

to ensure the protection and management of the treescape through negotiation. As such, the council's forestry team has been consulted on development proposals at this site over recent years and has been involved with some of the tree monitoring and management issues associated with both the development projects that have been implemented, and some of the general management activities on the site.

- 2.2 It is acknowledged that past historical management of the trees on this site has enabled many fine specimen trees to mature, however the council has become increasingly concerned that the ongoing development of the site has brought increasing pressure on the treescape despite HR Wallingford's best efforts to manage this process. The density of the development and diversity of the associated business activity have made it increasingly difficult for HR Wallingford to ensure protection of the trees and unfortunately there have been several instances where trees have been lost or damaged as a result. Further details emphasising this are provided in section 4.2 of this report.
- 2.3 Following the recommendations from the council's forestry team for HR Wallingford to adopt a pro-active tree management policy, an arboricultural consultancy was appointed in March 2008 to compile a tree management plan. However, since its production it would appear that little, if any of the recommended management works have been implemented. Of more concern was that, following a detailed on-site inspection by the tree officer and the council's landscape consultant, the management plan appeared to have several flaws in terms of interpretation, omissions of trees that did require work and inappropriate works specified for other trees.
- 2.4 This culmination of events and potential threats further emphasised by the recent submission of a planning application that failed to consider the impact on the trees, has meant that the council's informal arrangement with the HR Wallingford is no longer sufficient to ensure the protection and sustainable management of this valuable treescape. The council has therefore served the tree preservation order in accordance with its legal duty to ensure protection of significant trees within the district.

It's important to stress the purpose of the TPO is not to prevent development, it is purely seeking to protect trees with a high amenity value, both as individuals and collectively as an historic treescape. It also highlights the need to appropriately consider this important treescape in the development process, allowing for both sustainable high quality development and the long term retention of the trees.

3.0 REASONS FOR OBJECTION

- 3.1 The council have received only one objection to the TPO which is from the site owners, HR Wallingford. However, the objection is extensive comprising two documents from arboricultural and planning consultants acting on behalf of HR Wallingford i.e.
- original objection report from Vincent and Goring Planning Associates - providing overview of reasons for the objection
 - supporting objection from Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd - providing specific tree and legislative reasons for the objection

Copies of the objection documents are attached at appendix B and the main issues are summarised below:

- that the TPO is inappropriate given HR Wallingford's track record
- that the informal working relationship between the council and HR Wallingford remains appropriate
- the TPO imposes a huge and unnecessary burden on HR Wallingford and the council
- the 'blanket order' is unnecessary and contrary to Government guidance
- the expedience of serving the TPO has not been proven by the council, it is ill conceived and unjustified
- the council has not adhered to Government guidance in serving of the TPO and has included trees that are not appropriate for inclusion

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 When giving consideration to the confirmation of this order, councillors are advised to take account of the following points which seek to address the concerns raised in the objections and explain the actions taken by the council.

- 4.2
- ***that the TPO is inappropriate given HR Wallingford's track record***
 - ***that the informal working relationship between the council and HR Wallingford remains appropriate***

The serving of the TPO is not a reflection on the ethics and management principles adopted by HR Wallingford. The development of this site is wholly supported in principle by the council and the benefits it has provided to the local community are to be applauded. However, despite the best intentions of all concerned there have been several instances over recent years where trees have been damaged as a result of site activity, poorly implemented maintenance operations and unsympathetic development proposals highlighting future threat.

In summary these include:

- loss of trees due to non compliance with tree protection conditions associated with construction of the Maplin building in 2004
- trenching works associated with installation of services damaging multiple trees
- neglect of new planting
- damage to recent planting from grass maintenance operations
- submission of a planning application for an extensive housing development that would adversely effect large numbers of high quality trees.

In addition, the lack of an appropriate tree management plan for the site and lack of evidence of any proactive approach to tree management has resulted in a decline in the quality of the tree stock and has threatened its longevity. As such, the informal arrangements between the council and HR Wallingford are failing to be effective and it is therefore suggested that the TPO is appropriate

and necessary to protect this important treescape.

