

---

## ARBORICULTURAL REPORT – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGES RELATING TO NOTABLE TREES

### WESLEY COLLEGE 801 PAERATA ROAD, PAERATA (INCLUDES RESPONSE TO S92 QUESTIONS)

---

**Client:** Nick Pollard, Planner, Boffa Miskell Ltd

**From:** Gerard Mostert, Peers Brown Miller Ltd

**Date:** 24 March 2024

---

### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 Peers Brown Miller Ltd has been briefed to supply an arboricultural assessment of the Notable trees at Wesley College, 801 Paerata Road, Paerata (LOT 1001 DP 566172).
- 1.2 The property is subject to the Auckland Unitary Plan. There is a group of Notable trees on the property listed as **group 2804** in Schedule 10 Notable Trees Appendix to the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP).
- 1.3 The listed trees are, according to the Auckland Council GIS:
  - Natural Heritage: Notable Trees Overlay - 2804, Bunya Bunya Pine, Puriri, Totara, Tulip Tree, Pin Oak, Oak, Unverified position of tree.
- 1.4 In Schedule 10 Notable Trees Appendix, the trees are listed as a group:
  - *Araucaria bidwillii*, *Vitex lucens*, *Podocarpus totara*, *Liriodendron tulipifera*, *Quercus palustris*, *Quercus robur* (i.e., the scientific names of the species listed in the GIS note).
- 1.5 The Auckland Council GIS notes that **the position of the trees is unverified**.

- 1.6 The same list of trees appears in the Auckland Council District Plan (Franklin Section) as C.363 under Schedule 8A (Historic Buildings, Structures and Trees). C.363 does not verify the position of the trees.
- 1.7 A later Precinct Plan (Precinct Plan 2 Wesley Sub Precinct Concept Plan) (WSPCP) shows “trees to be retained” – including a number of “Schedule Notable Trees” – which slightly differs from Schedule 6.
- 1.8 The uncertainty over which trees are Notable, and where they are located, is an obstacle to the forward planning of development in the vicinity of Wesley College.

## 2 2024 Assessment

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to review the status of the Notable trees on site, to locate them as far as is practically possible, and to discuss their future protection in consultation with Auckland Council Heritage Division.
- 2.2 I visited Wesley College with West Fynn, Heritage Arborist, Auckland Council Heritage Division, on 16 October 2024.
- 2.3 I was able to establish substantial consensus with Mr. Fynn about which trees are intended to be part of Group 2804, and was also able to present a case to Heritage about which trees could reasonably be excluded from Schedule 10.
- 2.4 There is consensus between the parties (the property owner, Council and consultants) that it is desirable to identify and protect the best trees at Wesley College.

## 3 History

- 3.1 It appears that group 2804 was adopted into the AUP from the earlier Franklin District Plan (FDP), without alteration.
- 3.2 The only location plan for Group 2804 is a “bubble map” included in the Heritage site pack for 801 Paerata Road. This is shown below. The site diagram in Fig 1 is not fit for purpose for a number of reasons, which are discussed.
- 3.3 The Franklin 2 Precinct – Wesley Sub-Precinct Concept Plan includes a list of Notable trees, with locations, but the individual trees are not named and the list of trees in the Concept Plan is slightly different from Schedule 10 of the AUP.



Fig 1 – Marked-up aerial from the Heritage site pack for 801 Paerata Road

#### 4 Limitations relating to Group 2804 specifically

- 4.1 Group 2804 in Schedule 10 lists the species of Notable trees to be protected, but does not specifically identify or locate the individual trees, nor does it say how many examples of each species are included.
- 4.2 The Heritage Site Pack aerial photograph in Fig 1 is unclear and does not allow the identification of all individual trees. Some of the trees “circled” are not in the Notable Tree list (for example, a claret ash in the extreme NE corner of the group).

