## TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT FORM

Site address and parish: 367 Eastfield Road, Peterborough					
Location in property: Front garden					
Tree species: Horse chestnut					
Map ref:	SCORE: 58				
Inspected by: Bryan Clary	Date: 14.04.15				

- In order to set a standard for the Tree Preservation Order assessment, the trees importance/visibility must be judged taking account of the factors which increase the trees desirability for inclusion, and areas of potential conflict associated with the built environment.
- It is suggested that the use of half points is used to increase accuracy and balance where categories do not quite match.
- Only Complete Section 2 when assessing a group.
- I If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1 or 2, question the reason for making the Order.
- If the tree is marked as 'No' in Item 1.1, 'Extensive' in Item 3.4 or item 3.9, or 'High' in Item 3.14 or item 4.4, the tree should not be scheduled for a TPO unless there are extenuating circumstances.
- In Item 3.10 the size of the tree should be judged according to the average for the species.
- I If the trees score less than 25 in Section 3 question the reason for making the Order.
- □ To be considered for a TPO the score should be at least <u>50</u> points, the exception being a tree of historic interest or a tree recognised as a key feature in the area.
- I Trees being assessed as a group should score at least <u>56</u> points.

See over for assessment form

Prior to assessing the tree(s) health it would be prudent to judge if the tree(s) should be assessed as a single specimen or a group.

## Individual

	bes the trees merit protection as individual specimens Yes ■ their own right?		No 🗆	
	Group			
	Does the overall impact and quality of the trees merit a group designation?		Yes 🗆	No 🗆
	Would the trees reasonably be managed in the future as a group?		Yes 🗆	No 🗆
	Woodland			
	Does the woodland form an area greater than 0.1 hectare?		Yes 🗆	No 🗆
	Would normal silvicultural management principles reasonable applicable?	ably		
	Does the woodland currently contain regeneration and a Ground flora?		Yes 🗆	No 🗆
	Does the woodland form part of a garden?		Yes 🗆	No 🗆
	Area			
	Does the area comprise scattered individual trees?		Yes 🗆	No 🗆
	Is the area classification warranted as an emergency mean	Yes 🗆	No 🗆	
	Is the area designation intended as a temporary measure Pending future reclassification?		Yes □	No 🗆
	Do all trees/species merit inclusion?		Yes 🗆	No 🗆
La	ndscape function			
• (tru •	Landmark tree(s)Image: Constraint of the systemSkylineImage: Constraint of the systemRoad frontageImage: Constraint of the systemunk, principal, classified, unclassified)Image: Constraint of the systemBackdropImage: Constraint of the systemGlimpses between properties or through gatewaysImage: Constraint of the systemFiltered viewsImage: Constraint of the systemScreening/bufferingImage: Constraint of the system			
Vis	sual Prominence			
•	Conurbation			

- Site and immediate surroundings Value restricted to site •
- •

## **TPO ASSESSMENT FORM**

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
Visua	al Amenity					
1.1	Seen by the general public	Easily	Sometimes	No	<mark>3</mark> 21	
1.2	Presence of other 'local' trees	< 4	< 10	> 10	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	<mark>3</mark> 21	
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
Visua	al Impact as a group					
2.1	Group quality close by	Good	Moderate	Poor	321	
2.2	Group quality at a distance	Good	Moderate	Low	321	
2.3	Group impact at a distance	Great	Moderate	Low	321	
2.4	Group impact close by	Great	Moderate	Low	321	
Grou	o quality/impact should take acc	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inter	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
Tree	Health Considerations					
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.6	Main branch structure	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.10	Tree species/size comparison	Large	Average	Small	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.11	Maturity	SM/Mat	F Mature	O Mature	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.12	Past management	Appropriate	Average	Inappropriate	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.13	Life expectancy	> 40 years	< 40 years	< 10 years	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.14	Future maintenance	Low	Average	High	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.15	Future visual impact	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
Impa	ct considerations					
4.1	On the highway	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <6m	32 <mark>1</mark>	
4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	32 <mark>1</mark>	
4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	32 <mark>1</mark>	
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
may a	harmony of the tree and its surro add or deduct .5 of a point	oundings (size,	growth rate, sh	ade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
•	ial Interest Factors					
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	32 <mark>1</mark>	
5.2	Species rarity for the local soil	Rare	Moderate	Common	32 <mark>1</mark>	
5.3	SSSI	> One	One	None	32 <mark>1</mark>	
5.4	Historic interest	Great	Moderate	None	32 <mark>1</mark>	

## APPENDIX 2

5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	32 <mark>1</mark>	
6	Total Score (50 or 56 required)				58	