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1.0 Introduction.

1.1 Our company received instruction from Jarrod Colbert, from Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd on behalf of Pokeno Village Holdings Limited, to prepare an arboricultural assessment report for the proposed plan change for 163 and 201 Hitchen Road, Pokeno known as the Graham Block.

1.2 This report has been commissioned to identify and assess the vegetation on the site, including scheduled trees and vegetation, and to assess whether the plan change request adequately protects significant vegetation on the site.

1.3 I visited the site on 24 February 2017 and the following report is based upon the findings of this visit and the conditions found.

1.4 A list of documentation supplied, on which I have based this assessment, is attached as Appendix A.

1.5 This report deals only with the trees and vegetation that has been specified in Appendix B. It takes no account of any other trees or shrubs that have not been listed.

1.6 A tree survey of Pokeno Village was undertaken in 2008 by Independent Arboricultural Consultants Ltd (IAC) which included some of the trees on the Graham Block. Comment has been provided regarding that report where necessary.

1.7 All assessments were made from ground level and, where given, the tree dimensions are estimates. Only those trees that were over 6.0m high were surveyed.

2.0 Site description

2.1 The combined area of the two properties (the site) is 38.8ha. They are legally described as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Land area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163 Hitchen Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 73437</td>
<td>1.3ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 Hitchen Road</td>
<td>Part Allot 16 Parish of Mangatawhiri</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 The site is generally steep farmland with areas of existing and generating native vegetation, vineyards, fruit and nut trees, wetlands and two dwellings with associated buildings and infrastructure.

2.3 There are two Taraire trees and a stand of Native Bush that are listed in the Waikato District Plan and are identified in this plan in Appendix 2 Inventory of Historic Buildings, Structures, Trees and Areas as Items C.33 and C.34 respectively.

3.0 The Proposal

3.1 It is proposed that the existing large Lot Overlay at the northern end of the site is deleted from the Structural Plan Area and the site is rezoned Residential 2 to the north and Countryside living to the south.
4.0 The Schedule of Implicated Vegetation

4.1 Refer to attached Appendix B for tree survey data, Appendix C for a plan of the tree and vegetation locations and Appendix D for photographs.

4.2 There are 27 entries in the data table, each entry representing either an individual tree or a group of two or more trees.

5.0 Arboricultural Assessment

163 Hitchen Road

1 – English Oak

5.1 This tree is located on the roadside boundary of 163 Hitchen Road. While it is a tree in good health and has good form its proximity to Hitchen Road will make it difficult to retain the tree successfully once the roading improvements, including footpaths, have been constructed and therefore should not be considered for retention.

2 – Honey Locust

5.2 A tree in fair condition. As a species, Honey Locust are prone to limb failure and this would not be a tree that would be desirable to retain in a suburban area.

3 – Boundary planting of Lemonwood and Poplar

5.3 These trees are located on the west and south boundary of 163 Hitchen road. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

201 Hitchen Road

4 – Radiata Pine woodlot

5.4 An unmanaged plantation which includes a boundary shelter belt. Little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

5 – Fruit and nut trees

5.5 An area of fruit and nut trees planted for cropping. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

6 – Cork Oak x 2

5.6 These two trees are located between numbers 4 and 5 and although not good specimens they are uncommon in the Auckland / Waikato area and have some botanical interest as it is the species that cork is produced from. Consideration should be given to retaining these trees if possible.

7 – Native regeneration and nut trees

5.7 This gully has been planted with nut trees on the edges and native trees down to the stream and manmade pond.

5.8 The nut trees have been planted for cropping. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

5.9 The native planting has been well maintained and is relatively weed free with the tallest trees around 8.0m. There is a good range of species and it has the potential of becoming an diverse
native bush with potential to expand the area if desired. Recommend that the native trees are considered for retention.

8 – Kahikatea x 8

5.10 These semi mature Kahikatea are located in a wetland area that has very little other native vegetation present. Their condition is fair to good and they have the potential to become significantly larger. The majority of the area is overgrown with Crack and Pussy willow which are nor desirable in wetland areas as they tend to dominate.

5.11 In the IAC report these eight trees were listed as four separate entries numbered 87 – 90, although tree 90 is not plotted it is assumed that it is a part of this group as no other Kahikatea are present that match.

5.12 As this is a wetland, which is the natural habitat for kahikatea, it is recommended that they are considered for retention. They would benefit from the removal of the willow and revegetation with native plants suitable for wetlands is undertaken.

9 – Group planting of English Oak, fruit and nut trees

5.13 These trees are located in a gully that extends from Hitchen road to above the wetland area that the 8 x Kahikatea (Number 8) are located. Included in this area, but surveyed separately, are trees numbered 10 and 11.