- 4.3 In Schedule 10, Group 2804 refers to Lot 1 DP72819, which no longer exists. This suggests that none of the trees in Group 2804 is protected under the AUP because the legal description is incorrect.
- 4.4 Some of the trees inside the “bubble” diagram in Fig 1 are at 51 Puhitahi Hill Road (LOT 850 DP 589520, LOT 852 DP 589520, LOT 1000 DP 589520). None of the source documents listed above (AUP, FDP, WSPCP) lists any Notable trees at 51 Puhitahi Road, i.e. the trees within 51 Puhitahi Road are clearly not protected by the AUP.
- 4.5 Group 2804 includes an English oak as one of the Notable trees, but neither I nor the Heritage arborist were able to find a suitable candidate within the Fig 1 “bubble” diagram. The nearest candidates are smaller trees within the Wesley College grounds, and one English oak within 51 Puhitahi Road, outside the “bubble”.

The Heritage site pack for Group 2804, and the “bubble” diagram, include an avenue of mostly pin oak trees along the NW site boundary of 801 Paerata Road. Some of these trees either straddle the boundary with the road reserve, or are entirely inside the road reserve, and are thus removed from protection under Schedule 10. The WSPCP does **not** include these trees as candidates for the Notable Trees Schedule.

## 5 Tree assessment

- 5.1 In 2014 I undertook an assessment of the trees at the Wesley College campus. That report was a critique of the previous Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM) survey of the trees on site undertaken by Andre Le Claire of Arborlab Ltd, date unknown.
- 5.2 At the time when the trees were scheduled in the Franklin District Plan, STEM was the standard for scheduled tree evaluations. The evaluation process produced an additive score, and a score in excess of 126 points was considered sufficient grounds for including trees in the schedule.
- 5.3 My 2014 review of the trees on the Wesley College campus, and within the “bubble” diagram in Fig 1, concluded that only a select few of the trees met or exceeded the 126-point STEM score required for the original scheduling.
- 5.4 The 2014 assessment was useful in that it served to select the best trees on site.
- 5.5 My 2024 assessment concluded that the trees that met the 2014 STEM threshold are suitable candidates for inclusion in Schedule 10 Notable Trees Appendix of the AUP.
- 5.6 My 2014 survey data is tabled in Appendix 1.

- 5.7 The trees suitable for scheduling, as numbered in 2014 assessment are as follows: Trees 15 (tulip tree), 18 (bunya pine), 25 (mixed group of totara, puriri and rimu), 27 (single totara), 28 (single puriri), 29 (single totara), 32 (single totara), 34 (single silver dollar) and 40 (single totara). All of these trees met or exceeded the required STEM score.
- 5.8 No English oak that met or exceeded the STEM score was found in 2014, contrary to the Schedule 10 listing.
- 5.9 The pin oak avenue in the NW corner of 801 Paerata Road (trees 1 in my 2014 report) did not meet the STEM threshold, contrary to the Schedule 10 listing and site pack data, which appears to include the avenue trees.
- 5.10 The 2024 site visit corroborated the 2014 assessment of the trees. The trees which were assessed in 2014 to be suitable for inclusion in Schedule 10 are still significant, and Auckland Council Heritage Division agrees with the original assessment.



Fig 2 – A marked up site plan from my 2014 assessment of the trees at Wesley College. The trees that met the 126-point STEM score are marked in red. Trees 1 (NW corner of 801 Paerata Road) straddles the boundary with the road reserve of Puhitahi Hill Road. Trees 6 and 7 are within 51 Puhitahi Hill Road and are not scheduled for that reason.

## 6 Heritage Arborist comments

- 6.1 I have received an e-mail from West Fynn, Senior Heritage Arborist, which is attached to this document.
- 6.2 Mr. Fynn has attached a marked-up map of the site showing the trees that, in his opinion, are suitable for inclusion in Schedule 10 Notable Trees Schedule to the AUP.

6.3 I have paraphrased Mr. Flynn's comments below for clarification:

- *"When the site was first assessed, it looked like it [i.e. Wesley College] was all one [lot], and so some of the trees in the slightly wider area [i.e. including 51 Puhitahi Road] were wrongly assumed to be part of the site and therefore included [in the Schedule]."*
- *"Between the church and the northeastern corner [of Wesley College] there are a number of puriri and totara, and one totara further into the centre of the site in the central courtyard."*
- *"There was also originally a group of Puriri listed to the north of the site [i.e. 51 Puhitahi Road] ....but these cannot be included [in the schedule] as [they are] beyond the boundary [of the site, i.e. Wesley College]."*
- *"The common [English] oak was also described [in the Heritage site pack] as being close to the ridge. It is on the small side road to the northeast of the site, and can also not be included [because it is outside the site] and should be deleted as there are no others of this description within the site."*
- *"The pin oak grove is shown as within the road reserve and therefore also needs an amendment in the listing."*



Fig 3 – Heritage Arborist's mark-up of Wesley College – refer to 6.3 above.

