TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT - PART I

Species of Tree(s): Birren, Popular, Limb, CHERRY, MARLE - 420UP	Inspected By:	Date of Inspection:
Site Address: DIDCOT GIRLS SCHOOL	Children Halle	Tree on Property:
Parish DIOLAT	(95 of-	(09)

Describe the reasons for serving a TPO on this tree, group or woodland of trees in terms that justify the serving of a TPO. (i.e. similar to wording for Schedule 1.)

AS for 92+94

Tree Hazard Assessment Checklist

	Significant	Present	None Seen	Notes
Abrupt bends in branches		To a Maria		
Brittle decay				
Bottle-butt				
Excessive sinking down of branches				
End loading due to poor pruning			SEE OF	
Exposure of previously sheltered tree			S and the real	Annual transfer
Forks with included bark/Compressed Fork			37000	INDIVIDUAL TREE
Graft incompatibility			E135	Assessment
Fibre buckling				Dec 1000
Root instability				
Neglected Pollard				Van Line
Poor crown condition				
Ribs and open cracks in stems or major branches				
Target cankers				100
Wounds & Cavities	No.			
Decay fungi present			rate les	
Other			September 1	

Risk to Tree(s)

Under good, active arboricultural or silvicultural management	YES	NO	sement/1.781
This tree is at risk from development, change of property ownership, pruning or felling.	YES	NO	

Other Comments:

If the tree cannot be safely retained, give reasons:

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT - PART II

Preliminary Selection: Tree Health & Tree Safety

Α	(SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years?	(YES)	NO	NB: Do not TPO trees if:
	Good biological health for age	(YES)	NO	Safe Useful Life Expectancy is less than 10
В	If NO, can the problem be treated economically (see notes opposite)	YES	NO	It is not economic to retain the tree in a safe condition.
	The tree(s) appears to be structurally safe	YES	NO	Condition.
	If NO, can the tree be made safe using recognised arboricultural methods?	YES	NO	Economic assessment: evaluate the amenity value of the tree against the cost of re-planting.
С	If YES, will it be economical to restore and maintain this tree in a safe condition?	(YES)	NO	See overleaf for checklist for Tree Hazard Assessment.
	If NO, Is replacement planting desirable in this location	NO	NO	Assessment.

D	TPO Type	INDIV	DUAL	GROUP	AREA	WOO	DLAND		
Visi	bility & Visual Impact Yes/	ligh	R	ating (circ	le a num	ber)	No/L	.ow	Notes
1	Extent of visibility	5	4	3	2	1	0		ALL CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF
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 = 23
Size	e, Form & Future Potential						14 18	-	dy e. ee in
В	Size: is or will become appropriate to the site	5	4	3	2	1	0		Jahren I
9	Form: allowing for species (inc.'interesting')	5	4	(3)	2	1	0		
10	Future amenity potential	5	4	3	2	1	0		Sub total B = 9
Spe	cial Factors								MIGNE WINDS
11	Habitat value	5	4	3	2	1	0		
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)		Sub total C = \2
Pote	ential to Impact Other Features								4
20	Highway	5	4	3	2	1	0	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		Sub total D= - 7
Oth	er Factors		40						And to March News
24	Other Factors (describe)	5	4	3	2	1	0		Sub total E =

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT - PART I

Species of Tree(s):	Inspected	Date of
Birch Groves x2.	By:	Inspection: 24/03/11
Site Address: DIVCOT GIALS & CHOSE	MONTHEN	Tree on Property:
Parish Olocot	(92+54	of TPO).

Describe the reasons for serving a TPO on this tree, group or woodland of trees in terms that justify the serving of a TPO. (i.e. similar to wording for Schedule 1.)

DISREGARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ARBORIUMTURAL ADVICE PROVIDED BY OCC. THE EELLINE OF SIGN FIRMS AMENITY TREES + PROPOSED FELLING OF ALL THE TREES ON THE WORTERN POUNDARY WITH CHUNCHILL NO.

Tree Hazard Assessment Checklist

	Significant	Present	None Seen	Notes
Abrupt bends in branches	2	N PEI		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
Brittle decay		26.1		
Bottle-butt				The state of the s
Excessive sinking down of branches				The second of the second
End loading due to poor pruning			ols ad to	
Exposure of previously sheltered tree			The same of the sa	/
Forks with included bark/Compressed Fork				
Graft incompatibility	Y Ses	7 3 5		ASSESSMENT
Fibre buckling				IMPLEMENTED EL
Root instability				oce
Neglected Pollard				\
Poor crown condition				A STATE OF THE STA
Ribs and open cracks in stems or major branches				
Target cankers				
Wounds & Cavities				
Decay fungi present				
Other				/

Risk to Tree(s)

Under good, active arboricultural or silvicultural management	YES	NO	
This tree is at risk from development, change of property ownership, pruning or felling.	YES	NO	74V - 63

Other Comments:

If the tree cannot be safely retained, give reasons:

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT - PART II

A	eliminary Selection: Tree Health & Tree (SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years?	(YES)		NO	N	B: Do not	t TPO trees	if:		
-	Good biological health for age	(YES)		NO	-			xpectancy is less than 10		
В	If NO, can the problem be treated economically (see notes opposite)	YES		NO		years. It is not economic to retain the tree in a s				
	The tree(s) appears to be structurally safe	(YES)	+	(NO)		condit	ion.			
	If NO, can the tree be made safe using recognised arboricultural methods?	YES		NO	Economic assessment: evaluate the amen of the tree against the cost of re-planting.					
С	If YES, will it be economical to restore and maintain this tree in a safe condition?	(YES)		NO	See overleaf for check Assessment.		1991	klist for Tree Hazard		
	If NO, Is replacement planting desirable in this location	NO	September 1	NO		0000011101				
Am	enity Assessment: Consider as individual to	ree, group	OR w	oodland	d.					
D	ТРО Туре	INDIVIDU	-	GROUP	100	woo	DLAND			
Visi	bility & Visual Impact Yes/H	ligh	Ra	ting (circ	le a nu	mber)	No/L	ow 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 = \		
Size	, Form & Future Potential			- Control						
8	Size: is or will become appropriate to the site	5	4	3	(2)	1	0	The second second second		
9	Form: allowing for species (inc. 'interesting')	5	(4)	3	2	1	0			
10	Future amenity potential	5	4	3	(2)	1	0	Sub total B = 3		
Spe	cial Factors		-					0.00		
11	Habitat value	5	4	3	2	1	0			
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)	Sub total C = \\		
Pote	ential to Impact Other Features	****								
20	Highway	5	4	3	2	1	(0)	and the state of t		
21	Services	5	4	3	2	1	0			
22	Walls	5	4	3	2	1	0			

5

3

2

1 0

Buildings

Other Factors (describe)...

Other Factors

23

24

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

Sub total D= -4

Sub total E =