4.3 • ***the TPO imposes a huge and unnecessary burden on HR Wallingford and the council***

For the reasons stated above the treescape of Howbery Park is seen to be threatened. Following careful consideration, the tree officers consider that the TPO is now necessary. However, the council is keen to ensure that the administrative procedures are managed as effectively as possible, minimising any ‘burden’ for both parties.

The benefits to the owners from adopting a proactive tree management plan for the site are manifold and the tree officers have emphasised this to HR Wallingford. The ability to submit a single tree works application for all works programmed for a 2 or 3 year period is just one such benefit. This would ensure that resources required to comply with the legislation are minimal and would only require additional applications where unforeseen re-active works are required. The need for such re-active works is also greatly reduced through the proactive management process as demonstrated by the management of the council’s own treestock.

It should be noted that the recently submitted tree works application from HR Wallingford, for works on 44 individual trees and 12 groups of trees was processed and approved in 12 working days. The letter of consent issued approval for works to all of the trees allowing for the works to be completed within a two year period.

4.4 • ***the ‘blanket order’ is unnecessary and contrary to Government guidance***

Councillors will be familiar with the use of the ‘blanket’ or ‘area’ category order as a provisional tool to ensure trees are protected whilst further detail is gathered and negotiations pursued with tree owners. The original area order has now been revised in line with Government guidance and the TPO now comprises the individual, group and woodland categories listed in the introduction and detailed in appendix A.

Despite the revised format of the order, HR Wallingford have sustained their objection, suggesting that the extent of the TPO remains excessive. Further justification and reasoning for the extent and format of the TPO is provided in the following paragraphs to address this point and those raised by Broad Oak arboricultural consultants.

4.5 • ***the expedience of serving the TPO has not been proven by the council, it is ill conceived and unjustified***

The two main criteria for the serving of a TPO are;

- that there is a current or perceived future threat to the trees

- that the trees are of amenity significance to the public

The first of these criteria has been discussed and justified above in paragraph 4.2 and the photographs that will be shown at committee support this. The ongoing development proposals for this site are seen to sustain and increase this threat and therefore a TPO on a site, which has been identified for future development, is both appropriate, expedient and inline with government guidance.

In light of this the TPO is seeking to ensure that adequate provision is made to accommodate the trees as part of the future development proposals and in doing so ensure the trees continue to contribute to, rather than adversely affect the social, economic and employment benefits the site offers.

The TPO will help to ensure that any development is 'sustainable' and therefore supports PPS 4 rather than conflicting with it as has been suggested.

It is important to note the serving of this TPO does not in anyway affect the implementation of previously approved planning consent, which has yet to be constructed.

Only one tree (T76 Poplar) which has been included within the TPO will be required to be removed if the owners seek to implement their approved permission. Plans showing the yet to be implemented planning permission and the plan showing the tree protected by the TPO will be presented at committee to demonstrate this clearly. A copy can be seen in Appendix D.

The public amenity value of trees on this site is more complex and requires a more detailed explanation. The council uses a structured amenity assessment process to assess the trees and their individual and collective merits. Initially the extent of public access and vantage points which surround the site are considered.

There are obvious public viewpoints from surrounding roads, footpaths and the river. However, due to positive transport and infrastructure improvements, which the council are very much in approval of, this has resulted in a significant increase in the extent of uninhibited coming and going by members of the public to the site. This has increased the amenity significance of the trees across the whole site and this has been reflected in the amenity value accredited to the treescape when compiling the TPO.