## 7 Inconsistencies between the AUP, FDP, and WSPCP

- 7.1 The AUP and FDP listings are the same, but neither of them indicates the location or number of the Notable trees.
- 7.2 The AUP listing relies on the Heritage Site Pack, which includes a “bubble diagram” roughly showing the positions of the trees, but it is otherwise consistent with the FDP listing.
- 7.3 The WPP is slightly different. It does not include 51 Puhitahi Road. It *excludes* the pin oak windrow in the NW corner of Wesley College as Notable trees. It *includes* the isolated totara tree that is not in the AUP or FDP.
- 7.4 It is proposed to rationalize these three documents by relying on a modified version of the AUP listing, while deleting the precinct plan because it adds no new information.
- 7.5 A table is provided as an appendix that compares the various documents (AUP, FDP and WSPCP).



Fig 4 – Proposed locations for revised Notable tree group 2804. This figure is suitable for inclusion as an explanatory diagram in the Notable Trees Schedule. These numbers have been added in the table (Appendix 3) for comparison with the original AUP numbers.

## 8 Proposed new Notable Tree Group 2804

- 8.1 I propose that Notable Tree Group 2804 is modified as follows, to include nine items as shown in Fig 4 above.
- 8.2 This revised listing represents a compromise between Auckland Council Heritage Division and the landowner, but does not result in the loss of any trees from the Schedule.
- 8.3 One tree previously listed – an English oak – will be removed from the list as no suitable candidate could be found within 801 Paerata Road (i.e. it does not exist within the site – the only suitable candidate being outside Wesley College).
- 8.4 Trees that stand outside the site (e.g. at 51 Puhitahi Hill Road) will be excluded from the schedule as they are on the incorrect property. It should be noted that none of these trees met the STEM threshold for scheduling in 2014 (and still do not).

8.5 The modified Notable group 2804 will accommodate the wishes of Council's Heritage arborist by including an avenue of pin oak trees (Trees 1), even though they did not meet the STEM threshold for scheduling in 2014 (and still do not).

8.6 The proposed new group is as follows, as numbered in Fig 4: pin oak avenue (*Quercus palustris*) (1), a tulip tree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) (2), a bunya pine (*Araucaria bidwillii*) (3), a group of one rimu (*Dacrydium cupressinum*), one totara (*Podocarpus totara*) and one puriri (*Vitex lucens*) (4), a totara (5), a totara (6), a puriri (7), a totara (8) and a totara (9).

8.7 The proposed new Notable Group 2804 lists the individual trees and provides a location for each tree and group suitable for inclusion in Schedule D10. Fig 4 above is suitable for inclusion in Schedule D10.

8.8 Proposed new text for Group 2804 in Schedule D10:

2804	1 <i>Quercus palustris</i> (avenue) 2 <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> x 1 3 <i>Araucaria bidwillii</i> x 1 4 <i>Dacrydium cupressinum</i> x 1, <i>Podocarpus totara</i> x 1, <i>Vitex lucens</i> x 1 5 <i>Podocarpus totara</i> x 1 6 <i>Podocarpus totara</i> x 1 7 <i>Vitex lucens</i> x 1 8 <i>Podocarpus totara</i> x 1 9 <i>Podocarpus totara</i> x 1	1 Pin oak avenue 2 Tulip tree x 1 3 Bunya pine x 1 4 group – rimu, totara and puriri (one of each) 5 totara x 1 6 totara x 1 7 puriri x 1 8 totara x 1 9 totara x 1	Paerata 801 and reserve Road (pin oak avenue)	Road of Puhitahi Hill (pin oak avenue)	LOT 566172	1001	DP of Puhitahi Hill
------	---	---	--	---	------------	------	---------------------

