[Resolution Endorsing Tree for Landmark Tree Status at 2626 Vallejo Street]

Resolution endorsing landmark tree status for the Monterey Cypress (Cupressus macrocarpa) tree, located at 2626 Vallejo Street, Assessor’s Block 0953, Lot 006.

WHEREAS, Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810 charges the Urban Forestry Council to examine nominated landmark trees using criteria approved by the Board of Supervisors; and,

WHEREAS, the Monterey Cypress (Cupressus macrocarpa) tree located at 2626 Vallejo Street fulfills the landmark tree criteria that includes:

Size: The tree is a large tree.

Character Defining Form: The tree is a beautiful tree.

Neighborhood Appreciation: (1) Letters recommending support of landmark tree status were received; (2) there was no stated opposition to landmark status; and (3) the tree was nominated and has the support of the property owner.

Prominent Landscape Feature: The tree is a prominent landscape feature in an area of low to moderate tree density.

Tree Condition: The tree is in good condition and well maintained.

and,

WHEREAS, The Monterey Cypress Tree at 2626 Vallejo Street provides social, environmental and economic benefits to the property, neighborhood and city; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, The Urban Forestry Council recommends the Monterey Cypress (Cupressus macrocarpa) tree, located at 2626 Vallejo Street, Assessor’s Block 0953, Lot 006 for landmark tree status to the Board of Supervisors.
I hereby certify that this Resolution was adopted at the Urban Forestry Council's
Regular Meeting on April 22, 2008.

Monica Fish, Council Secretary

VOTE: Approved (11-0) (4 Absent)
Ayes: Chair Milne, Vice-Chair Quirke, Members Blair, Boss, Cohen, Habert, Miller, Nervo,
Rodgers, Sherk and Short
Noes: None
Absent: Members Griswold, Hillan, Marks and Sustarich
Report of Findings for the Monterey Cypress on Vallejo Street

The Landmark Tree Committee of the Urban Forestry Council met on Tuesday April 8, 2008 and considered the nomination for Landmark Status of the Monterey Cypress (Cupressus macrocarpa) in the rear property of 2626 Vallejo Street.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend landmark status. The vote was 4-0.

The committee members voting for recommendation, found that the tree met some standards that could merit Landmark Tree Status. These criteria included:

- The tree was a large and beautiful tree
- It is a prominent landscape feature in an area of low to moderate tree density
- The tree was in good condition and well maintained
- The tree was nominated and had the support of the property owner
- There was no stated opposition to landmark status

While there were no individual criterion that was, on its own, significant or unique enough to qualify this tree, in sum the criteria, especially considering the absence of opposition, were deemed sufficient. It is, after all, a big beautiful tree and has the property owner’s support.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Boss
Chair, Landmark Tree Committee of the Urban Forestry Council
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Section 810, the UFC has developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation. Attach sheets if more space is needed.

Evaluator’s name: Mei Ling Hui
Date of evaluation: March 19, 2008
Scientific name: Cupressus macrocarpa
Common name: Monterey Cypress
Street address: 2626 Vallejo
Cross streets: Scott

**Rare:**  [ ] Rare  [ ] Uncommon  [x] Common  [ ] Other

Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: Comprise 3.8% of all San Francisco Tree, according the most recent UFORE report

**Size:**  [x] Large  [ ] Medium  [ ] Small

Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: approx 50’ tall, 40’ spread. It’s a multi-trunk tree, with two main trunks which split about 10’ above the root crown. DBH approx. 5’.

**Age:**  [x] Significantly advanced  [ ] Not significantly advanced

Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment: Tree is quite large. Neighbors claim the tree was the size it currently is in 1960, when they moved into the house next door.

**Historical Association:**  [ ] Yes  [x] None apparent

Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation:

__________________________

__________________________

**Ethnic appreciation:**  [ ] Yes  [x] None apparent

Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Describe nature of appreciation: ____________________________________________

Neighborhood appreciation: _____ Yes  ✔ Yes None apparent
Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:
Describe:

Planting defines neighborhood character:  ✔ Yes  ____ No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution:

Profiled in a publication or other media:  ___ Yes  ✔ Yes Unknown
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.
Describe coverage: ______________________________________________________

High traffic area:  ____ Yes  ✔ No
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.
Describe:

Low tree density:  ____ Low  ✔ Moderate  ____ High
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Describe:

Extends between multiple properties:  ✔ Yes  ____ No
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.
Describe:

Accessible from public right-of-way:  ___ Yes  ✔ No
High visibility.
Describe:

Important wildlife habitat:  ___ Yes  ✔ No
Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.

