

LTC-08/06/2015 - SUMMARY OF RESPONSES from Nomination Forms (Landmark Criteria) for Norfolk Island / Cook Pine at "46A" Cook St.											
Nominator / Evaluator	NOMINATOR	HILLSON	HILLAN	HUI	KIDA	SHORT	SWAE	Arbrst McNair (PropOwnr)	Arbrst Costello (PropOwnr)	Arbrst Leggitt (Nomntr)	Attorney for PropOwn
*** RARITY ***	Rare	Norf IP-Unc/rare	Common	Cook-Rare	Cook-Uncommon	Common	Uncommon	NorflsIndPine-Common	Agrees Norfolk per McNair	CookPine (+Mr. Hummer)	See** + McNair's opinion
*** PHYSICAL ***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Size	Large	Large	Large	Large	Medium/Lg for SF	Large	Large (for SF)	85' tall		100' tall	
Advanced age for species		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No per ownr's arbrst	No		Mature	
Distinguished Form	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	
Condition	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good health		Good	
*** HISTORICAL ***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Historical association	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes	None apparent	None apparent			
Media or print	Yes/unknown	Yes/unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Yes	Unknown				
*** ENVIRONMENTAL ***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Prominent landscape feature	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, per prop owner		Yes	
Low tree density	moderate	low/moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate			
Interdepn't group of trees	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No			
Visible/access. fr/ Public ROW	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Low visibility		Yes	
High traffic area	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No			
Important wildlife habitat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Perch for birds			
Erosion control	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No			
Wind or sound barrier	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	left blank	No	No			
*** CULTURAL ***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Neighborhood appreciation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	left blank	Prop owner...*			
Cultural appreciation	None apparent	Yes	None apparent	None apparent	None apparent	None apparent	Yes/none apparent				
Contribution to nghrhd character	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	left blank	left blank				

*does not believe it adds any "cultural" value to the neighborhood.

**Ms. Bonaparte stated that what matters, as Ms. Hui indicated, is if it fits the criteria for landmark status.

NOTE: Look at 8/6 + 10/1/15 LTC Written Summary & ADOPTED 8/6/15 Minutes for more information.

LTC-10/01/2015 - SUMMARY OF RESPONSES stated in re Landmark Criteria for Tree (Norfolk, Cook, Hybrid) at "46A" Cook St.											
Nominator / Evaluator	NOMINATOR	HILLSON	HILLAN	HUI	KIDA	SHORT	SWAE	Arbrsts McNair & Costello	<-- see Column to left	Arbrst f/ Nomntr	Atty for PropOwn
*** RARITY ***	Cook Pine	species unclear	EXCUSED	species unclear	EXCUSED	convinced hybrid*	see commnts below	hybrid per Ritter			
*** PHYSICAL ***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***		***	***
Size	Large										
Advanced age for species		"sister tree"***									
Distinguished Form				nice-looking							
Condition											***
*** HISTORICAL ***	***	***	***	some hstrc value	***	insufficient evidence	No per HistPrsvnStaff	***		***	per LTC minutes*
Historical association	Yes										
Media or print											***
*** ENVIRONMENTAL ***	***	***	***	some envr value	***	***	***	***		***	
Prominent landscape feature											
Low tree density											
Interdepn't group of trees											
Visible/access. fr/ Public ROW											
High traffic area											
Important wildlife habitat											
Erosion control											
Wind or sound barrier											***
*** CULTURAL ***	***	***	***	some cult value	***	***	***	***		***	
Neighborhood appreciation		Yes					Yes				
Cultural appreciation											
Contribution to nghrhd character											

10/01/15 LTC met for additional clarification on categories of species and historic, other landmark tree criteria could have been discussed as shown in this chart above.

Blank boxes may indicate no response from evaluator or not discussed at meeting or may not have discussed due to it having been done at earlier Aug. 6, 2015 meeting.

NOTE: Look at 8/6 + 10/1/15 LTC Written Summary & DRAFT 10/1/15 Minutes for more information.

(*continued*) LTC-10/01/2015 - SUMMARY OF RESPONSES stated in re Landmark Criteria for Tree (Norfolk, Cook, Hybrid) at "46A" Cook St.