Examples of this informal, yet extensive public access to the site are given below and reinforce the significance of the treescape to the public;

- the public bus route which currently services the centre of the site at least twice a day
- public services such as the Environment Agency and the nursery school are tenants that attract numerous daily visitors
- footpaths now provide links to neighbouring sites such as the Institute of Hydrology and the council offices, whose staff have access to the canteen at HR Wallingford
- the hundreds of staff employed in the variety of businesses that now

- occupy the site and access the site on a daily basis
 - public events such as the annual Wallingford 10k run and the ‘Turnstyle’ art exhibition which were recently hosted on the site
- 4.6
- ***the council has not adhered to Government guidance in serving of the TPO and has included trees that are not appropriate for inclusion***

The council uses a standardised amenity assessment to determine the expedience of including trees within a TPO. This ensures a consistent and defensible procedure as recommended by the government publication ‘*Tree Preservation Orders, A guide to the law and good practice.*’ This methodology has been applied to all the trees included in this TPO. However, due to the scale of this order only a cross section of amenity assessments have been formally recorded. Other specific assessments can be supplied on request. Examples, showing both higher and lower scoring trees and groups are attached at appendix C, along with the assessment guidance criteria. Whilst the assessment process does not use a specific ‘cut off’ score, we have found that where a tree or group scores less than 30 its inclusion in the order becomes questionable. A range of examples are attached, including one of the few that score below 30, so as to enable informed assessment of the procedures that have been applied.

The TPO categorisation is important when assessing the amenity value of individual trees that form part of a ‘group’ category. Some may have limited amenity value in isolation, but it is the amenity impact provided by the group as a landscape feature, such as an avenue, which will determine its amenity significance. Equally, there may be individual trees within an avenue that are in poor physiological or structural condition, and as such the council would not resist their removal. However, their contribution to the landscape feature of the avenue is such that the council would wish to secure their replacement with trees of a suitable size and species so as to sustain the avenue feature.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

- 5.1 The South Oxfordshire Local Plan adopted 2006 recognises the contribution that trees make to the appearance and character of towns and villages within the district and commits the council to preserving and retaining existing trees. These aims are embodied in policies C1, C6, C9, CON7 and A1 which seek to underpin the statutory duty of the council to protect trees of amenity value.
- 5.2 In order to ensure consistent interpretation of the TPO legislation, guidance has been sought from the DETR publication “Tree Preservation Orders. A Guide to the Law and Good Practice”.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1
- Careful consideration and site assessment has been applied to the compilation of this TPO to ensure that it's serving is both expedient and compliant with Government guidance.
 - The trees that are included in the order are significant both in terms of their contribution to the historic landscape of the listed building and as important landscape features of the site and surrounding area.
 - The increasing density and diversity of activity on this site means that trees have been lost or damaged over recent years and that there is an ongoing and increasing threat to this important treescape.
 - The adoption of a proactive tree management plan for this site will not only ensure the treescape is sustainably managed but also address the owner's liabilities in terms of health and safety and minimise the costs and resources required to manage the trees and the administrative procedures associated with compliance with the TPO legislation.
 - The preservation order will allow the trees to be managed following best arboricultural practice, thereby addressing any future compatibility issues whilst maintaining the trees in good health for future generations.

7.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 **That tree preservation order no. 06/2010 be confirmed.**

Author Martin Gammie
Contact No. 01491 823770
Email Add. forestry@southoxon.gov.uk

APPENDIX A:	TPO schedule, map and aerial photograph
APPENDIX B:	Letters of objection
APPENDIX C	Sample amenity assessments
APPENDIX D	Plan of previously approved development

APPENDIX A

TPO SCHEDULE, MAP AND AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH

APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF OBJECTION

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE AMENITY ASSESSMENTS AND GUIDANCE NOTES

G12

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT – PART II

Preliminary Selection: Tree Health & Tree Safety

A	(SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years?	YES	NO	NB: Do not TPO trees if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Useful Life Expectancy is less than 10 years. • It is not economic to retain the tree in a safe condition. Economic assessment: evaluate the amenity value of the tree against the cost of re-planting. See overleaf for checklist for Tree Hazard Assessment.
B	Good biological health for age	YES	NO	
	If NO, can the problem be treated economically (see notes opposite)	YES	NO	
C	The tree(s) appears to be structurally sound at the time of inspection.	YES	NO	
	If NO, can the tree be made safe using recognised arboricultural methods?	YES	NO	
	If YES, will it be economical to restore and maintain this tree in a safe condition?	YES	NO	
	If NO, Is replacement planting desirable in this location	YES	NO	

Amenity Assessment: Consider as individual tree, group OR woodland.