## 9 S92 Response

- 9.1 Leon Saxon, Consultant Arborist (Arborlab Ltd) has been processing the arboricultural aspects of the present application on behalf of Council.
- 9.2 Mr. Saxon has asked various questions relating to the information provided. His questions pertain to Appendix 3 of my original report from 2014, rather than from the more recent report (28/10/2024).
- 9.3 Mr. Saxon's questions are answered below, point by point, and the Appendix 3 table has been updated accordingly:

**9.3.1 *Please confirm what the colour coding in the table “Feature Type” at Appendix 3 identifies.***

I have modified the colour code and heading (it was explained by a note in the original table). WCD = Within Council Designation – OCD = Outside Council Designation (i.e. the extent of the original Notable tree designation).

**9.3.2 *The colour coding in the column entitled ‘STEM Score’***

Unfortunately, I cannot remember the original reason for this, since it dates back to 2014, and I have removed it from the column for simplification.

**9.3.3 *Please confirm what the “size” column refers to in the Appendix 3 Table.***

Council's arborist is correct – height x spread x girth in metres, approximate. I have stated this explicitly in the table now.

**9.3.4 *Please confirm what the acronyms BT and ET refer to in the Appendix 3 Table.***

The acronym is Below / Exceeds Threshold (i.e. in terms of STEM score. Now stated explicitly in the table.

### 9.3.5 *What is intended by the ‘Council Designation’?*

Nick Pollard comments “*ID 2804 of Schedule 10 to the Auckland Unitary Plan for Notable Tree locates 6 species at 801 Paerata Road. The trees identified as Within Council Designation (WCD) are within the site known as 801 Paerata Road and listed under the Botanical Name / Common Name. The other trees are identified in the Franklin 2 Precinct. While these trees may be within 801 Paerata Road, they are not listed for ID 2804 are therefore Outside Council Designation (OCD).*

### 9.3.6 *Why do some of the trees in Appendix 3 not have STEM scores?*

In my report I state that trees that “have no hope” of meeting the STEM threshold were deliberately excluded. I go on to say that the trees have to be at least 8m in height to have any chance of meeting the STEM threshold. Practically speaking, trees that do not have a STEM score can be ignored for the purposes of this assessment.

### 9.3.7 *Trees 28 and 29 are identified as “WCD group”. Please confirm what is intended.*

These trees were originally grouped together in the Council designation. One could remove the word “group” without affecting the intention.

### 9.3.8 *Please add a column to identify the 2024 tree numbers.*

This has been done.

## 10 Conclusions and recommendations

- 10.1 There is clear consensus between the client, the client’s planner, Council’ Heritage arborist and the client’s consulting arborist that the significant trees within Wesley College are to be protected, but that clarity must be obtained about which trees are protected and where they stand.
- 10.2 Heritage Arborist West Fynn has provided a marked-up aerial of 801 Paerata Road which lists the trees which he would like to see included in the updated schedule, and excluding those at 51 Puhitahi Road.
- 10.3 I recommend that the Notable tree listing at Wesley College is updated, and that the proposed new Group 2804 is included in Schedule 10 Notable Trees Appendix. This should

list the number of trees of each species, and include a map of where they are located.

- 10.4 The pin oak trees on the NW property boundary of Wesley College will be included in the schedule, with modifications to show that some trees stand within Puhitahi Hill Road. This is despite the trees not meeting the threshold for inclusion as Notable trees.
- 10.5 I recommend that the trees at 51 Puhitahi Hill Road (LOT 850 DP 589520, LOT 852 DP 589520, LOT 1000 DP 589520) are specifically acknowledged to be outside group 2804 and therefore not protected. These trees do not meet the threshold for inclusion as Notable trees.
- 10.6 If adopted, the recommendations of this report will repair long-standing deficiencies in Schedule 10 Notable Trees Schedule, and clarify the tree protection situation at Wesley College and surrounds.
- 10.7 The proposed new Group 2804 is very nearly the same as contained in the AUP, FDP and WSPCP, but has been rationalized to remove inconsistencies.
- 10.8 It is hoped that Auckland Council Heritage, Regulatory and Legal will assist in this process.
- 10.9 By completing this process, we will protect the best trees on the site, affording them the highest level of protection that the Unitary Plan allows, while allowing for the practical redevelopment of adjacent sites.