5.14 These trees appear to have been planted earlier than other fruit and nut trees on the site as they are more mature and larger than the rest.

5.15 There was a row of Radiata pines along the northern edge of this area that were removed approximate 2 – 3 years ago, some native planting has occurred where the pines were but they have become overgrown with weed species in most places. This row of pines was numbered 84 in the IAC tree survey.

5.16 The nut and fruit trees have been planted for cropping. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

5.17 There several English Oak trees that are in fair condition that are yet to obtain any substantial stature. They have some arboricultural value but not to an extent that they should be considered for retention. Three of the English Oak trees were numbered 85 in the IAC report. I was unable to confirm which three Oak trees it related to in the area.

10 – Taraire x 2 (Item C.33)

5.18 These two Taraire trees are located towards the top of the gully described in number 9. There are nut and oak trees on their western, southern and eastern sides. To the north there was once a row of Pine trees that have been removed 2-3 years ago, now there is mostly weeds species.

5.19 The northern most Taraire tree has two significant decay pockets at the base of the trunk. These two areas are located opposite each other on the north and south sides. It is likely that the decay meets up within the trunk but there appears to be sufficient sound wood around these two areas to ensure that that tree has a low to moderate chance of failure at this time. The upper canopy is showing signs of poor vigour as it has sparse foliage and the leaf and shoot extension appears to smaller than average. The lower and internal foliage appears to have poor to fair vigour.
5.20 The southern Taraire tree has a large decay wound at the base of the trunk on the southern side. This area of decay begins at the base and extents up the trunk approximately 1.1m. Good response wood around this decay has developed to ensure that the tree has a low to moderate chance of failure at this time. The canopy is in better condition than other Taraire mostly because it has more protection from wind, although its vigour still appears to be less than average.

5.21 These two trees are numbered 86 in the IAC survey and have been described as having good health and form and that they are superior specimens in terms of size, health and form. The listing in the Waikato District Plan describes them as having good health and form.

5.22 I am assuming that as the IAC survey and the listing of these trees were done prior to the removal of the Pine trees that the trees health has deteriorated as a result of becoming more exposed to the elements.

5.23 In my opinion their current health would not have warranted them being listed in the district plan or being described as having superior health and the decay present in both trunks reduces their form to fair. The Taraire located in the mixed planting numbered 21 exhibits better form, is in good health and forms a useful comparison with either of these two trees. (See Photos 4 and 6). There are no other features, such as visibility or age that would warrant these two trees being scheduled.

5.24 Due to their condition I would recommend that these two trees are not retained at all costs if it can be shown that a better outcome for the plan change can be achieved if these two trees can be removed.

11 – Pohutukawa tree

5.25 This tree is at the top of the gully described in number 9 near Hitchen Road. Although not a tree of any size that is worthwhile retaining in its current location, its size, species and condition lends to being considered for being readily transplanted to elsewhere as part of a reserve or similar.

12 – Mixed boundary planting

5.26 This group of planting is on the north-western boundary of the garden around the dwelling. It forms a continuous canopy and would have to be treated as a single entity if it was to be retained.

5.27 Some of the trees exhibit structural flaws that would require, in some cases, the entire tree to be felled to remove the hazard. Once you start removing trees that are sharing a symbiotic relationship, such as these ones are, the neighbouring trees are subject to forces that they are not adapted to and the likelihood of further failures increases.

5.28 In the urban environment that is proposed these hazards are unlikely to be tolerated so it is recommended that these trees are removed.

13 – Pin Oak

5.29 This tree is located in the garden to the northeast of the dwelling. It is an early mature specimen exhibiting good health and form.
5.30 Due to its good health and form consideration should be given to retaining this tree. To successfully retain the tree there can be no excavation or fill within approximately 5.0m of the trunk.

14 – Mixed planting on boundary
5.31 This group of planting is on the south-eastern boundary of the garden around the dwelling. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

15 – Weeping Willow
5.32 This is a single specimen that has little arboricultural value and is not worthwhile retaining.

16 – Redwood and Pin Oak
5.33 These two trees are planted within 3.0m of each other adjacent to the dwelling. Neither of these trees will flourish in close proximity to each other. Not worthwhile retaining.

17 - Mixed planting on boundary
5.34 This group of planting is on the western boundary of the garden around the dwelling. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

18 – Mixed Shelter belt
5.35 Poplar and Radiata pine managed as a shelter belt. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

19 – Cork Oak x 4
5.36 These four trees are planted above a block of grape vines. As with number 6 they are not good specimens but they are uncommon in the Auckland / Waikato area and have some botanical interest as it is the species that cork is produced from. Consideration should be given to retaining these trees if possible.

