

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER Proposed Plan Change 9 to the
Operative Hamilton City District Plan

AND

IN THE MATTER Session 1 Notable Trees and
Historic Heritage Areas

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JOHN P. ADAM

ON BEHALF OF WAIKATO HERITAGE GROUP # 427

& L KELLAWAY # 452

DATED 25 APRIL 2023

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is John Phillip Adam. I hold a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology (Auckland), Diplomas in Parks and Recreation Administration and Horticulture (Lincoln College, Canterbury University) and successfully completed an applied paper in Historic Gardens and Landscapes at the University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada in 1988.
2. I have been actively involved in the conservation and preservation movements since leaving secondary school in the early 1970s. I have been a member of the Australian Garden History Society since the early 1980s.
3. In 1998 I founded my business, 'Endangered Gardens.' I have researched and written many heritage garden/landscape conservation plans and reports for local councils/communities and worked with teams of heritage consultants including those who prepared the Albert Park, Auckland Domain, Western Park Conservation Plans and in recent years heritage thematic studies on Christchurch and Dunedin City urban, suburban and rural areas.
4. My brief with the heritage teams that prepared the Christchurch and Dunedin Thematic reports, focused heavily on the gaps in the protected historic urban infrastructure, through an examination of both the archival, published, and pictorial records, matched with field work. I also contributed to the analysis of the historic significance and policy recommendations.
5. In 2003 I was jointly awarded the New Zealand Fulbright Scholarship and undertook research in Los Angeles, California on the New Zealand based (1929-1932/ Auckland Rotorua and Wellington) and Swiss born landscape architect, Fred Tschopp (1905-1980), who practised in Los Angeles between 1925 and 1980.
6. I am a Fellow of Royal New Zealand Institute of Horticulture in 1998 and was awarded the Garden History Medal of the Royal New Zealand Institute of Horticulture in 2007.
7. I am familiar with Hamilton landscape having family who lived there through the 1980s and 1990s and where I began to survey heritage themes and organised workshops presented lectures about the Waikato as is detailed below.
8. I am a member of ICOMOS (NZ) and the New Zealand Member (2021-2024) for the ISCCL (International Scientific Committee of Cultural Landscapes.)
9. I participated in the expert conferencing sessions ARBORICULTURE on 15 March, 2023 and HERITAGE AND PLANNING 17th March 2023 and confirm that I signed the Joint Witness Statements for both meetings.

CODE OF CONDUCT

10. I am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Environment Court Practice Note 2023) and although I note this is a Council hearing, I agree to comply with this code. The evidence I will present is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on information provided by another party. I have not knowingly omitted facts or information that might alter or detract from opinions I express.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

11. My scope of evidence includes:
 - General (Session 1 Notable Trees and Historic Heritage Areas)
 - Heritage Landscapes
 - Notable Trees
 - Specific scheduling- NZR Railway Memorial Trees
 - Specific trees assessments
 - NZR Railway Memorial Avenue for Waikato Heritage Group #427
 - Camelia for L Kellaway #452
12. The separation of the session has made it difficult to give evidence on general topics. Hence my evidence statement covers both topics.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

13. The history of the Hamilton City and suburban public landscapes is not supported by background reports in the Chapter 19 review (including Notable Trees and Historic Heritage Areas) which leaves a significant omission in understanding the origins of the reserves and streets in my view, and does not provide an appropriate level of identification and protection of planted and built heritage landscape.
14. Notable Trees on private is important, but are not included under PC9. This risks the loss of these important trees because of their rarity (scientific values) of genetic history as urban intensification takes place. Inclusion of notable trees growing on private lands is important.
15. Within all these HHAs the heritage landscape has not been assessed or included in the rules. HHAs that should have been created include the Hamilton Gardens Nursery; and Ruakura Homestead Drive. In the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA the significance of built landscape and its design both publicly and privately has been identified as important and in my view, there should be a specific report on the built landscape of the proposed. A number of the areas such as Hayes Paddock and the Frankton Railway Village have existing information.
16. For all HHA's there needs to be heritage management policy guidelines for the replacement and repair of all heritage infrastructure including preferred trees to assist owners. This is a common practice overseas.
17. I would have to conclude that there has in my view been insufficient assessment of the Notable component of the STEM assessments and that this should be addresses where not included in the evaluation.
18. The focus of PC9 is the public landscape yet there is no professional explanation in my view. I would recommend a Heritage Landscape Report on the Public Landscape is undertaken in order to provide robustness to the process for city wide proposed trees proposed for Chapter 19.

HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

19. In regards to Heritage Landscapes I have adopted in my written and field research a temporal and spatial concept named *keystone processes* articulated by planning historian, Dr. Daniel Marcucci, Assistant Professor today of the Urban & Regional Planning Programme at East Carolina University, North Carolina. Marcucci's model he published about in 2000 is a holistic process, incorporating both the natural and cultural values of the times.
20. Marcucci lists five categories of *keystone processes*; Geomorphology; Climate change; Colonization Patterns; Disturbances and Cultural Processes. Further, cultural processes are grouped by Marcucci into six types: Cultural Values, Political, Legal Land control, Settlement Patterns, Transportation Advances and Economic Activity.¹
21. Marcucci argues that "Landscape history needs to tell how and why the landscape developed (Marcucci 2000: 67-81)". He says that "landscape change can be wholesale or incremental. Wholesale change occurs through wide-acting phenomena such as fire or rapid sub-urbanisation (Marcucci 2000: 72)".
22. Urban place-making has been occupied by a diverse range of relatively new experts such as historical geographers, environmental historians and garden historians who study the written, pictorial and field to interpret and explain both the creation and evolution of the historic cultural landscapes. This historic cultural landscape is a significant part of what defines 'character'. These historic landscapes have authorship (designers/architects – including landscape gardeners, foresters, engineers etc) and are dynamic and changing through time, influenced by governance (law), social and economic forces.
23. The continuous landscape design process tends to physically bury in-situ the historic streetscape and open space fabric. But it can and has been recovered throughout New Zealand by archaeological and other professional skills. Examples of the fabric would include wooden or stone cobble pavers, terracotta dish drain systems, railway networks tracks, pre-electric lighting infrastructure and the roading network. There has been some acknowledgement of the retention of some character elements via Consent Orders but these elements are but a few of what existed.

SUBMISSIONS / PLAN CHANGE 9 EVIDENCE

24. Section 6 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) recognises and provides for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. In my view, the protection given by s 6(f) of the RMA extends to the curtilage of the heritage item, the surrounding area that is significant for retaining and interpreting the heritage significance of historic heritage. This may include the land on which a heritage building is sited, its precincts, and the vegetation surrounding the heritage item. It is important to consider the relation of historic features with their built context and other surroundings, for example historic gardens.
25. Submission #427 by the Waikato Heritage Group requested Council conduct a city-wide Heritage Landscape Assessment Review, and that identified historic areas be scheduled. Other councils do undertake Heritage Landscape Assessments such as Christchurch city. It is still possible in my view to complete this background report. It

¹Daniel Marcucci, Landscape History as a Planning Tool, in, *Landscape and Urban Planning*. Vol. 49. 2000. pp. 67-81.

would assist within each proposed HHA and with the city-wide STEM assessments, as there are a number of STEM assessments which do not include the notable assessment component for a STEM evaluation. If the STEM evaluations do not include all components the scores can be misaligned. It would provide documentation going forward that is more robust as the STEM system was designed to do.

26. Submitter #196 (being a group of architects named within the submission received) have sought that the work of landscape architects, whose work forms an integral part of the built environment, be reviewed and included into Chapter 19. Council has advised that this has not been undertaken in preparing PC9 and is beyond the scope of PC9. However, the Hamilton Gardens (Modernist) by Mashlan is one example that has provided to HCC previously and identified. Appended is my report on the Hamilton Gardens History (Appendix 2) which supports this potential area. A Heritage Landscape Report of city as part of an integrated approach to historic heritage would have provided further examples.
27. Dr Gui in his expert evidence statement comments on the town belt as a historic area, and although out of scope for PC9 is another example known to council from previous Management Plan discussions. The town belt is of significance in my view and it is a missed opportunity as Management Plan for these areas does not include a Heritage Landscape component and there is an absence of scheduled Notable trees particularly in the Lake Domain.
28. Mr Miller's evidence includes the guidance written by Historic England which states under Identification – to understand the significance of an area with research into the development of the area and principal stages of development, how the area is laid out, its social and economic character, and architectural and landscape character. I support inclusion of identification and the following stages recommended by Historic England.
29. The proposed HHAs can be a useful planning tool to manage the extent and effects of urban redevelopment. However, they need to be informed by a robust study and planning recognition of heritage landscapes and an associated rule framework. There is no rule frame work for heritage landscape within the HHA except in regards to fencing, which in my view focuses on new fencing rather protection of existing historic ones.
30. Heritage landscapes are locations that portray dynamic relationships between people and the land; constantly changing environments passed on from one generation to the next and are worthy of respect and preservation. The plan change process should not under-estimate the importance of Hamilton's heritage landscape. As much as any other aspect of the world around us, these have the potential to be recognised as important heritage features.
31. The plantings, landscape, landforms and their historical interconnections are not only significant heritage, but can be important for 'place making' and urban sustainability.
32. Mr Knotts assessment reflects a focus on built heritage and has not been an integrated approach to historic heritage areas by the omission of built landscape heritage assessment. I consider that placing greater emphasis on surroundings, and landscapes has the potential to complement and enhance the efficacy of the