**Gerard Mostert** MISA MNZAA ISA-Certified Arborist NZ-0024A

**Senior Consultant Arborist**

**Peers Brown Miller Ltd**

**021493327**



## 11 Appendix 1 – Comparison between AUP, FDP and WSPCP listings

11.1 The following table compares the current group 2804 in the AUP, group C.363 under Schedule 8A of the FDP, and the new proposed group.

#	Name ( <i>Genus species</i> )	Group 2804 in extg Schedule 10 AUP	C.363 In 8A FDP	Wesley SPCP	Location known	
					AUP/FDP	Proposed Group 2804
1	Pin oak ( <i>Quercus palustris</i> )	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
2	Tulip tree ( <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> )	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
3	Bunya pine ( <i>Araucaria bidwillii</i> )	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4	Group – one each of: Rimu ( <i>Dacrydium cupressinum</i> ), totara ( <i>podocarpus totara</i> ), puriri ( <i>vitex lucens</i> ).	No	No	No	No	Yes
5	Totara ( <i>Podocarpus totara</i> )	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
6	Totara ( <i>Podocarpus totara</i> )	Yes	Yes		No	Yes
7	Puriri ( <i>vitex lucens</i> )	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
8	Totara ( <i>Podocarpus totara</i> )	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
9	Totara ( <i>Podocarpus totara</i> )	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
10	English oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	Yes	Yes	No	No	N/A

Table 1 – Comparison of the Notable tree listings in the AUP, FDP and WSPCP.

## 12 Appendix 2 – Email from Auckland Council Senior Heritage Arborist

### **Gerard Mostert**

---

**From:** West Fynn <West.Fynn@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>  
**Sent:** Monday, 21 October 2024 12:08 pm  
**To:** Gerard Mostert  
**Cc:** Unitary Plan  
**Subject:** RE: Wesley College - 801 Paerata Road  
**Attachments:** weseley college tree map.docx

Hi Gerard

Thank you for meeting on site.

I believe that when first assessed the site looked much like it was all one and so some trees in the slightly wider area were wrongly assumed to be part of the site as a whole and therefore included.

I realise the attached annotated plan is not very carefully drawn on my part!

However, I can add the following explanation.

Between the church and the northeastern corner there are a number of Puriri and Totara and one Totara further into the centre of the site in the central courtyard.

There was also originally a group of Puriri listed to the north of the site when it appeared to be part of the wider site but these cannot be included as beyond the boundary.

The Common Oak was also described as being close to the ridge and is on the small side road to the north east of the site and can also not be included and should be deleted from the listing as there are no others of this description within the site.

As you said, the Pin Oak grove is shown as within the road reserve and therefore also needs an amendment in the listing.

Finally, it is also noted that the lot and dp for the site are no longer correct and needs updating in the schedule.

2804	<i>Araucaria bidwillii, Vitex lucens, Podocarpus totara, Liriodendron tulipifera, Quercus palustris, Quercus robur</i>	Bunya Bunya Pine, Puriri, Totara, Tulip Tree, Pin Oak, Oak	Group	Paerata Road 801
------	--	--	-------	------------------

Happy to discuss further.

Cheers

**West Fynn| Senior Heritage Arborist**  
**Heritage**  
**Plans and Places**  
**Chief Planning Office**  
**Auckland Council**  
Mobile 021824708  
Auckland Council, Level 16, 135 Albert St

