

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1306



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202856.308 | N 599621.349 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 6.2 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 600 | N° of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | H | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | M | | Comment: | A reasonably good small tree. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | N | | Is work cost effective?: | | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | | Comment: | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1307



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202877.366 | N 599622.964 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 6.5 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 1100 | N ^o of Trunks | 3 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: | | Coppice growth. | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | b, c & d always apply | | | | | | |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunk will damage tree. | | | | | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1308



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202906.602 N 599601.299 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 7.3 | Canopy spread: | 7 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N ^o of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | H |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | H | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | M | | Comment: | Reasonably good form and good health. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | Y | | | Is work cost effective?: | Y | | |
| Landscape Groups: | Comment: | | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Remove dead small dead leader and remove small branches off lower trunk. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1309



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202927.129 | N 599586.645 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 8.5 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 600 | N ^o of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | H |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| | Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | H | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | M | | Comment: | Well-formed young tree. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | N | | Is work cost effective?: | | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | N | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1315



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 203113.165 | N 600547.653 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 10.5 | Canopy spread: | 8 | Trunk Circum: | 800 | N ^o of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| | Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:


| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | M | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | H | | Comment: | Prominent good young tree. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | N | | Is work cost effective?: | | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Good form. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1316



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 203108.121 | N 600538.810 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 8.6 | Canopy spread: | 7 | Trunk Circum: | 600 | N° of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| | Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | M | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | H | | Comment: | Prominent good young tree. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | N | | Is work cost effective?: | | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1317



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 203096.771 | N 600520.933 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus mannifera | | | Common Name: | White brittle gum | | |
| Height: | 9.1 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 600 | N ^o of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | M | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | M | | Comment: | Good form. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | N | | Is work cost effective?: | | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | | Comment: | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Remove small dead branches. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1318



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 203042.862 | N 600442.901 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 8.4 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 1300 | N° of Trunks | 5 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | L |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L | |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: Poor form. | | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1319



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202979.093 | N 600349.591 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 8.3 | Canopy spread: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N ^o of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:


| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | H | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | M | Comment: Good form and health, well balanced crown. | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | N | Is work cost effective?: | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

| | |
|----------|------|
| Tree N°: | 1320 |
|----------|------|



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202973.438 | N 600341.507 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 10.2 | Canopy spread: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 1100 | N° of Trunks | 2 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | L | | Comment: | Poor form. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | Y | | | Is work cost effective?: | N | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1321



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | M |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | M |
| Recommendation: | Retain |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202967.550 | N 600333.044 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 9.2 | Canopy spread: | 7 | Trunk Circum: | 800 | N° of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | G | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | H | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | M | | Comment: | Good form. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | N | | | Is work cost effective?: | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Requires minor pruning to 2 metres. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1322



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202961.974 | N 600324.822 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 6.7 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 1300 | N ^o of Trunks | 5 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | L | | Comment: | Dead leader, poor form. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | Y | | | Is work cost effective?: | N | | |
| Landscape Groups: | Comment: | | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1323



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | Y |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202957.006 N 600316.089 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 9.6 | Canopy spread: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 1700 | N ^o of Trunks | 5 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | L |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L | |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: Poor form. | | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1324



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202921.977 | N 600259.444 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 5 | Canopy spread: | 3 | Trunk Circum: | 800 | N° of Trunks | 3 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | L |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | S | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L | |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: Coppice growth. | | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply | | | | | |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | | | | | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1325



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | Y |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202904.207 | N 600233.878 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 6.3 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 1600 | N° of Trunks | 6 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | S | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:


| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: Coppice growth. | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | N | Is work cost effective?: | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

| | |
|----------|------|
| Tree N°: | 1326 |
|----------|------|



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202899.341 | N 600223.591 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 9.5 | Canopy spread: | 8 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N° of Trunks | 3 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1327



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202851.939 | N 600152.512 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 8.5 | Canopy spread: | 7 | Trunk Circum: | 1300 | N° of Trunks | 2 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | H |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:


| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1328



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202833.612 | N 600123.007 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 8 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 1300 | N° of Trunks | 3 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | S | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1329



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202805.630 | N 600084.280 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 6.6 | Canopy spread: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 1200 | N° of Trunks | 2 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | L |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | L | | Comment: | Poor form. | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | Y | | | Is work cost effective?: | N | | |
| Landscape Groups: | Comment: | | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Poor union at 1 metre. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1330



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | N |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202799.197 | N 600074.655 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 6.1 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N° of Trunks | 3 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | L |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:


| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L | |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: Very poor form. | | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | | | Y | Is work cost effective?: | | | | N |
| Landscape Groups: | | Comment: | | | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1331



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | Y |
| Classification of Tree Quality: | |
| • Arboricultural Assessment | P |
| • Contribution to Urban Amenity | P |
| Recommendation: | Remove |
| Location | |

Survey Details:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Organisation: | dsb Landscape Architects | Grid Co-ordinates: | E 202732.063 | N 599973.410 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 8.3 | Canopy spread: | 8 | Trunk Circum: | 1600 | N° of Trunks | 5 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of epicormic growth | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | P | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/P | Form: | U | Hazard Potential: | M |
| Habitat Value: | N | | | Tolerance to Disturbance: | M | | |

Contribution to Future Urban Amenity:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Scenic: | L | Rareness or Commonness: | M | Habitat quality: | M | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | L | | Comment: | | | | |
| Economic justification for retention or removal: | | | | | | | |
| Ameliorative work to reduce Risk: | Y | | Is work cost effective?: | N | | | |
| Landscape Groups: | | | Comment: | | | | |

Tree Protection and Management:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tree Protection Zone & Conditions: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes: | Removing trunks will damage tree. | |