


# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N<sup>o</sup>: 1332



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202726.514 | N 599963.514 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST      |              |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |             |                          |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus rubida                      |                       |     | Common Name:              | Candle bark |                          |   |
| Height:                              | 5                                      | Canopy spread:        | 3   | Trunk Circum:             | 600         | N <sup>o</sup> of Trunks | 3 |
| Health/Condition:                    | Relative density of foliage            |                       |     |                           |             |                          | L |
|                                      | Amount of dead wood in canopy          |                       |     |                           |             |                          | M |
|                                      | Prevalence of insect attack or disease |                       |     |                           |             |                          | L |
|                                      | 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:              | All epicormics. |                       |  |  |  |  |  |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N<sup>o</sup>: 1333



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202707.884 | N 599935.939 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST      |              |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |             |                          |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus rubida                      |                       |     | Common Name:              | Candle bark |                          |   |
| Height:                              | 8.5                                    | Canopy spread:        | 3   | Trunk Circum:             | 800         | N <sup>o</sup> of Trunks | 1 |
| Health/Condition:                    | Relative density of foliage            |                       |     |                           |             |                          | M |
|                                      | Amount of dead wood in canopy          |                       |     |                           |             |                          | H |
|                                      | Prevalence of insect attack or disease |                       |     |                           |             |                          | M |
|                                      | 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 tree.               |   |                               |   |
| 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 smaller lower branches. |                       |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1480



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202082.4 | N 599226.6 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 5                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300       | N° of Trunks      | 8 |
| 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         |                       |     |                           |            |                   | 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:                |   |                         | 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°: 1481



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202107.6 | N 599246.5 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 3                                      | Canopy spread:        | 3   | Trunk Circum:             | 1400       | N° of Trunks      | 8 |
| 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 off dead trunk. |                          |   |                               |   |
| 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°: | 1482 |
|----------|------|



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202113.6 | N 599250.8 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                  |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       |     | Common Name:              | River peppermint |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 6                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 900              | N° of Trunks      | 1 |
| 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         |                       |     |                           |                  |                   | 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: Very poor 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:              |   |                       |  |  |  |  |  |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Tree N°: | 1483 |
|----------|------|



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202115.6 | N 599253.0 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                  |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       |     | Common Name:              | River peppermint |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 6                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1200             | N° of Trunks      | 5 |
| Health/Condition:                    | Relative density of foliage            |                       |     |                           |                  |                   | L |
|                                      | Amount of dead wood in canopy          |                       |     |                           |                  |                   | M |
|                                      | Prevalence of insect attack or disease |                       |     |                           |                  |                   | M |
|                                      | 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, broken leader. |                          |   |                               |   |
| 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:              | Numerous low branches. |                       |  |  |  |  |  |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N<sup>o</sup>: 1484



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202118.6 | N 599254.9 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                  |                          |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       |     | Common Name:              | River peppermint |                          |   |
| Height:                              | 6                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300             | N <sup>o</sup> 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         |                       |     |                           |                  |                          | 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:              | Dead main leader. |                       |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1485



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202130.7 | N 599265.3 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                  |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       |     | Common Name:              | River peppermint |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 7                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300             | N° of Trunks      | 1 |
| 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         |                       |     |                           |                  |                   | 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:              | Dead leader. |                       |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1486



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202135.0 | N 599268.7 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                  |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       |     | Common Name:              | River peppermint |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 5                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300             | N° of Trunks      | 8 |
| 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         |                       |     |                           |                  |                   | 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:              | Dead main stem. |                       |  |  |  |  |  |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1487



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202138.9 | N 599272.6 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                  |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       |     | Common Name:              | River peppermint |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 6                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1600             | N° of Trunks      | 7 |
| 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:                     | 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:              | Dead main leader. |                       |  |  |  |  |  |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1488



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202145.4 | N 599277.7 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 5                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1600       | N° of Trunks      | 8 |
| 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:                     | 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: All 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:              | Broken off dead main leader. |                       |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1489



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202150.5 | N 599281.9 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |    |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|----|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |    |
| Height:                              | 7                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1600       | N° of Trunks      | 10 |
| 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:                     | 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: | M | b, c & d always apply |
| Arboricultural Notes:              |   |                       |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1490



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202155.2 | N 599286.3 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 6                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300       | N° of Trunks      | 4 |
| 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:                     | 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:                |   |                         | 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°: 1491



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202188.5 | N 599313.9 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 4                                      | Canopy spread:        | 3   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300       | 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 |  |                       |     |                           |            | 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:                |   |                         | 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°: 1492



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202204.9 | N 599328.9 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>TH</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |          |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus bicostata                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Blue gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 8                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300     | N° of Trunks      | 2 |
| 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 |  |                       |     |                           |          | 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: Unsuitable species. |                          |   |                               |   |   |
| 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 trunk will damage tree. |                       |

# MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1493



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202213.2 | N 599322.5 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>TH</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                   |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus mannifera                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | White brittle gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 4                                      | Canopy spread:        | 6   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300              | N° of Trunks      | 6 |
| 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: Only 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°: 1494



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202215.4 | N 599338.2 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>TH</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |                  |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       |     | Common Name:              | River peppermint |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 3                                      | Canopy spread:        | 3   | Trunk Circum:             | 900              | 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         |                       |     |                           |                  |                   | 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: |                          | 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°: 1495



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202238.9 | N599347.8 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>TH</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |           |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |                           |               |      |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus elata                       |                       | River peppermint          |               |      |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 6                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4                         | Trunk Circum: | 1300 | 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         |                       |                           |               |      |                   | 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: 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°: 1496



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202242.0 | N 599351.0 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>TH</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 5                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300       | N° of Trunks      | 6 |
| 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: 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°: 1497



|                                 |        |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202247.9 | N 599357.4 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 <sup>TH</sup> November 2009 | Assessor ID:       | JL & ST    |            |

## Tree Details:

|                                      |  |                       |     |                           |            |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species:                             | Eucalyptus viminalis                   |                       |     | Common Name:              | Ribbon gum |                   |   |
| Height:                              | 5                                      | Canopy spread:        | 4   | Trunk Circum:             | 1300       | N° of Trunks      | 9 |
| 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: 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:              |   |                       |