## 13 Appendix 3 – 2014 Tree Assessment

2014 #	2024 #	Name / binomial	Size Height x Spread x Girth (m) (approx.)	Feature Type Within / Outside Council Designation	STEM score	Photo	Notes BT / ET = Below / Exceeds STEM threshold.
1	1	Pin Oak ( <i>Quercus palustris</i> )	8x10x1.5 max	WCD avenue	66-99	1,2,3	About 18 trees, not all Pin Oak. No single tree meets threshold i.e. impossible for avenue to meet threshold as STEM score for trees in a group is lower than for individual trees. Some trees quite poor – stunted, windswept, asymmetrical, tangled crowns. Pronounced trunk flare in some trees, with swollen butt sounding hollow in one example (perhaps root crown rot?).
2		Pohutukawa ( <i>Metrosideros excelsa</i> )	4x4x1	WCD Row (4)		4	Four small (although healthy) Pohutukawa within designation on Council aerial photo – below threshold (BT).
3		Willow Myrtle ( <i>Agonis flexuosa</i> )	7x7x1.5 max	WCD Row (3)		4	Willow Myrtle of poor overall appearance within Council designation but BT
4		Norfolk Island Pine ( <i>Araucaria heterophylla</i> )	11x6x1	OCD Single		-	NI Pine in very poor and deteriorating health. Outside Council Designation (OCD). BT.
5		Willow Myrtle	7x7x1.5	OCD Single		-	Poor health. OCD. BT.
6		Pohutukawa		WCD Row		5	Fair example. WCD. BT.

7		Mixed row of Puriri ( <i>Vitex lucens</i> )and Karaka ( <i>Corynocarpus laevigatus</i> )	10x6x2 max	WCD Row	115	5	Healthy trees that appear to be an overgrown hedgerow. An example of trees that are within the Council photo designation, but which are not mentioned in the type description (Karaka). Stem score is for best Puriri in this group at east end of the row of trees.
8		Totara ( <i>Podocarpus</i> <i>Totara</i> )	7x5x1	OCD	94	7 (rear)	Single healthy Totara OCD and BT. Too small to score high on STEM
9		Claret ash ( <i>Fraxinus</i> <i>oxycarpa</i> 'Raywood')	11x10x2	WCD Single	99	6	Single tree – some dieback, previous failures and pruning wounds, in fair overall health. WCD, BT. Visibility is offset by the structural deficits.
10		Redwood ( <i>Sequoia</i> <i>sempervirens</i> )	18x10x2	WCD Group	96	7	Redwood in mixed group - very poor health, although a large and visually prominent tree. Below the threshold. Would be a heritage tree if its health were better. Visible for miles. Removal recommended.
11		<i>Picea</i> sp.	9x6x1	WCD Group		7	Senescent Fir tree in mixed group – BT. Removal recommended. Not specifically mentioned in 'Type' description
12		Magnolia ( <i>Magnolia</i> <i>grandiflora</i> )	7x7x1	WCD Group		7	Mediocre example of Magnolia in mixed group – Fair in all ways – BT
13		Puriri	5x5x1	WCD Group		7	Smaller Puriri in mixed group – Poor health, pronounced dieback – BT
14		Puriri	7x6x2	WCD		8	Healthy Puriri but of relatively small stature – BT
15	2	Tulip Tree <i>Liriodendron</i> <i>tulipifera</i>	12x12x3	WCD Single	138	8	Good example of Tulip Tree. Exceeds threshold (ET). Big, strong, healthy tree with apparently sound crown structure. Some root restrictions. Highly visible – can be seen from golf club 2km away or more.

16		Pohutukawa	7x7x1	WCD		8	Relatively small and sparse-crowned example. BT. Pohutukawa is not mentioned in 'Type' description.
17		Pin Oak	8x8x1	WCD	114	9	Healthy single tree, imperfect form. Pronounced trunk flare, as with other Pin Oaks. BT.
18	3	Bunya Pine	15x12x2	WCD Single	198	9	Specimen-quality tree. Obvious on the skyline. Defines the space. Deserves Heritage status. ET.
19		Redwood	9x9x2	WCD Group	78	9	Poor overall health – diseased. Most leaves are brown. BT due to poor health.
20		Totara	7x7x1	WCD Group	77	9	Good, relatively small tree with little viewing audience. BT.
21		Redwood	7x9x2	WCD Group	72	9	Poor overall health, topped? BT because of poor overall health, truncated stature.
22		Redwood	12x9x1.5	WCD Group	102	9	Better than the surrounding redwoods, but still in deteriorated health – sparse-crowned. BT due to poor health.
23		Exotic	7x9x1.5	WCD Group		9	Exotic deciduous tree – lacks viewing audience. BT
24		Puriri	7x7x1.5			-	Healthy, relatively small tree. BT
25	4	Mixed group – Totara, Rimu, Puriri	8x7x1	WCD Group	126	10	Group of healthy native trees of similar size. ET. Can be seen for some distance along access road and across countryside. Although of different species these trees have been assessed together as they grow co-dominantly.
26		Kowhai group ( <i>Sophora tetrapetala</i> )	7x7x1.5	OCD Group	78	-	Group of fair Kowhai trees, no viewing audience. BT

