TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT FORM

Site address and parish: 291A Thorpe Road (Longthorpe Parish)				
Location in property: Rear garden				
Tree species: Sycamore				
Map ref:	SCORE: 64			
Inspected by: Bryan Clary	Date: 13.12.17			
Mature. Located <1m from the boundary. The Sycamore contributes to the local landscape and is one				
of the better quality trees with good long term potential compared to others in the vicinity. The tree in in				
good overall condition and is relatively small for the species. It is noted that tree works have been				
undertaken on the bowling green side of the crown, however, they do not diminish the value of the tree.				
No defects were noted nor were there any requirements noted for extensive tree surgery now or in the				
future. The only tree works that are possible in the future may be a reduction from the dwelling and				
crown lifting.				

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.

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.

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.

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

	Does the trees merit protection as individual specimens Yes ■ in 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 reasonably be applicable?		
	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 measure?	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) Skyline Road frontage Ink, principal, classified, unclassified) Backdrop Glimpses between properties or through gateways Filtered views		

Filtered views •

Screening/buffering •

Visual Prominence

-	Conurbation	
•	Conurbation	
٠	Neighbourhood, estate, locale	
٠	Site and immediate surroundings	•
٠	Value restricted to site	
		TPO ASSESSMENT FORM

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I Amenity					
1.1	Seen by the general public	Easily	Sometimes	No	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.2	Presence of other 'local' trees	< 4	< 10	> 10	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	32 <mark>1</mark>	
Visual 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	
	o quality/impact should take acc Health Considerations	count of the hea	alth, vigour, cha	aracter and inter	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 21	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive	3 2 1	
3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak	3 2 1	
3.6	Main branch structure	Good	Average	Poor	321	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 2 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	-	Poor	3 2 1	
			Average			
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
3.10	Tree species/size comparison	Large	Average	Small	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.14	Future maintenance	Low	Average	High	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.15	Future visual impact	High	Average	Low	<mark>3</mark> 21	
	ct considerations					
4.1	On the highway	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <6m	<mark>3</mark> 21	
4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	<mark>3</mark> 21	
4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sh	nade 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>	
5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	32 <mark>1</mark>	
6	Total Score (50 or 56 required)	I	I		64	

This page is intentionally left blank