D	TPO Type	INDIVIDUAL	GROUP	AREA	WOODLAND	
---	----------	------------	-------	------	----------	--

Visibility & Visual Impact		Yes/High	Rating (circle a number)					No/Low	Notes
1	Extent of visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total A =24	
2	Frequency of viewing	5	4	3	2	1	0		
3	Importance to the viewers	5	4	3	2	1	0		
4	Extent of 'Restricted' public visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0		
5	Aesthetic merits close by	5	4	3	2	1	0		
6	Aesthetic merits at a distance	5	4	3	2	1	0		
7	Importance to landscape/treescape	5	4	3	2	1	0		

Size, Form & Future Potential

8	Size: is or will become appropriate to the site	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total B =7
9	Form: allowing for species (inc. 'interesting')	5	4	3	2	1	0	
10	Future amenity potential	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Special Factors

11	Habitat value	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total C =6
12	Rarity of species	5	4	3	2	1	0	
13	Tree is characteristic of this area	5	4	3	2	1	0	
14	S.S.S.I. or other designated area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
15	Historical significance	5	4	3	2	1	0	
16	Contribution to local air quality	5	4	3	2	1	0	
17	Shading value	5	4	3	2	1	0	
18	Screening value	5	4	3	2	1	0	

19	Contribution to character of Conservation Area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
----	--	---	---	---	---	---	-----	--

Potential to Impact Other Features

20	Highway	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total D=-3
21	Services	5	4	3	2	1	0	
22	Walls	5	4	3	2	1	0	
23	Buildings	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Other Factors

24	Other Factors (describe)...	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total E =0
----	-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

TOTAL (A+B+C-D+E) =34

G18

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT – PART II

Preliminary Selection: Tree Health & Tree Safety

A	(SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years?	YES	NO	NB: Do not TPO trees if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Useful Life Expectancy is less than 10 years. • It is not economic to retain the tree in a safe condition.
B	Good biological health for age	YES	NO	
	If NO, can the problem be treated economically (see notes opposite)	YES	NO	
C	The tree(s) appears to be structurally sound at the time of inspection.	YES	NO	Economic assessment: evaluate the amenity value of the tree against the cost of re-planting. See overleaf for checklist for Tree Hazard Assessment.
	If NO, can the tree be made safe using recognised arboricultural methods?	YES	NO	
	If YES, will it be economical to restore and maintain this tree in a safe condition?	YES	NO	
	If NO, Is replacement planting desirable in this location	YES	NO	

Amenity Assessment: Consider as individual tree, group OR woodland.

D	TPO Type	INDIVIDUAL	GROUP	AREA	WOODLAND
---	----------	------------	-------	------	----------

Visibility & Visual Impact		Yes/High	Rating (circle a number)					No/Low	Notes
1	Extent of visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0		
2	Frequency of viewing	5	4	3	2	1	0		
3	Importance to the viewers	5	4	3	2	1	0		
4	Extent of 'Restricted' public visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0		
5	Aesthetic merits close by	5	4	3	2	1	0		
6	Aesthetic merits at a distance	5	4	3	2	1	0		
7	Importance to landscape/treescape	5	4	3	2	1	0		Sub total A =28

Size, Form & Future Potential

8	Size: is or will become appropriate to the site	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total B 13
9	Form: allowing for species (inc. 'interesting')	5	4	3	2	1	0	
10	Future amenity potential	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Special Factors

