

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1016



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202801.132 | N 600108.609 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 5.5 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 600 | N° 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: | A 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: | Light prune. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1017



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202800.387 | N 600101.339 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus viminalis | | | Common Name: | Ribbon gum | | |
| Height: | 7 | Canopy spread: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 1300 | N° of Trunks | 2 |
| 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 | | | | | | 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 second trunk will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1018



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202798.220 N600100.385 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus viminalis | | | Common Name: | Ribbon gum | | |
| Height: | 6.5 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 800 | N° of Trunks | 2 |
| 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 | | | | | | 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 second trunk will damage tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1019



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Regulated Tree: | Y |
| 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 202795.449 | N 600097.049 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus viminalis | | | Common Name: | Ribbon gum | | |
| Height: | 7 | Canopy spread: | 7 | Trunk Circum: | 1600 | 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 | | | | | | 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: | H | | Comment: | Good form. | | | |
| 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: | Requires light pruning. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1020



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202797.845 | N 600092.251 |
| 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: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 800 | N° 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 | | | | | | F | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/F | 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: | Poor union at 1.5 metres. | | | | | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1021



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202791.517 | N600089.570 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus mannifera | | | Common Name: | White brittle gum | | |
| Height: | 5 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 600 | 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 | | | | | | F | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/F | 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: | Poor union at 2 metres. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1022



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202785.242 | N 600085.130 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 7 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 800 | 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 | | | | | | G | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/G | Form: | T | Hazard Potential: | L |
| Habitat Value: | H | | | 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: | | | | |
| 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 two small trunks. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

| | |
|----------|------|
| Tree N°: | 1023 |
|----------|------|



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202783.905 | N 600079.079 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 7 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 800 | 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 | | | | | | 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: | H | | | 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: | | | | |
| 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: | Requires light pruning. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1024



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202785.775 | N 600074.921 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 5.5 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 1600 | N ^o 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 | | | | | | 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: | b, c & d always apply | | | | | | |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | | | | | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1025



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202779.125 | N 600075.536 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 3 | Canopy spread: | 3 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N ^o of Trunks | 3 |
| 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 | | | | | | 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^o: 1026



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202780.360 | N 600066.422 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 7 | Canopy spread: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N ^o of Trunks | 2 |
| 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: | M | | Comment: | | | | |
| 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 two small trunks. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1027



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202776.652 | N 600065.537 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|--------------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus viminalis | | | Common Name: | Ribbon gum | | |
| Height: | 5.5 | Canopy spread: | 5 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N ^o of Trunks | 6 |
| 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 | | | | | | H |
| | 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: | b, c & d always apply | | | | | | |
| Arboricultural Notes: | | | | | | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1028



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202774.713 | N 600057.448 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus mannifera | | | Common Name: | White brittle gum | | |
| Height: | 4.5 | Canopy spread: | 4 | Trunk Circum: | 900 | N° of Trunks | 3 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | L |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | L |
| | 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: | N | Cultural, Social, Scientific: | L |
| Contribution to Immediate Landscaping: | | L | Comment: | | | | |
| 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: | Coppice off dead tree. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N^o: 1029



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202763.102 | N 600044.506 |
| 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: | 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 | | | | | | M |
| | 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: | | | | |
| 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: | Light prune required. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1030



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202760.251 | N 600040.507 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus bicostata | | | Common Name: | Blue gum | | |
| Height: | 6 | Canopy spread: | 6 | Trunk Circum: | 2200 | N° of Trunks | 9 |
| Health/Condition: | Relative density of foliage | | | | | | M |
| | Amount of dead wood in canopy | | | | | | M |
| | Prevalence of insect attack or disease | | | | | | L |
| | 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: 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: | | | | | | | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1031



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202758.525 | N 600031.966 |
| 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: | 7 | Trunk Circum: | 1100 | N° 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 | | | | | | 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: | | | | |
| 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°: | 1032 |
|----------|------|



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202752.249 | N 600023.426 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 7 | Canopy spread: | 5 | 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 | | | | | | H |
| | Prevalence of mistletoe | | | | | | H |
| Overall health/condition of the tree | | | | | | F | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/F | 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: | Very poor union at 2 metres. | |

MOLONGLO / COOMBS & WRIGHT TREE ASSESSMENT

Tree N°: 1033



| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 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 202746.163 | N 600019.189 |
| Date of Survey: | 4 th November 2009 | Assessor ID: | JL & ST | |

Tree Details:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Species: | Eucalyptus rubida | | | Common Name: | Candle bark | | |
| Height: | 7.5 | Canopy spread: | 7 | Trunk Circum: | 1600 | N° of Trunks | 4 |
| 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 | | | | | | F | |
| Age: | A | Age/Health/Condition: | A/F | Form: | T | 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. | |