Interdependent group of trees:  ✔ Yes  ____ No
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees. Describe: Possibly. Under the Cypress there are 2 Pitt crassifolium and about a dozen tree ferns.

**Erosion control:**  
✓ Yes  
No

Tree prevents soil erosion. Describe: Tree is growing in a steeply banked location.

**Wind or sound barrier:**  
Yes  
✓ No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise. Describe: It’s large enough to have an effect on wind or noise but I don’t think it’s really close enough to any buildings or loud enough in their area for the tree to do much in this regard.

The tree does have branches which partially hang over adjacent buildings.

**Prominent landscape feature:**  
✓ Yes  
No

A striking and outstanding natural feature. Describe, attach photo if possible:

**Character-defining form:**  
✓ Yes  
No

Tree is an example of good form for its particular species. Describe: This tree is frequently pruned to manicure and to reduce the interaction of branches and other structures. The canopy has been somewhat rounded out by this pruning. But the form is still indicative of this species overall.

**Tree condition:**  
✓ Good  
Poor  
Hazard

Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard

Describe:

**Additional comments**

It’s a beautiful, well cared for tree that appears to be in good health. Tree is well loved by the property owners who are very responsibly maintaining it. It’s my opinion that this tree is an excellent candidate for landmark status.
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Evaluator's name: Carolyn Blair
Date of evaluation: April 2, 2008
Scientific name: Cupressus macrocarpa
Common name: Monterey Cypress
Street address: 2626 Vallejo
Cross streets: Scott

Rare: ___Rare  ___Uncommon  ___Common  ___Other
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.

Comment: The Monterey Cypress was one of the original survivors on the West Coast and helped create the micro climate for other tree species in San Francisco’s Golden Gate Park.

Size: ___X ___Large  ___Medium  ___Small
Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: This tree appears to be topped or pruned to reduce its natural crown height.

Age: ___40 ___Significantly advanced  ___Not significantly advanced
Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).

Historical Association: ___Yes  ___X ___None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation:

Ethnic appreciation: ___Yes  ___X ___None apparent
Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.
Describe nature of appreciation:

Neighborhood appreciation: ___X ___Yes  ___None apparent
Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:

Planting defines neighborhood character: ___X ___Yes  ___No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution: Contributes to multiple backyard neighbors.

Profiled in a publication or other media: ___Yes  ___X ___Unknown
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

**High traffic area:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.

**Low tree density:**  ____ Low  ____ Moderate  ____ High
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

**Extends between multiple properties:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.

**Accessible from public right-of-way:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
High visibility.

**Important wildlife habitat:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.

**Interdependent group of trees:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.

**Erosion control:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
Tree prevents soil erosion.

**Wind or sound barrier:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

**Prominent landscape feature:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
A striking and outstanding natural feature.
Describe, attach photo if possible: This tree is a large species that has been pruned into a pleasing shape for views that adjoining backyard neighbors appreciate.

**Character-defining form:**  ____ Yes  ____ No
Tree is an example of good form for its particular species.
Describe: This tree has been pruned into an unnatural shape that is still striking, but not of its original form.

**Tree condition:**  ____ Good  ____ Poor  ____ Hazard
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard
Describe: This tree has been well cared for by a professional arborist and loved by its owner.

**Additional comments:** Because there are several other Monterey Cypress in this neighborhood that have been allowed to grow to their significant natural height and form, I would not say that this is the best example of this species with landmark qualities.
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Section 810, the UFC has developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation. Attach sheets if more space is needed.