20 – Pine Shelter belt
5.37 Radiata pine managed as a shelter belt. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

21 – Mixed planting
5.38 An area of native planting that has been well maintained and is relatively weed free. There is a mature Rewarewa and Taraire while the rest of the planting is a good range of native species up to 6.0m high. This area has the potential of becoming a diverse native bush. There are some nut trees at the western end of the area that appear to be outside the site. It is recommended that the native trees are retained.

22 – Group planting of Sweet Chestnut trees
5.39 An area of sweet Chestnut planted for cropping. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

23 – Group of native trees (Item C.34)
5.40 A stand of mature natives that is scheduled in the Waikato District Plan. The area has been fenced off from stock, is weed free and has a good understorey of native plants as well.

5.41 Listed in the IAC survey and district plan as being a significant stand of natives with which I agree.
5.42 This is an important group of trees that should be retained.

24 – Group planting of Sweet Chestnut trees
5.43 These trees are planted within the fenced off area of number 23 and are almost a part of the native stand. They have been planted for cropping and have little arboricultural value. It is recommended that they are removed and replaced with native revegetation planting.

25 – Group planting of fruit and nut trees
5.44 An area of nut trees planted for cropping. They have little arboricultural value and not worthwhile retaining.

26 – Group of mixed natives and exotics
5.45 An area of wetland that is predominately Pussy Willow. There are a few native trees up to 6.0m high. There is little arboricultural value in the existing vegetation and not worthwhile retaining although as this is a wetland, it is recommended that the willow and other weed species are removed and revegetation with native plants suitable for wetlands is undertaken.

27 - Puketea
5.46 This is a single specimen that is decline. Although it is a native it has little arboricultural value in its current situation and is not worthwhile retaining.

Other vegetation
5.47 There are other trees on the site that have not been surveyed as they were under 6.0m high. None of those trees had any arboricultural value that would make them worthwhile retaining.

5.48 The IAC survey lists three groups of trees that have been removed since the survey was undertaken. They are number 84 (Row of pines), 91 (Group of Monterey Pines and Monterey Cypress) and 92 (7 x Pines).

6.0 Conclusion
6.1 Of the 27 trees or groups of trees surveyed two groups of natives should be retained. They are number 21 and 23. Number 23 is the stand of scheduled natives.

6.2 A further eight trees or groups of trees should be considered for retention as part of the plan change. They are numbers 6, 7 (natives only), 8, 10, 11, 13, 19 and 20