implementation of the proposed HHAs and identification and protection of the historic heritage.

Specific Notable Trees

33. Frankton Railway Village Memorial Avenue: Information on the memorial avenue has been provided by WHG and identification of the trees, however the two trees referred to in Mr Redfern's evidence in regards these are not part of the two selected, and represent a different form of Notable Trees are an avenue grouping. While the avenue falls within the proposed Frankton Railway Village HHA this is not sufficient identification and protection in my view. Inclusion of the NZR Memorial Avenue is important and has a score of 285. It should be included. (Appended in Appendix 3)
34. The camelia at 10 Taniwha Street is a tree on private land, however should be considered for scheduling and has a score of 279. I have appended a STEM Evaluation (Appendix 3)

CONCLUSION

35. In my view the current plan change, as notified, provides no supporting framework (objectives, policies or rules) for the management of historic landscapes, only for buildings. A foundation for the formulation of plan provisions for achieving this is required, in my view.
36. With these improvements, there is the potential to make a contribution to innovative area-based conservation planning that covers the range of natural and physical heritage features present in Hamilton.
37. The history of the Hamilton City and suburban public landscapes is not supported by background reports in the Chapter 19 review (including Notable Trees and Historic Heritage Areas) which leaves a significant omission in understanding the origins of the reserves and streets where the proposed in Notable Trees, and the historic heritage of built landscape within the proposed Historic areas.
38. Notable Trees are not included under PC9 on private lands further risks the loss of these important trees because of their rarity (scientific values) of genetic history as urban intensification takes place. I support the inclusion of **notable** trees growing on private lands.
39. Within all these HHAs the heritage landscape has not been assessed or included in the rule framework. HHAs that should have been created include the Hamilton Gardens Nursery and Ruakura Homestead Drive. In the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA where (a set number for each section) trees are reported as planted by the original tenants of the State houses across the gardens.
40. For all HHA's there needs to be heritage management policy guidelines for the replacement and repair of all heritage infrastructure and features of the built landscape including preferred trees to assist owners. This is a common practice overseas.
41. I would have to conclude that there has in my view been insufficient assessment of the Notable component of the STEM assessments and that this should be addressed where not included in the evaluation.
42. The focus of PC9 is the public landscape yet there is no professional explanation in my view. I would recommend a Heritage Landscape Report on the Public Landscape

is undertaken in order to provide robustness to the process for city wide proposed trees proposed for Chapter 19.

Dated this day of 26 APRIL 2023.

JOHN P. ADAM

Appendix 1

The following is a part of a paper which includes reports that provide a selection of relevant reports for assisting with histories of Heritage Landscape in regards to Hamilton city.

Hamilton Gardens Paper unpublished J P Adam

In Archives NZ was found a rare coloured surveyor's plan of Hamilton drawn by Andrew Sinclair. Fieldwork was begun on the ornamental use of the native Totara tree across Waikato gardens. Woodlands gardens were reviewed. Regional reports were written on the Te Aroha Hot Springs Domain (1994); Rotorua Government Gardens (1997); Waihi Heritage Landscapes (2004), and also focused on Hamilton gardens. These reports followed :

Adam, John P. 1989. An Illustrated Garden History Lecture to the Landscape Guild Annual Conference at the Hamilton Gardens, 14 October, 1989.

Adam, John P. 2003. Beale Cottage, Hamilton East. Landscape history research for the Beale Cottage and Garden, Conservation Plan, by a local heritage team.

Adam, John P. 2007. New Zealand Experimental Sites / Sights of Scientific Inquiry: A Preliminary Survey. For the Forest History Society of Australia Conference at Canterbury University, January 2007. 26p. [unpublished]

Adam, John P. 2013. Woodlands Gardens Report for Conservation Plan. For Matthews & Matthews for Woodlands Trust Hamilton. April.