11	Habitat value	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total C 12
12	Rarity of species	5	4	3	2	1	0	
13	Tree is characteristic of this area	5	4	3	2	1	0	
14	S.S.S.I. or other designated area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
15	Historical significance	5	4	3	2	1	0	
16	Contribution to local air quality	5	4	3	2	1	0	
17	Shading value	5	4	3	2	1	0	
18	Screening value	5	4	3	2	1	0	

19	Contribution to character of Conservation Area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
----	--	---	---	---	---	---	-----	--

Potential to Impact Other Features

20	Highway	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total D=-2
21	Services	5	4	3	2	1	0	
22	Walls	5	4	3	2	1	0	
23	Buildings	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Other Factors

24	Other Factors (describe)...	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total E =51
----	-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------------

TOTAL (A+B+C-D+E) =41

T49

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT – PART II

Preliminary Selection: Tree Health & Tree Safety

A	(SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years?	YES	NO	NB: Do not TPO trees if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Useful Life Expectancy is less than 10 years. • It is not economic to retain the tree in a safe condition.
B	Good biological health for age	YES	NO	
	If NO, can the problem be treated economically (see notes opposite)	YES	NO	
C	The tree(s) appears to be structurally sound at the time of inspection.	YES	NO	Economic assessment: evaluate the amenity value of the tree against the cost of re-planting. See overleaf for checklist for Tree Hazard Assessment.
	If NO, can the tree be made safe using recognised arboricultural methods?	YES	NO	
	If YES, will it be economical to restore and maintain this tree in a safe condition?	YES	NO	
	If NO, Is replacement planting desirable in this location	YES	NO	

Amenity Assessment: Consider as individual tree, group OR woodland.

D	TPO Type	INDIVIDUAL	GROUP	AREA	WOODLAND
---	----------	------------	-------	------	----------

Visibility & Visual Impact		Yes/High	Rating (circle a number)					No/Low	Notes
1	Extent of visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total A =14	
2	Frequency of viewing	5	4	3	2	1	0		
3	Importance to the viewers	5	4	3	2	1	0		
4	Extent of 'Restricted' public visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0		
5	Aesthetic merits close by	5	4	3	2	1	0		
6	Aesthetic merits at a distance	5	4	3	2	1	0		
7	Importance to landscape/treescape	5	4	3	2	1	0		

Size, Form & Future Potential

8	Size: is or will become appropriate to the site	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total B =8
9	Form: allowing for species (inc. 'interesting')	5	4	3	2	1	0	
10	Future amenity potential	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Special Factors

11	Habitat value	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total C =5
12	Rarity of species	5	4	3	2	1	0	
13	Tree is characteristic of this area	5	4	3	2	1	0	
14	S.S.S.I. or other designated area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
15	Historical significance	5	4	3	2	1	0	
16	Contribution to local air quality	5	4	3	2	1	0	
17	Shading value	5	4	3	2	1	0	
18	Screening value	5	4	3	2	1	0	

19	Contribution to character of Conservation Area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
----	--	---	---	---	---	---	-----	--

Potential to Impact Other Features

20	Highway	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total D=0
21	Services	5	4	3	2	1	0	
22	Walls	5	4	3	2	1	0	
23	Buildings	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Other Factors

24	Other Factors (describe)...	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total E =0
----	-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

TOTAL (A+B+C-D+E) =27

T59

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT – PART II

Preliminary Selection: Tree Health & Tree Safety

A	(SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years?	YES	NO	NB: Do not TPO trees if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Useful Life Expectancy is less than 10 years. • It is not economic to retain the tree in a safe condition.
B	Good biological health for age	YES	NO	
	If NO, can the problem be treated economically (see notes opposite)	YES	NO	
C	The tree(s) appears to be structurally sound at the time of inspection.	YES	NO	Economic assessment: evaluate the amenity value of the tree against the cost of re-planting. See overleaf for checklist for Tree Hazard Assessment.
	If NO, can the tree be made safe using recognised arboricultural methods?	YES	NO	
	If YES, will it be economical to restore and maintain this tree in a safe condition?	YES	NO	
	If NO, Is replacement planting desirable in this location	YES	NO	

Amenity Assessment: Consider as individual tree, group OR woodland.