Evaluator's name: HILUV
Date of evaluation: 4.7.08
Scientific name: CUPRESSUS MACROCARPA
Common name: MONTEREY CYPRESS
Street address: VALLEJO ST.
Cross streets: 

Rare: Rare Uncommon V Common Other
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: 

Size: Large V Medium Small
Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: 

Age: Significantly advanced V Not significantly advanced
Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment: 

Historical Association: Yes V None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation: 


Ethnic appreciation:  
   ___Yes    ___None apparent
Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.
Describe nature of appreciation:  

Neighborhood appreciation:  
   ___Yes    __None apparent
Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:
Describe:  

   IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS MAY ENJOY THIS TREE


Planting defines neighborhood character:  
   ___Yes    ___No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution:  

Profiled in a publication or other media:  
   ___Yes    ___Unknown
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.
Describe coverage:  

High traffic area:  
   ___Yes    ___No
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.
Describe:  

Low tree density:  
   ___Low    ___Moderate    ___High
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Describe:  

STREET TREES PLentiful AND OF GOOD QUALITY SIZE. FEW IN BACKYARDS

Extends between multiple properties:  
   ___Yes    ___No
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.
Describe:  

   VISUALITY
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Accessible from public right-of-way: Yes ☑ No
High visibility.
Describe: ________________________________

Important wildlife habitat: Yes No
Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.
Possible limited.

Interdependent group of trees: Yes ☑ No
This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.
Describe: ________________________________

Erosion control: Yes No
Tree prevents soil erosion.
Describe: ________________________________

Wind or sound barrier: Yes ☑ No
Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.
Describe: ________________________________

Prominent landscape feature: Yes ☑ No
A striking and outstanding natural feature.
Describe, attach photo if possible: ________________________________

Character-defining form: Yes No
Tree is an example of good form for its particular species.
Describe: ________________________________
Natural character of tree.
Tree condition:  □ Good  □ Poor  □ Hazard
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard
Describe:  SUPERB SPECIMEN  

Additional comments:

MUCH MORE THAN ANYTHING, THIS TREE
IS AN EXAMPLE OF SUPER MAINTENANCE
AND CAREFUL PLANNING, IT IS ALSO
A FINE EXAMPLE OF CONSIDERATION OF
NEIGHBORS, AS THE DISTANCE, SMALLER
PERFECTLY APPEALING CONSIDERATION AFFORDS
NEIGHBORS' VIEW.
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Section 810, the UFC has developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation. Attach sheets if more space is needed.

Evaluator’s name: __________________________
Date of evaluation: ________________________
Scientific name: ____________________________
Common name: _____________________________
Street address: _____________________________
Cross streets: ______________________________

Rare: ____ Rare  ____ Uncommon  ____ Common  ____ Other
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: __________________________________

Size: ____ Large  ____ Medium  ____ Small
Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: __________________________________

Age: ____ Significantly advanced  ____ Not significantly advanced
Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment: __________________________________

Historical Association:  ____ Yes  ____ None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation: ______________________________________
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

**Ethnic appreciation:**  
Yes [ ] No [x] None apparent

Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.
Describe nature of appreciation: ____________________________________________

**Neighborhood appreciation:** [x] Yes  [ ] None apparent

Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:
Describe: ________________________________________________________________

**Planting defines neighborhood character:**  [x] Yes  [ ] No

Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution:
_____________________________________________________________________

**Profiled in a publication or other media:**  [x] Yes  [ ] Unknown

Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.
Describe coverage:
_____________________________________________________________________

**High traffic area:**  [ ] Yes  [x] No

High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.
Describe: _______________________________________________________________

**Low tree density:**  [x] Low  [ ] Moderate  [ ] High

Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Describe: _______________________________________________________________

**Extends between multiple properties:**  [x] Yes  [ ] No

High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.
Describe: _______________________________________________________________
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Section 810, the UFC has developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation. Attach sheets if more space is needed.

Evaluator’s name: 

Date of evaluation: 4/12/08

Scientific name: Cupressus macrocarpa

Common name: Monterey Cypress

Street address: 2626 V-16th St

Cross streets: Sloat

Rare: Rare Uncommon Common Other
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.

Comment:

Size: Large Medium Small
Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.

Comment:

Age: Significantly advanced Not significantly advanced
Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).

Comment:

Historical Association: Yes None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.