Adam, John P. 2014. POSTER. Endangered Gardens: A Practitioner's Guide to New Zealand Garden History. Gardens at the Frontier: New Perspectives on Garden History. Symposium 29-31 January. Hamilton Gardens, 29th to 31st January.

Beaumont, L.; Kellaway, Laura & Adam, JP. 2017. Ruakura: Science Lost from Sight/Site. Heritage on the Edge. ICOMOS AGM, Hamilton, October.

Research on hydro dam villages built along the Waikato river and as Research Assistant for Professor Diane Brand at Victoria University (2012-2013) resulted three papers

Brand, D. 2014. Kit/set/tlements: Camps and Hydrotowns in New Zealand 1840-1985. Journal of Urban Design, Volume 19 (3) pp. 333-351.

Brand, D. 2014. Foreign Bodies: The roll of overseas agencies in New Zealand Hydroelectric development 1940-1970. In Proceedings of the 12th Australian Urban History Planning History Conference. University of Victoria, Wellington. Pp. 61-73.

Brand, D. 2014. Ernst Plischke and the Design of Urban New Zealand, 1939-47. Journal of Urban Design, Volume 19 (5). Pp. 682-699.

Appendix 2 Hamilton Gardens History

Hamilton Gardens History JP Adam Unpublished paper 2006

HAMILTON GARDENS HISTORY By John P Adam. Written ca 2006. 2023.

I have been delving into the history of the Hamilton Gardens as I had searched for the physical site of the several MoW nurseries. I have been amazed to find that in the 1950s new parks officer, John Mashlan, drew a plan for the then and now present Hamilton Gardens as he called it a 'Botanic Garden', beginning the development near an existing (leased to the City) nursery ground and building two new glass houses were to open at what I would call today a modernist 'Tropical Glass House'. [Note it was not called a 'Winter Garden' as the Auckland Domain one was called in 1920s.]. The current spin on this garden area is today to call it the 'Victorian garden'!! Yet it was never planted in the Victorian era but basically in the 1950s and was perceived as contemporary then (even at its opening wrongly acknowledging the history of the Town Belt it sat on!!) - in fact it was very clever to manipulate the abandoned nursery trees to look 'park like'. I would call all the themed 'Paradise Gardens' at the Hamilton gardens as 'Post Modern gardens' and just maybe one can tease out an argument to claim that the 'Botanical Gardens' come 'Victorian garden' was one of the first postmodern gardens in (NZ) and the world? So if one was asked to state its 'heritage significance'???

These gardens and the two glasshouses that were built for the new 'Hamilton Gardens' were made in part to block the motorway that MoW planned and in fact the alignment had to be changed. That is why there is a kink in the road today!! This road was linked to the large new state housing area called Melville's (southern side of the river) and the building of the Cobham bridge. John Mashlan must have been very aggressive to Fred Jones (1894-1953) the Government landscape architect and here one can see why the work stress on Jones would lead to his early demise [He was only 57 when he died]. Auckland City were as aggressive towards their landscape architects they employed from the UK at the same time. Melville's subdivision that had large parks (still there) appears to have been being designed at the peak of the tensions between Hamilton City and MoW housing construction ie 1951-1953. Mashlan was linked to the reform of public lands in 1950s by the Holland National Govt. and a Govt appointment made in 1950 to oversee the post war era disbanding the (liberal and aging – fate of many beautifying societies – i.e. Whanganui) Hamilton Beautifying Society and their staff so that the City Borough Council could gain control of the Crown's/State owned and managed Town Belt/ River and Domain Board lands!! It was/is one big power struggle that is writ large on most of our public lands history through the decades.

These are the primary sources for the above conclusions.

“Gardening Advice and Seasonal Work [by 'Nikau']...

...Tropical House.

Almost in one stride Hamilton has caught up with many of the towns of New Zealand- Wanganui, Wellington, Timaru and Oamaru, for example – by the building and opening of the new Tropical Garden.

Older residents will remember the area as Mr. Bateson's nursery, sheltered by trees and hidden by hedges. The land has been cultivated, shrubs have been freshly planted and the hedges have been removed, but **the best of the trees have been**

retained. Lawns have been laid down, too, so that the **new hot houses have a fine setting**. *Waikato Times*, 26 July, 1960. P13. C4-6.

Display Of Tropical Plants In New Glasshouse.

