododendron

**Total Score: 156**



# 290 Willis Street Te Aro



**Ulmus procera**  
**Elm**

**STEM ELVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 290 Willis Street, Aro Valley      **HEIGHT (m):** 14m    **SPREAD (m):** 14.0    **DBH (cm):** 116cm Dia  
**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Ulmus procera*      **COMMON NAME:** Elm  
**TREE OWNER:** NZ Transport Agency      **CONTACT DETAILS:**  
**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 24 February 2010  
**PHOTO TAKEN**     **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 180      **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:


RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen		15
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	In very good health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		21
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		15
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8		15
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major	High amenity value to area, associates with adjacent building	21
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15

NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		n/a
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**General Comments:**

Double leader at 1.4 – 1.8m above ground level (loses points for form)  
 Root damage on pavement under fence, new pavement recently laid.  
 Little deadwood, some minor branch breakages  
 Major damage to paving concrete on inside of property boundary  
 Approx 5m overhanging building roof  
 Neighbouring elm and sycamore creating singular canopy  
 Large feature tree in a very prominent part of central Wellington beside very busy highway intersection

**Total Score: 180**



# 6 Woodmancote Road Khandallah



***Fagus sylvatica* 'cuprea'**  
**Copper beech**

**STEM ELVUATION**

**STREET ADDRESS:** 6 Woodmancote St, Khandallah      **HEIGHT (m):** 9.0    **SPREAD (m):** 14.0    **DBH (cm):** 1.04m Dia

**BOTANICAL NAME:** *Fagus sylvatica 'cuprea'*      **COMMON NAME:** Copper beech

**TREE OWNER:**      **CONTACT DETAILS:**

**EVALUATING OFFICER:** Bruce MacDonald      **DATE:** 24 February 2010

**PHOTO TAKEN**       **LOCATED ON PLANNING MAP VIA GPS**       **SINGLE SCORE:** 144      **GROUP SCORE:**

GPS co-ordinates:

RATING CATEGORIES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>1. CONDITION EVALUATION - IS THE TREE A GOOD SPECIMEN?</b>							
a) Form or Shape	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent	Specimen	Typical branching habit	15
b) Occurrence	Predominant	Common	Infrequent	Rare	Very Rare		15
c) Vigour/Vitality	Poor	Some	Good	Very good	Excellent	In excellent health	21
d) Function	Minor	Useful	Moderate	Important	Major		15
e) Age	0-20yrs	20-40 Years	40-80 Years	80-100 Years	100yrs+		21
<b>2. AMENITY EVALUATION - DOES THE TREE HAVE VISUAL/LANDSCAPE VALUE?</b>							
a) Stature (m)	3 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 +		9
b) Visibility (km)	0.5	1	2	4	8	Immediate locality and hillside vantage points	9
c) Proximity	Forest	Parkland	Group 10+	Group 3+	Solitary		21
d) Role in Location	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		15
e) Climate	Minor	Moderate	Important	Significant	Major		3



NOTABLE VALUES	POINTS					COMMENTS	SCORE
	3	9	15	21	27		
<b>3. STATURE</b>							
a) Recognition	Local	District	Regional	National	International		
b) Feature							n/a
c) Form							n/a
<b>4. DOES THE TREE HAVE HISTORIC VALUE?</b>							
a) Age 100 years +							n/a
b) Association							n/a
c) Commemoration							n/a
d) Remnant							n/a
e) Relic							n/a
<b>5. DOES THE TREE HAVE SCIENTIFIC VALUE?</b>							
b) Botanical Value (genetic purity, propagation, collection value, species variation)	No Significance	Minor significance	Moderate significance	Very Significant	Major		n/a

**Total Score: 144**

**General Comments:**

- No current conflicts
- Nice tree
- Slight wind sculpturing from the north
- Gas line under roots
- Good upper canopy form
- 3x main leaders all appear sound, but with typically tight inclusion