Describe nature of appreciation:
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Ethnic appreciation:  ☑ Yes  ☐ None apparent
Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.
Describe nature of appreciation:_________________________________________

Neighborhood appreciation:  ☐ Yes  ☑ None apparent
Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:
Describe:___________________________

Planting defines neighborhood character:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution:_________________________________________

Profiled in a publication or other media:  ☑ Yes  ☐ Unknown
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.
Describe coverage:_________________________________________

High traffic area:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.
Describe:________________________________________________________________

Low tree density:  ☑ Low  ☑ Moderate  ☐ High
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Describe:_________________________________________________________________

Extends between multiple properties:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.
Describe:________________________________________________________________
Accessible from public right-of-way:  Yes  No

High visibility.

Describe: __________________________________________________________

Important wildlife habitat:  Yes  No

Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.

_______________________________________________________________

Interdependent group of trees:  Yes  No

This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.

Describe: _______________________________________________________

Erosion control:  Yes  No

Tree prevents soil erosion.

Describe: _______________________________________________________

Wind or sound barrier:  Yes  No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

Describe: _______________________________________________________ 

Prominent landscape feature:  Yes  No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible: ____________________________________

Character-defining form:  Yes  No

Tree is an example of good form for its particular species.

Describe: _______________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Tree condition: □ Good □ Poor □ Hazard
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard

Describe: ____________________________________________________________
........................................................................................................

Additional comments

[Handwritten text: Recommend Landmark Tree Status, despite common spruce + that few are other large trees in the city]
SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

Landmark Tree Nomination Form

Disclaimer: Any information you include on this form will be part of the public record. Anyone may request to see the information you submit for a landmark tree nomination. For more legal information, see the last page of this form.

Who can nominate a landmark tree?
- An authorized nominator is a Supervisor, head of a City department or agency, Planning Commissioner, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board member, or property owner.
- The Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and the head of a City department or agency may nominate a tree.
- The head of a City department or agency may nominate a tree on property under their jurisdiction. City departments and agencies should conduct an internal approval process before nominating a tree.
- A property owner may nominate a tree on his or her property.
- A member of the public may ask an authorized nominator to nominate a tree.

I am one of the following authorized nominators
- Property owner
- Board of Supervisor member
- Head of a city department or agency
- Planning Commission member
- Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board member

Please note that a permit will be required for any future removal of a landmark tree.

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code 810, the Urban Forestry Council requests the following information.

Property owner: [Signature]

Authorized nominator (Supervisor, Planning Commission, Landmarks Advisory Board, Head of City Department/Agency):

Name: [Signature]

Address:
San Francisco, CA 94128

Address: 440-1555 h 218-9235c

Phone (day): 440-7555

Fax #: 440-1555

Email: harriet@heyman.com

[Stamp: RECEIVED]

By: [Signature]
I am the property owner or an authorized nominator and I support this nomination.

Hamit Hayman  
Feb. 26, 2008  
Signature  
Date

I am the property owner and I grant permission for city staff to evaluate the nominated tree on the property with advance notice.

Hamit Hayman  
Feb. 26, 2008  
Signature  
Date

TREE DESCRIPTION

Tree name (species and common name): Monterey cypress

Number of trees: 1

Street address: 2626 Vallejo St. at Scott

Location of Tree:  
☐ Front yard  ☑ Rear yard  ☐ Side yard  ☐ Corner-side yard
☐ Public right-of-way  ☐ Public lands  ☐ Not sure
☐ Other: ____________________________

GPS units (OPTIONAL): ________________________________

Height: \( \frac{45-50}{40} \) feet

Average canopy width: \( \frac{40}{40} \) feet

Circumference at chest level: \( 108 \) inches

Circumference at ground level: \( \) inches

NB: The tree base is at a level that is difficult to access. The tree is easily 9' in diameter before the crotch.

1 Distance from one edge to opposite edge of tree canopy
3 Distance around trunk on the ground where the trunk meets the soil.

The Urban Forestry Council will use the following criteria to evaluate each potential landmark tree. Please check the applicable criteria boxes and provide additional information about each component. If you need more space to describe the tree, please attach additional sheets.

Species  
☐ Rare

Size or Age  
☐ Greater than typical mature size or age

50 yrs old

Cultural/Historical Value  
☐ Significant historical or cultural association with person, place, event
☐ Significant ethnic appreciation
☐ Neighborhood appreciation of tree
☐ Part of planting that defines neighborhood character
☐ Profiled in a publication or other media

Key Location  
☐ High traffic area  
☐ Low tree density area  
☑ Extends between several properties  
☐ Visually accessible from public right-of-way

Updated on June 19, 2007
Ecology
- Important wildlife habitat
- Part of interdependent group of trees
- Erosion control
- Wind or sound barrier

Visual characteristic
- Prominent landscape feature
- Character defining form

Tree Condition: Robust + recently pruned
- No apparent problems
- Minor problems
- Major problems
- Extreme problems

Describe how/why the tree has historical importance due to an association with a building, structure, site, street, person or event.