A tribute to the foresight of the late Mr W. A Graham, Hamilton's first surveyor, who after the Maori War in 1863-64 laid out the town of Hamilton and **provided a town belt around the area**, was paid by Mr. F. M. Yendell, chairman of the parks and reserves committee of the Hamilton City Council, at the opening of the **new tropical display** arranged in a glasshouse built the council in Sillary Street, Hamilton East, yesterday... [Before Motorway built. This building challenged the MoW to change the road alignment!!]

...The development [four acres] that had been undertaken was only part of the whole scheme, and it was hoped that eventually botanical gardens would be formed in the area surrounding the glasshouse. **...work was started in 1955** to develop botanic botanical gardens at Sillary Street, and the first stage in this development could be seen in the tropical display in the glasshouse that had been built by the council. ...". *Waikato Times*, 25 July, 1960. P2 C3-5.

[Tropical Plants are very modern!! Teaching facility for apprentices (see one man sent away) Becomes called the 'Victorian garden' yet it was created in the 1950s!! Other descriptions are 'Gardenesque'.]

The 'Postmodern experiment' – Hamilton gardens – has to be understood in terms of the deconstructed 'Woodlands' and perhaps the abandoned 'Hamilton Lake.' ie the Rose Garden that was moved to Hamilton Gardens.

This is a quote from a G. Doube who worked at the Hamilton Gardens in 2006 and who published a story at <http://www.anbg.gov.au/chabg/newsletter/07-march/>

"...Four acres adjoining the nursery were converted from town belt for the purposes of establishing a botanical garden in 1960. One of these acres had been converted two years earlier and a tropical glasshouse had been built upon it. Thus when Hamilton Gardens officially opened on 24th July 1960 it comprised the Tropical Display House set within four acres of Gardenesque planting, which was, at the time, a common style in the public gardens of New Zealand provincial centres. These original four acres and the Greenhouse have been preserved and incorporated into the current garden plan as 'The Victorian Flower Garden'..."

The land quoted above by Doube was not on the Town Belt but on a joint 'Education' and 'Cemetery Reserve', Allotment 262 marked 'green' on a plan (below) drawn by Government Surveyor Andrew Sinclair Jnr and located on land just to the south of the true 'Town Belt'. See the Royal Commission report on the Town Belt from 1908. Gazette Notice. AAD3 W3362 246 1/178 [1]. Hamilton Domain 1907-1911. ANZW. Order in Council on NZ Gazette 20 May 1879.

and improvements completed during the year.

HAMILTON DOMAIN.

Sections Nos. 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 405A, 209, 210, 214, 215, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 281, 282, 321, 322, 323, 324A, 325A, 326, 331, 332, 333, 334, 337, 338, 339, 340, 343, 344, 345, 346, 349, 350, 351, 352, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 362A, 363, 363A, 365, 366, 367, 367A, 368, 368A, 369, 370, 371, 372, 372A, 373, 373A, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, and 410, Town of Hamilton East, and 168 acres, Hamilton East Town Belt. Also Sections Nos. 28, 129, 140, 142, 399A, 146, 147, 149, 170, 171, 201, 202, 203, 212, 409, 457, 458, 194, 195, 197, 198, 206, 207, 209, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 225, 226, 227, 228, 251, 454, 320, 324, 325, 335, 337, 350, 352, 369, 376A, 453A, 180 acres 2 roods 24 perches, Hamilton West Town Belt, and Section No. 372, Parish of Te Rapu, **Hamilton Lake**, 141 acres. Area, 663 acres 2 roods.

Work done during year: Seddon Park ploughed and cleared, front portion laid down in grass, and back portion cropped and reploughed for cropping and laying down in grass; lake reserve cleared in readiness for ploughing and grassing; shrubs and hedges planted in Seddon and Steele Parks, and noxious weeds eradicated. Improvements now on domain: Fences, drains, trees, shrubs, and buildings. Used for sports and picnics. Proposed operations for ensuing year: Cropping and laying down in grass the Lake Reserve and Seddon Park, and general improvements.

