TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT - PART I

Species of Tree(s): Mixed Bitch x 2 Alder x 1 Magnohi x 1 Sycamore x 2 Hornbeam x 1	Inspected By: MD9	Date of Inspection:	
Site Address: 2 Winterbrook Wallingford OXIO 9EA.	Spread across east / North Sections of garden.		

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.)

. Thees at risk of removed due to proposed development. PIO/W1589

Tree Hazard Assessment Checklist

	Significant	Present	None Seen	Notes
Abrupt bends in branches				
Brittle decay				
Bottle-butt				
Excessive sinking down of branches			-	
End loading due to poor pruning			<i></i>	
Exposure of previously sheltered tree			~	
Forks with included bark/Compressed Fork		~	No.	
Graft incompatibility				
Fibre buckling				, B (a) (b)
Root instability			v	
Neglected Pollard			~	
Poor crown condition			_	
Ribs and open cracks in stems or major branches			~	
Target cankers			~	
Wounds & Cavities			-	
Decay fungi present			4	
Other	1 1			

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	

Other Comments:

If the tree cannot be safely retained, give reasons:

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER ASSESSMENT - PART II

NO

NB: Do not TPO trees if:

Preliminary Selection: Tree Health & Tree Safety

A (SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years? (YES

A	(SULE) Life expectancy is more than 10 years?	(YES)	'	NO	NB	: Do not	IPO trees	S IT.		
	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		years. It is not economic to retain the tree in a safe condition.				
	The tree(s) appears to be structurally sound at	(YES)		NO	1	Corrain	OII.			
С	the time of inspection. If NO, can the tree be made safe using	YES		NO	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Economic assessment of the tree against the		nt: evaluate the amenity value e cost of re-planting.		
	recognised arboricultural methods? If YES, will it be economical to restore and	YES	NO	1		verleaf for checklist for Tree Hazard				
	maintain this tree in a safe condition? If NO, Is replacement planting desirable in this location	TES NO								
Am	enity Assessment: Consider as individual to	ree, group	OR w	roodlan	d.					
D	TPO Type Both	INDIVIDU	JAL	GROUP	AREA	WOO	DLAND			
Visi	bility & Visual Impact Yes/I	ligh	Ra	ating (circ	le a nun	nber)	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= 23	
Size	e, Form & Future Potential	,					10.5			
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	Sub total	B = []	
Spe	cial Factors									
11	Habitat value	5	4	3	(2)	1	0	1000		
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	MON3		
15	Historical significance	5	4	3	2	1	0			
16	Contribution to local air quality	5	4	3	2	1	0	- West to mai	n Rd	
17	Shading value	5	4	3	2	1	0	7.9.		
18	Screening value	5	4	(3)	2	1	0	100		
19	Contribution to character of Conservation Area	5	4	3	2	1	(n/a)	Sub total	c=16	
Pot	ential to Impact Other Features									
20	Highway	5	4	3	2	1	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	Sub total	D= - \	
	er Factors									
24	Other Factors (describe)	5	4	3	2	1	0			
								Cub total	E = 44	