D	TPO Type	INDIVIDUAL	GROUP	AREA	WOODLAND
---	----------	------------	-------	------	----------

Visibility & Visual Impact		Yes/High	Rating (circle a number)					No/Low	Notes
1	Extent of visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0		
2	Frequency of viewing	5	4	3	2	1	0		
3	Importance to the viewers	5	4	3	2	1	0		
4	Extent of 'Restricted' public visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0		
5	Aesthetic merits close by	5	4	3	2	1	0		
6	Aesthetic merits at a distance	5	4	3	2	1	0		
7	Importance to landscape/treescape	5	4	3	2	1	0		Sub total A =17

Size, Form & Future Potential

8	Size: is or will become appropriate to the site	5	4	3	2	1	0	
9	Form: allowing for species (inc. 'interesting')	5	4	3	2	1	0	
10	Future amenity potential	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Special Factors

11	Habitat value	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total C =8
12	Rarity of species	5	4	3	2	1	0	
13	Tree is characteristic of this area	5	4	3	2	1	0	
14	S.S.S.I. or other designated area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
15	Historical significance	5	4	3	2	1	0	
16	Contribution to local air quality	5	4	3	2	1	0	
17	Shading value	5	4	3	2	1	0	
18	Screening value	5	4	3	2	1	0	

19	Contribution to character of Conservation Area	5	4	3	2	1	n/a	
----	--	---	---	---	---	---	-----	--

Potential to Impact Other Features

20	Highway	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total D=0
21	Services	5	4	3	2	1	0	
22	Walls	5	4	3	2	1	0	
23	Buildings	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Other Factors

24	Other Factors (describe)...	5	4	3	2	1	0	Sub total E =
----	-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------

TOTAL (A+B+C-D+E) =34

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT – GUIDANCE NOTES

Guidance on the meaning of the questions used on the assessment sheet

Visibility & Visual Impact	
1	<p>Extent of visibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the tree(s) is clearly visible to the public • A tree that scored 5 on this scale would be clearly visible <u>and not</u> 'crowded' in by other features/structures • The tree does not need to be wholly or partially visible from <u>all</u> sides
2	<p>Frequency of viewing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of people likely to see the tree and how often they are likely to see the tree. • Score for the average number of people viewing the tree through a typical week. • E.g. Score 5 in a busy shopping centre • If seen from a road, score for average number of cars passing per hour (>??=5, x-y=4, etc
3	<p>Importance to the viewers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what degree are viewers likely to be conscious of the trees presence? • E.g. People in a busy shopping area may be less aware of trees around them than people in a residential area. • E.g. Trees are more likely to be 'noticed' in a parkland
4	<p>Extent of 'Restricted' public visibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refers to visibility from properties not generally considered public spaces but from which the public may view the tree. • This would include residential buildings, offices and factories. • Does not include places such as hotels and public houses where it can be argued that the generally uninhibited coming and going of members of the public makes them 'public spaces'. • E.g. Score 5 if visible by more than 20 residential properties
5	<p>Aesthetic merits close by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May include, but is not limited to, exceptional specimens. For example, those with an unusual or striking form. • 'Close by' means near enough to be able to readily distinguish individual leaves or leaflets. • The merits may be seasonal rather than perennial – e.g. distinctive foliage on deciduous species • The phrase 'Aesthetic' includes the concept of <i>pleasantness</i> or <i>pleasing</i> that is implied by the term 'amenity'
6	<p>Aesthetic merits at a distance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As No.4 above but from a distance where the overall shape of the tree is dominant and the individual leaves or shoots tend to merge
7	<p>Importance to landscape/treescape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the tree was removed, would this be to the detriment of the visual amenity of associated/nearby trees or to the wider environment in general • E.g. Score 5 if the removal of the tree(s) would significantly alter the existing landscape/treescape
Size, Form & Future Potential	
8	<p>Size: is or will become appropriate to the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relates to expected mature size of species but does not exclude trees that can be reasonably managed (by means of arboricultural practices) to maintain a suitable tree size • Does not include spreading of woodland beyond existing boundaries • Current or future individual tree, group or woodland size is a positive feature given its location • E.g. Score 5 for a large, fully mature Oak tree on a village green where the tree does not impinge on highways or buildings