Above is an abstract report of Public Domains (written through 1900s-1920s*) under government laws – acts – placing them as high status public lands to be administered by ‘Domain Boards’ approved by the Governor General. Committee members were from local councils surrounded the district lands. Board members in the 19th century were appointed un-elected but a change took place with the Te Aroha Hot Springs Domain that from a point forward only elected members of local governments could be nominated. Sir Edward Stafford reminded the Auckland Domain Board in the 1870s the land was for the ‘People of New Zealand’ and not just Aucklanders’ and the same argument was made for Hamilton in 1908 at the Royal Commission and or before 1908. The same Domain Act typology manged the first NZ National Parks but in 2023 there are no longer Domain Boards but an elderly ‘Reserves Act’ from 1977 where the ‘Domain’ designation was struck down to attempt a create a level playing field that was not a wise decision from the writers perspective. Historic Reserves were redefined in 1977 but there was considerable cultural cringe revealed by bureaucrats stating there was little history in New Zealand worth designating. They were ahistorical modernists. In 2022 the Victorian Government of Australia designated a four year old newly designed and greatly admired public city square has having high heritage value!!! And in the 1900s historic trees across New Zealand (Taranaki) had there own Acts to protect them from the fast moving power and telephone polls and wires that would lead to some historic tree destruction.

* In 1923 the Hamilton Domain Board did a land swap selling part of the Domain to buy a better portion of nearby land. AJHRNZ Session II C-10, 1923. P1.

The quote by Ruth Wackrow that the Rotoroa Lake Domain came to be Borough land is wrong. It probably remains Crown Land meaning any work had to be approved by the Crown!!



Appendix 3 STEM for NZ Railways memorial Avenue

STEM EVALUATION BY J P ADAM

STEM EVALUATION	NZ Railways Memorial Avenue Swarbrick Park Rifle Range Road Hamilton Includes two rows of circa 1920s trees made up mainly of of Japanese cedars	Dated April 2023 Assessor J P Adam
CONDITION (i) Health		
a. Form	9	
b. Occurrence	15	
c. Vigour & Vitality	15	
d. Function	21	
e. Age	27	87
AMENITY (ii) Community		
a. Stature	27	
b. Visibility	27	
c. Proximity	15	
d. Role	15	
e. Climate	9	93
NOTABLE (iii) Distinction		
a. Stature	15	
b. Historic -	9	
c. Age	9	
d. Association	9	
f. Commemorative	9	
g. Scientific	15	
h. Remnant/ Relic	9	
i. Rarity	15	
j. Endangered	9	105
	TOTAL	285

Notes: Removal of some trees is noted at inspection in March 2023; however, the avenue is considered of historic heritage value as a group and as a memorial. This may be an early planting in relation to Forestry experiments at Rotorua.

Replanting of the same species within the existing row is recommended and ongoing maintenance.

The site is a known 19th century rifle range and as such is under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Toanga Act as archaeological.

The avenue is associated with the NZR Railway settlement and considered a memorial to railwaymen in the First World War.

Recommendation: The STEM assessment for the NZR Memorial Avenue has a score of 285 and meets the requirements for scheduling as per Mr Redferns criteria.

Appendix 4 STEM for Camelia at 10 Taniwha Street Hamilton Submittor #452

STEM EVALUATION BY J P ADAM STEM ASSESSMENT FOR CAMELLIA

<p>STEM EVALUATION</p> 	<p>Camelia species sasanqua</p> <p>10 Taniwha Street Hamilton 3204</p> <p>single tree in front garden</p> <p>ISaucer magnolia (<i>Magnolia sp.</i>)</p> <p>variety is Kanjiro, an old variety selected in Japan during the 1800s, and among the first sasanqua varieties brought to NZ in the early 1900s</p> <p>Height of 10 m and spread of 8m</p>	<p>Dated April 2023</p> <p>Assessor J P Adam</p> 
<p>CONDITION (i) Health</p>		
<p>a. Form</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>b. Occurrence</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>c. Vigour & Vitality</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>d. Function</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>e. Age</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>87</p>
<p>AMENITY (ii) Community</p>		
<p>a. Stature</p>	<p>27</p>	
<p>b. Visibility</p>	<p>27</p>	
<p>c. Proximity</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>d. Role</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>e. Climate</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>93</p>
<p>NOTABLE (iii) Distinction</p>		
<p>a. Stature</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>b. Historic -</p>	<p>9</p>	
<p>c. Age</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>d. Association</p>	<p>15</p>	
<p>f. Commemorative</p>	<p>9</p>	
<p>g. Scientific</p>	<p>9</p>	

h. Remnant/ Relic	9	
i. Rarity	9	
j. Endangered	9	99
	TOTAL	279

Recommendation: The STEM assessment for the camelia has a score of 279 and meets the requirements for scheduling as per Mr Redferns criteria.