6.3 Number 10 is two Taraire trees that are schedule under the district plan. Their health and form is not considered to be of such an importance that it is essential that they should be retained. The removal of the adjacent row of pines have adversely effected their health and both trees have significant decay in their trunks that may cause structural issues in the future.
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## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pokeno Township Tree Survey by Independent Arboricultural Consultants</td>
<td>8 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB-101</td>
<td>Proposed Zone Plan – DFH Joint Venture – Graham Block, Pokeno by Civil Plan Consultants</td>
<td>01-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Graham Block Tree Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Girth @ 1.4m (mm)</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Protection status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English Oak</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Semi mature tree on the road boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Semi mature tree. Due to this species habit of limb failure should not be considered for retention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boundary planting of Lemonwood and Poplar trees.</td>
<td>7 – 15</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nothing significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Radiata Pine woodlot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Unmanaged pine plantation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fruit &amp; nut trees</td>
<td>Up to 6m</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Mix of varieties dominated by Sweet Chestnut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cork Oak x2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Although they are not large they are not a common species in Auckland / Waikato region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Girth @ 1.4m (mm)</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Protection status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Native regeneration and nut trees</td>
<td>Native trees up to 8m Nut trees up to 6m</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Native trees generally fair - good Nut trees generally poor - fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nut trees on edges of the planting with natives in steeper parts and at the bottom of the gully. Natives species include trees Puriri, Totara, Kahikatea, Kohuhu, Cabbage tree, Kawakawa, Pigeonwood and Kanuka. The nut species include Horse Chestnut, Sweet Chestnut, Hazel and Macadamia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kahikatea x 8</td>
<td>12 - 16</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Fair - Good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>In wetland area growing amongst Crack and Pussy Willow. Important wetland plant. Willow should be removed otherwise it will take over the wetlands. Kahikatea are numbered 87 – 90 in IAC report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Group of English oak, fruit and nut trees.</td>
<td>Up to 12m</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nut and fruit tree planting in a gully dominated by Sweet Chestnut, Walnut and English Oak. On north side of the planting a row of Pines (numbered 84 in IAC report) have been removed the past 2 – 3 years. In their place are some recently planted native plants that are being out grown by noxious weeds. Three of the English Oak are numbered 85 in IAC report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Taraire x 2</td>
<td>10 12</td>
<td>2500 2800</td>
<td>Poor to fair Fair</td>
<td>Scheduled (Item C.33)</td>
<td>Both trees are exhibiting thinning canopies with below average vigour, with the northern tree in a poorer condition than the southern one. Northern tree has two significant decay pockets at the base of the trunk and the southern has a large area of decay from the base of the trunk up to 1.1m. Numbered 86 in IAC survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pohutukawa</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2600 x5 stems</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Upright specimen. Has potential to be transplanted elsewhere if not able to be retained in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mixed boundary planting</td>
<td>Up to 20 metres</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Fair - Good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Dominated by Pin Oak with some Algerian Oak, Snake Bark maple, Liquidambar and Lemonwood. Some have poor form with structural flaws evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Girth @ 1.4m (mm)</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Protection status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Good standalone specimen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mixed boundary planting</td>
<td>Up to 14</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - Good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Dominated by Italian Alder with banksia, Magnolia ‘Little Gem’ and Maple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Weeping Willow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Typical willow vigour with poor form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 x Redwood 1 x Pin Oak</td>
<td>13 15</td>
<td>2100 2400</td>
<td>Fair Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Located in small garden adjacent the dwelling planted only 3m apart. Redwood codominant stem at 5.0m. Can only consider as a group due to symbiotic relationship to their proximity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mixed boundary planting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Dominated by Japanese Cedar on boundary also Camphor Laurel, Walnut, Lemonwood, and Liquidambar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mixed shelter belt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Poplar and Radiata Pine regularly trimmed as a shelter belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cork Oak x 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Not significant in health or size they are not a common species in Auckland / Waikato region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Girth @ 1.4m (mm)</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Protection status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Radiata Pine shelter belt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Trimmed as a shelter belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mixed planting</td>
<td>Up to 14</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Generally fair - good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Predominant revegetating native planting under 6 metres around mature 1 x Taraire and 1 x Rewarewa. Some nut trees at the south west end appear to be outside the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Group planting of Sweet Chestnut</td>
<td>Up to 7</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Plantation - most under 6 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Group of native trees</td>
<td>Up to 18</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Generally fair - good</td>
<td>Scheduled (Item C.34)</td>
<td>Good collection of mature Rewarewa, Taraire, Titoki, Pukatea, Tawa Kahikatea and Puriri trees with native understory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sweet Chestnuts</td>
<td>Up to 7</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - Fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Removal would benefit the native bush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fruit &amp; nut trees</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - fair</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Mix of varieties dominated by Sweet Chestnut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mixed natives and exotics in wetland</td>
<td>Up to 7m</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor - good</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Dominated by Pussy Willow and noxious weeds. A few Totara, Ponga &amp; Lemonwood. Generally no value due to weeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Girth @ 1.4m (mm)</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Protection status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Puketea</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Solitary tree in decline. Not worth retaining.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tree Data Table Key**

Overall condition has been categorised as good, fair, poor or dead.

- **Good**: A healthy specimen with good vigour, form, long life expectancy and no significant defects.
- **Fair**: Tree of average vigour and form. Minor defects may be present but not significant structural stability.
- **Poor**: Tree with low vigour or poor form, significant defects and possible limited life expectancy.
Client: Pokeno Village Holdings Limited
Site: Graham Block, Pokeno
Title: Tree Position Plan
Date: 03/03/17
Drawn: SGB
Dwg No: 1 of 2
Photographs

Photo 1 – Number 7 native planting with a row of nut trees above arrowed.

Photo 2 – Scheduled Taraire x 2 (Number 10) arrowed within group of English Oak and nut trees (Number 9)
Photo 3 – Northern Taraire (Number 10) showing decay on north side of trunk, similar sized decay directly opposite.

Photo 4 – Northern Taraire (Number 10) showing thinning canopy due to poor vigour.
Photo 5 – Southern Taraire (Number 10) showing decay on the trunk. Extent of decay arrowed.

Photo 6 – Foliage of the mature healthy Taraire in the native planting (Number 21).
Photo 7 - Looking towards the pine woodlot (Number 4) with the fruit, nut and native regeneration sloping left to right (Numbers 5 and 7) and one of the Kahikatea (Number 8) in the centre.

Photo 8 – Group of scheduled native trees (Number 23) to the right looking down to the mixed native and exotic in the wetlands (Number 26) on the left-hand side.