Describe how/why the tree has cultural, social and/or historical importance.

Describe how/why the tree is a defining or meaningful feature of a neighborhood, viewed to the north and east, while providing wind shelter. It is a particularly magnificent tree and can be seen and appreciated by many neighbors.

Describe how/why the tree has ecological value like wildlife habitat and erosion control.

Describe any tree health or structure issues.

Updated on June 19, 2007
If you have any questions about this form, tree terms or tree concepts, please contact the Urban Forestry Council staff (below). It is acceptable if you cannot provide some of the information requested on this form.

A photograph of the tree must be submitted with this form.

Please attach optional supporting documents such as letters, arborist report, etc.

Send to: Attn: Landmark Tree Nomination, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
OR environment@sfgov.org

Any information you submit will be part of the public record.
The Public Records Act defines a "public record" broadly to include "any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics." Govt. Code § 6252(e). The Sunshine Ordinance defines "public information" as the content of "public records" as defined in the Public Records Act. Admin Code § 67.20(b). Pursuant to the Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, this document is a public record and will be available to the public upon request, at the hearing site, at the San Francisco Main Library, and on the Urban Forestry Council's website. Admin Code §§ 8.16, 67.7(b), and 67.21(a).

FOR STAFF USE ONLY
Application received date
Tree evaluation form
Board of Supervisors Decision
Landmark Tree #
Title recorded date

Received by
UFC recommendation date

Updated on June 19, 2007
Garden wall is obscured by back N.B. 2c-25' of tracing
Mei Ling Hui
Urban Forest Coordinator
SF Environment
City and County of San Francisco
11 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms Hui,

I am writing to support awarding landmark status to the mature Cypress tree at 2626 Vallejo Street in San Francisco.

Our landscape architecture firm was responsible for the landscape design of the property during the recent remodel, and we have become very familiar with this tree. Located at the northeast corner of the site, the tree was overgrown and appeared long-neglected when we first saw it but was stunning even then. It was clearly an irreplaceable asset to the neighborhood due to its large and spreading canopy which provides privacy and screening for neighbors in several directions in an area with fairly few large trees.

Its well-balanced form has since been revealed by expert pruning and care. The tree is an excellent example of the species and provides a sculptural foreground element in views of the city and toward the bay. In our opinion, it is an important component of the city’s urban forest, and of the neighborhood landscape, and we hope the city will protect it as a landmark tree.

If we can provide any further information that would be helpful, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Best regards,

Annie Amundsen
Design Associate
Begin forwarded message:

From: Harriet Heyman <hh@harrietheyman.com>
Date: March 21, 2008 10:28:02 AM PDT
To: Chsquared@aol.com
Subject: Re: Monterey Cypress

Dear Cecilia,

Thanks. My message wasn't an oblique fund-raising plea. I just wanted to know if neighbors had any interest in, or stories about, the tree. I applied to the city's "Landmark Tree" commission; they are on the lookout for rare species or ones with historical or community significance. Ours is not rare, and as far as I know, George Washington never slept in it. But if it had been a source of neighbors' pleasure or contention, I wanted to pass that on to the city's tree czars. Happy Easter.

Best,
H

On Mar 21, 2008, at 1:50 AM, Chsquared@aol.com wrote:

We don't have any old photos of the tree, but very much like the way you have thinned and shaped it to provide some light and "see-through" but also highlight is beautiful shape. We still regularly go together with the Flints to pay for tree trimming of trees on the Green Street side to protect our view. While the cypress doesn't materially affect our view, we'd be happy to contribute to trimming it regularly to keep it as lovely as it is. Sorry I can't be more help with photos or stories.