LTC & STAFF COMMENTS:

Species:

* Ms. Short stated Mr. Ritter indicated to her while it is not uncommon, he was not aware of a huge quantity of these in SF.

Ms. Short wondered how many of Norfolks are hybrids, how many are Cooks and makes it a little more significant it is a hybrid though if most of what we have are hybrids then it becomes more common and we don't know.

Ms. Short stated there was a precedent with landmarking an unknown species.

Ms. Short stated she usually looks for more than one criterion to be met and appreciate people caring about the environment and community but not sufficient to vote for trees.

Ms. Short stated she wished there was clearer confirmation on what a hybrid meant in terms of its rarity; and stated Ritter did not think they were very common in SF.

Ms. Hillson stated she originally thought it was Norfolk as did most everybody except the nominators. Then thought it was Cook.

Ms. Hillson was told at this last meeting it is a hybrid but read in A Tropical Garden Flora that all hybrids are Cooks.

Ms. Hillson is unclear on species.

Ms. Hillson stated not all criteria have been met for all landmarked trees.

Mr. Swae stated the tree is not super rare; even hybrids are not super rare.

Ms. Hui stated UFC has evaluated specimens of unknown species and they have been landmarked so that is not necessarily a problem.

Historical:

** Ms. Hillson stated if sister tree has 120 rings, that would put date back to 1895 even if no trees shown in 1885 photo.

Mr. Swae spoke to Planning's historic preservation staff & from their view, tree would have to be a certain age, associated w/ some exceptional element of SF history.

Mr. Swae stated that Here Today mentions the building but the preservation staff told him the significance is based on architectural significance of the property.

He stated it was not related necessarily to the historic person or even associated with the property.

Mr. Swae stated the tree or landscape would need to be associated with a historic event or person or a historically designed landscape.

Mr. Swae stated there is no evidence and does not see it based on historical.

Mr. Swae stated it is not associated with a key individual or event or something related specifically to the tree.

NOMINATOR'S SUPPORTERS' COMMENTS:

Species:

Mr. Worn produced letter from field botany teacher of herbal medicine and stated the letter referred to Hortus Third to make positive identification.

Mr. Levitt had 2 arborists state it was a Cook Pine. He brought up A Tropical Garden Flora which states all hybrids are Cook Pines.

Historical:

Mr. Worn disagrees 1946/1951 tree was removed and current one put in its place as physically impossible.

Ms. Levitt referenced the historical material submitted earlier and the timeline.

Other:

Ms. Levitt asked that the worthiness of the tree to be landmarked be looked at per the criteria in the ordinance.

Ms. Beasley stated as SFSU Environmental Studies student provides great environmental benefit being large.

Ms. Beasley also stated it contributes to the biodiversity to help conserve nature.

See minutes of LTC for other remarks.

PROPERTY OWNER'S SUPPORTERS' COMMENTS:

Species:

Ms. Bonaparte stated from last meeting, parties would get more info on species ID whether Norfolk Island Pine which everyone had asserted or if Cook Pine.

Ms. Bonaparte stated Cook Pine apparently more rare in this area. Contacted Dr. Matt Ritter (Cal Poly) who opined it is a hybrid.

Ms. Bonaparte stated the documents stating the tree as a Cook Pine are wrong and not authoritative per Dr. Ritter.

Mr. McNair stated Dr. Ritter laid to rest the species issue and explained why there was so much controversy because it is a hybrid and has characteristics of both.

Mr. McNair stated the urbanforest map, in terms of rarity or historical, and after speaking with Peter Erlich in the Presidio, there is a greater number than the 15.

Mr. Costello stated that in his mind if Mr. Ritter says the tree is a hybrid, that is what he believes.

Mr. Costello stated that we really do not have a good understanding of the tree that is being landmarked.

Historical:

Ms. Bonaparte stated there was insufficient/contradictory historical evidence at last hearing. Here Today excerpt was in appendix.

Ms. Bonaparte stated there are no trees in 1885 photo. McNair's photo of today compared to 1940/1950 photo is not the same tree.

Mr. McNair compared the 1946 photo to current photo he took virtually in same location. He says it is not the same tree.

Mr. McNair said the tree was probably planted as a replacement tree.

Other:

See minutes of LTC for other remarks.