27	6	Totara	9x12x3	OCD Single	126	11	Healthy, structurally-sound single tree. Can be seen along access road and across countryside. ET. As score reflects, just good enough for schedule.
28	7	Puriri	9x10x3	WCD Group	126	12,13	Part of a valuable group of trees visible across the countryside. ET
29	8	Totara	9x7x1	WCD Group	132	13,14	Healthy Totara tree in prominent location. ET. Very similar to 32.
30		Rewarewa	9x4x1	WCD Group	66	13,14	Spindly and stunted – not a specimen. BT
31		Kahikatea ( <i>Dacrycarpus dacrydioides</i> )	8x4x1	WCD Group	66	13,14	Sparse-crowned tree, as above. BT
32	9	Totara	8x11x3	WCD Group	132	13,14	Healthy, structurally sound Totara tree in hill crest location. Very similar to 29.
33		Elms ( <i>Ulmus sp</i> )	10x5x1	OCD Pair		-	Two slender Elm trees, less significant than hill-crest trees like the Totaras. BT
34		Silver Dollar ( <i>Eucalyptus cinerea</i> )	12x20x4	OCD Single	126	-	Massive, heavy-crowned Silver Dollar. A specimen for this species in the Auckland region. ET. The sheer size of the tree justifies its protection.
35		Oaks ( <i>Quercus palustris</i> )	10x7x1.5	OCD Single		-	Fair specimens, BT, do not stand out against the skyline and do not warrant scheduling.
36		Mixed exotic windrow	12x7x2 Max	OCD Row		15	These trees collectively have substantial bulk but individually are all less than perfect specimens. BT

37		Liquidambar avenue ( <i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i> )	10x8x2 Max	OCD Group	114	16	Important landscape feature, but the individual trees are less than perfect specimens (included unions, previous failures, co-dominant leaders). BT
38		English Oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	10x8x1.5	OCD Single	120	17	Good-quality individual tree BT. Given enough time and space this tree would achieve specimen status.
39		English Oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	10x8x1.5	OCD Single	120	-	Good-quality individual tree BT. Virtually identical to 38. Has potential, given time and space.
40	5	Totara	10x15x3	OCD Single	132	18	Good-quality, dense-crowned Totara of spreading habit. Central feature of courtyard. ET
41		Rimu ( <i>Dacrydium cupressinum</i> )	8x5x1	OCD Pair	90	18	Small Rimu, small viewing audience. BT
42		Pohutukawa	9x10x2	OCD Single		18	Sparse-crowned Pohutukawa, small viewing audience BT
43		Totara	7x6x1	OCD Single		-	Healthy, small single tree. BT
44		Lombardy Poplar	11x2x1	OCD Pair		-	Healthy trees. BT. Tall, slender trees. Can achieve great height, and a good landscape species given time and space to grow.
45		English Oak	10x8x1.5	OCD Single	120	-	Healthy single tree of good value. BT. Similar to 38 and 39, could become a fine specimen given time and space.
46		Willow	7x9x1.5	OCD Single		-	Healthy single tree of little landscape value. BT
47		She-Oak	10x8x2	OCD		-	She-Oak group, remains of a previous continuous windrow. Healthy, fair overall appearance. BT

		<i>(Casuarina cunninghamiana)</i>		Group			
48		She-Oak <i>(Casuarina cunninghamiana)</i>	11x8x2	OCD Windrow	112		Important landscape feature. Obvious windrow of substantial, healthy trees, but not quite of specimen-quality. BT