Best, Cecilia

*************

Create a Home Theater Like the Pros. Watch the video on AOL Home.
(http://home.aol.com/diy/home-improvement-eric-stromer?video=15?ncid=aolhom000300000000001)
To: S.F. City Urban Forest Council

I live two houses west from 2626 Vallejo St. which has a big Monterey Cypress tree in their back yard. I understand the current owners have applied to the Urban City Council to consider it for landmark status. As I understand it, having landmark status means the tree cannot be cut down without a permit, but may be pruned. I recall when that tree was dark and looming, towering at perhaps almost twice its present height. The neighbors approached the then owner (a previous owner), who was most amenable. The tree was topped, thinned out and pruned, which made it considerably lighter and also kept it from growing taller. Although the tree blocks (though not entirely) my view of San Francisco Bay from my east facing windows, the way it is pruned I see the Bay through its branches in an attractive way. I am delighted to know that the present owners wish to keep the tree trimmed and maintained as it is now.

Sincerely,

Ayame Flint
2646 Vallejo St.
415-346-8960

***************
Planning your summer road trip? Check out AOL Travel Guides. (http://travel.aol.com/travel-guide/united-states?ncid=aoltrv00030000000016)
Our outfit, Pacific Slope Tree Cooperative, first pruned this Monterey Cypress five years ago, when the owners, Harriet and Michael, were renovating their house. Though the tree needed extensive pruning, we were impressed by how robust it was. We were pleased to find no signs of disease or rot due to substandard cutting in the past.

We did major restructuring of the tree, taking out large wind damaged limbs, and reducing limb length. While we typically see Seiridium cardinale (cypress canker) in Monterey Cypresses, this tree seemed to be doing exceptionally well in that its stem and needle vigor was very healthy. The tree starts at the ground as a single trunk and forks into two several feet above. This double trunk is asymmetrical as the down slope trunk is smaller and therefore supporting less of the upper canopy. The union of these two trunks has ample spacing rendering it less vulnerable to structural failure. The tree is well balanced with a good center of gravity. It has a handsome symmetrical crown, a fine shape overall, it frames views, and softens views of surrounding houses. Over the course of five years and two prunings, the owners have paid our cooperative upwards of $20,000 for tree pruning. I think this speaks to their commitment to the health, aesthetics and safety of the tree. There are fewer and fewer substantial trees in San Francisco. With the onset of diseases such as Pitch Canker, SOD, and Cypress Canker to name a few, I'm finding it harder and harder to find healthy mature trees in the bay area. While Monterey Cypress is not a rare species, it is unusual to see one so healthy, well pruned and well adapted to an urban site.

Chuck Oakander, Pacific Slope Tree Cooperative
From: Marianne Peterson <mhpetersen@pobox.com>
Date: March 19, 2008 9:33:49 PM PDT
To: Harriet Heyman <hh@harrietheyman.com>
Subject: Re: this and that

Hi Harriet -- thanks for your nice email and now some answers. First please know that your cypress tree was full-grown when we bought our house in 1960. It was very large (and unruly) then. Mrs. Ambrose Diehl owned the house then, and since she was the chief-of-protocol (Charlotte Maillard's job) at that time, as well as elderly, I can assure you that she spent nothing on maintenance of either the house or the garden. The fact is that I inherited her helper who we called "Big John" and employed for many years. He was a willing worker and inexpensive, but inept! I am sure you know that Marshall Naify spent even less and literally let your house go to rack and ruin and therefore spent NOTHING in the garden. As far as photos of the tree, I am not any help as I took many pictures through the years of our garden in bloom but none of them ever looked up to your property to photograph the cypress. But Dick and I both remember it very clearly from the beginning and agree that it was probably planted by the original builder of your home.

Dear Marianne and Dick,

Thank you, Dick, for giving me permission to go in your yard. As it turned out, the arborist did not need to. We lowered a ladder from the garage window, and she was able to inspect the tree. (It's in fine fettle.) I am doing a bit of historical sleuthing about our home: Do you, by any chance, have a photograph of your back garden from when you first moved into your house? I'm searching for a photograph that shows the Monterey Cypress, which would help date the tree. Do you recall any conversations with Marshall Naify about keeping the tree trimmed? I recall a story, perhaps apocryphal, that neighbors chipped in, to encourage him to keep the tree trimmed to preserve neighbor's views. I'll ask the Herbergs if they had any discussion with the previous owner about the tree. Thank you for any insights or recollections you care to share.