

**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: J. MALCOLM HILLAN  
Date of evaluation: 4-25-2011  
Scientific name: PRUNUS LAUROCERASUS  
Common name: ENGLISH LAUREL  
Street address: 864 FRANCISCO ST.  
Cross streets: HYDE / LEAVENWORTH

**Rarity** \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ Partially  No

Rarity: \_\_\_ Rare \_\_\_ Uncommon  Common \_\_\_ Other

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

Comment: COMMON FOUNDATION, PROPERTY-LINE,  
SCREENING SHRUB

**Physical Attributes** \_\_\_ Yes  Partially \_\_\_ No

Size:  Large \_\_\_ Medium \_\_\_ Small

Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.

Comment: OVERGROWN SHRUBS, HAS BECOME  
MULTI-TRUNKED TREE

Age: \_\_\_ Yes  No

Significantly advanced age for the species.

Comment: NO COMMENT

**Distinguished form:**  Yes \_\_\_ No

Tree is an example of good form for its species, has a majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.

Describe: TRUNK HAS BECOME "WHIMSICAL"  
WITH REMOVAL OF SHRUBBY LATERALS  
NOT PARTICULARLY INTERESTING

Urban Forestry Council  
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

2

Tree condition: \_\_\_ Good  Poor \_\_\_ Hazard

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

Describe: LOTS OF STUBS; DEADWOOD  
UNATTRACTIVE

Historical \_\_\_ Yes  Partially \_\_\_ No

Historical Association: \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ None apparent

Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.

Describe nature of appreciation: REPORTEDLY PART OF T. CHARLOT  
GARDEN. NOT LANDMARK WORTHY

Profiled in a publication or other media:  Yes \_\_\_ Unknown

Tree has received coverage in print, internet, video media, etc. Attach documentation if appropriate.

Describe coverage: REPORTEDLY IDENTIFIED IN SUNSET  
PUBLICATION. NOT LANDMARK - WORTHY.

Environmental \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ Partially  No

Prominent landscape feature: \_\_\_ Yes  No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible: NO COMMENT

Low tree density: \_\_\_ Low  Moderate \_\_\_ High

Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

Describe: NEIGHBORHOOD HAS  
TREES

Interdependent group of trees: \_\_\_ Yes  No

This tree in an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.

Describe: NOT IN THE LEAST

Visible or Accessible from public right-of-way:  Yes \_\_\_ No

High visibility and/or accessibility from public property.

Describe: VISIBLE FROM FRANCISCO ST.  
NOT AN ASSET.

Urban Forestry Council  
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

High traffic area:  Yes  No

Tree is located in an area that has a high volume of vehicle, pedestrian or bike traffic and has a potential traffic calming effect.

Describe: NO COMMENT

Important wildlife habitat:  Yes  No

Species has a known relationship with a particular local wildlife species or it provides food, shelter, or nesting to specific known wildlife individuals.

NO COMMENT : NONE APPARENT

Erosion control:  Yes  No

Tree prevents soil erosion.

Describe: NOT SIGNIFICANT

Wind or sound barrier:  Yes  No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

Describe: NOT SIGNIFICANT

Cultural  Yes  Partially  No

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: \_\_\_\_\_

Cultural appreciation:  Yes  None apparent

Particular value to certain cultural or ethnic groups in the city.

Describe nature of appreciation: \_\_\_\_\_

Planting contributes to neighborhood character:  Yes  No

Tree contributes significantly to, or represents, neighborhood aesthetic.

Describe contribution: HARMONIOUS WITH NEIGHBORHOOD AND LANDSCAPE. NOT LANDMARK WORTHY.

Urban Forestry Council  
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

4

Profiled in a publication or other media:  Yes  Unknown  
Tree has received coverage in print, internet, video media, etc. Attach documentation if appropriate.  
Describe coverage: \_\_\_\_\_

REPORTEDLY IN SUNSET PUBLICATION

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

SORRY.

Additional comments

THE CITY IS LITTERED WITH  
AGING AND POORLY MAINTAINED  
SHRUBS ADJOINING/BORDERING  
7 CHURCH GARDENS. THIS  
SPECIMEN IS NOT PARTICULARLY  
NOTEWORTHY AMONG THEM AND  
IN NO WAY IS WORTHY OF  
LANDMARKING BY THE CITY AND  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

EARLIER HEADING, AND CURRENT STUBBING  
AND DEADWOOD ARE PARTICULARLY  
UNATTRACTIVE, AND EVIDENCE OF  
NEGLECT/CARELESSNESS.