9	<p>Form: allowing for species (inc. 'interesting')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes specimen trees and trees whose shape is untypical for the species but still of aesthetic value. • May be affected by context. E.g. natural differences between woodland and open grown trees of the same species • E.g. Score 5 for a 'Classic' English Oak with large spreading crown
10	<p>Future amenity potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree is expected to give added amenity value in the future • DO NOT include size (covered in 8 above) • E.g. The tree may have been poorly pruned but be able to recover a good form in the future

Special Factors			
11	<p>Habitat value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the tree provide an important wildlife habitat? • Trees will score more highly for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A wide diversity/variety of habitats Providing habitats that potentially support rare or endangered species Providing habitats that are rare in the area 		
12	<p>Rarity of species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species is rare or endangered generally or within the local area 		
13	<p>Tree is characteristic of this area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees that make an important contribution to the landscape by virtue of the species being strongly associated with the particular landscape. E.g Beech trees on the Chilterns or Scots Pine in Scotland. 		
14	<p>S.S.S.I. or other designated area Is the area designated according to criteria that acknowledge its natural value? E.g.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Area of Conservation • S.S.S.I • AONB • County Wildlife Site • District Wildlife Site </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regionally Important Geological site • National Nature Reserve • Local nature Reserve • Independent Nature Reserve </td> </tr> </table>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Area of Conservation • S.S.S.I • AONB • County Wildlife Site • District Wildlife Site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regionally Important Geological site • National Nature Reserve • Local nature Reserve • Independent Nature Reserve
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Area of Conservation • S.S.S.I • AONB • County Wildlife Site • District Wildlife Site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regionally Important Geological site • National Nature Reserve • Local nature Reserve • Independent Nature Reserve 		
15	<p>Historical significance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree has some connection with humans in the past • Includes other notable features such as 'Tallest Tree' in County', etc. • E.g. Score 5 for Oldest known tree in county or, site of a good hanging by rampaging lynch mob! 		
16	<p>Contribution to local air quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment depends upon location and current/future potential. To score on this scale, the area will be subject to local pollution or poor air quality, e.g. from traffic density, and the tree is or will be of sufficient size to contribute to the air quality 		
17	<p>Shading value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shading must be positive rather than oppressive. • E.g. Score 5 if tree provides summer shading from strong sunlight in a school playground 		
18	<p>Screening value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers both the trees and the object being screened • Tree(s) acts as an effective screen either permanently or when in leaf • The area being screened would significantly detract from the amenity quality of the area were it to be visible as a consequence of the tree(s) being removed 		
19	<p>Contribution to character of Conservation Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree may be outside the Conservation area but still contributing to the character of the area 		

Potential to Impact Other Features		
20	Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subtract sum of these score from total to reflect 'negative' consequences of potential impact of tree on other features • Refer to NHBC Chapter 4.2. guidelines • E.g. Score 5 if tree is already likely casue of subsidence affecting nearby brick or concrete structure (i.e. not the garden shed)
21	Services	
22	Walls	
23	Buildings	
Other Factors		
24	Other Factors (describe)...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When scoring Other Factors, ensure description is worded so that a higher score means the factor makes the tree more valuable as an amenity.

'Tree' refers individual and/or groups of trees.

'People', refers to the general public unless otherwise stated.

APPENDIX D

PLAN SHOWING PREVIOUSLY APPROVED DEVELOPMENT