Arboricultural Assessment Report

LAND AT ST. MARY'S C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL, TIMSBURY



On behalf of

Bath & north East Somerset Council

prepared by

Alister Rankine BSc. (Forestry); Tech. Cert. (Arbor. A.) *Arboricultural Consultant*

October 2014

CONTENTS

- **1.0 INTRODUCTION / SCOPE**
- 2.0 TREE ASSESSMENT OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS
- APPENDIX A ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT TREE SCHEDULE
- APPENDIX B TPO ASSESSMENT

Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School, Timsbury

1. INSTRUCTIONS/SCOPE

- 1.1 This report has been produced on behalf of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
- 1.2 The purpose of the report is to:
 - Assess tree currently growing on land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School, Timsbury (NGR Ref: ST 672 589) in order to assess their merit with regard to visual amenity and qualification for consideration of a Tree Preservation Order
 - Assess potential arboricultural constraints in relation to any future development in the field adjacent to the eastern boundary of the school grounds.
- 1.3 This is a preliminary report based on ground level inspections of the trees by a person experienced in arboriculture.
- 1.4 The trees were inspected on 27th October 2014. The weather conditions were dry, breezy and overcast

Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School, Timsbury

2. TREE ASSESSMENT OBSERVATIONS and CONCLUSIONS

- The tree inspected were classified into 14 No. individual trees and 3 No. groups of trees ((see Appendix A Tree Schedule)
- The trees are located on the eastern boundary of land at St Mary's C of E Primary School
- The trees form a robust linear feature on the boundary of the school and can easily be seen from the adjacent field that has a public footpath running from the south-west corner of the field at its entrance off North Road.
- The trees are currently not under any known threat.
- Should the adjacent field to the east be developed proximity of an inappropriate layout design could impact on the welfare of the trees.
- Several of the trees have potential to grow considerably larger and thereby increasing rooting zones and shading.
- A buffer of at least 15m from the trees should be observed to prevent physical impact and pressure for unacceptable works to be carried out on the tree that would compromise their collective visual and landscape amenity.
- Whilst it may not be immediately expedient to make a Tree Preservation Order a Wessex Tree Officers' Group TPO Assessment has been undertaken on all the individual trees and groups of trees. They all attain the threshold to be considered for a Tree Preservation Order (see Appendix B).

APPENDIX A - TREE SCHEDULE

TPO Assessment Tree ScheduleLand at St Mary's C of E Primary School, Timsbury**Client:**B&NES

Surveyors:

Alister Rankine

Date of Survey:

27th October 2014

Tree Number	Species	Height (m)	Calculated Stem Diameter (mm)	Number of Stems	Root Protection Area (Radius, m)	E - Radius (m)	Age Class	Physiological Condition	ULE (Years)	Tree Structural Condition and Site Notes. Long-Term Recommendations	
T1	Hornbeam	11	500	1	6.00	6	М	G	40+	Good	B1
T2	Ash	10	380	1	4.56	4	М	F	40+	Fair	C1
Т3	Oak	9	350	1	4.20	3	М	F	20-40	Fair	C1
T4	Silver Birch	11	500	1	6.00	3	Μ	G	20-40	Good	B1
T5	Lime	8	320	1	3.84	2	М	F	40+	Fair	C1
T6	Silver Birch	11	380	1	4.56	3	М	G	20-40	Good	B1
T7	Beech	10	350	1	4.20	4	Μ	F	20-40	Fair	C1
T8	Ash	11	400	1	4.80	4	Μ	G	40+	Good	C1
Т9	Sycamore	8	200	1	2.40	2	М	Ρ	10-20	Fair	C1
T10	Ash	10	290	1	3.48	3	М	G	40+	Good	B1
T11	Beech	10	439	2	5.26	4	М	F	20-40	Fair	C2
T12	Beech	10	300	1	3.60	3	М	F	20-40	Fair	C2
T13	Beech	9	200	1	2.40	3	М	Ρ	10-20	Fair	C2
T14	Scots Pine	15	480	1	5.76	5	М	G	40+	Good	B1

Tree Number	Species	Height (m)	Calculated Stem Diameter (mm)	Number of Stems	Root Protection Area (Radius, m)	E - Radius (m)	Age Class	Physiological Condition	ULE (Years)	Tree Structural Condition and Site Notes. Long-Term Recommendations	BS Category
G1	Holly	9	180	1	2.16	3	М	G	40+	Good	B2
G2	Beech	15	500	1	6.00	5	М	G	20-40	Fair	B2
G3	Beech	12	350	1	4.20	4	М	F	20-40	Fair	C2

APPENDIX B - TPO ASSESSMENT

LAND AT ST. MARY'S C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL TO THE NORTH OF NORTH ROAD, TIMSBURY

TPO ASSESSMENT



LAND AT ST. MARY'S C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL TO THE NORTH OF NORTH ROAD, TIMSBURY

TPO ASSESSMENT



Site address and pa	Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary						
Tree species: Hornb	Tree species: Hornbeam						
Map ref:	T1	SCORE: 60					
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014					

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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	
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
3.1	Health Considerations Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 21	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 2 1	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	321	
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	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
					_	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 2 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 2 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.14	Future maintenance	Low	Average	High	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size, g	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al Interest Factors					
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	321	
5.2	Species rarity for the local soil	Rare	Moderate	Common	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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 (46 or 51 required)	·	·	·	60	

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAlistedTreesCurrentProjectsB&NESTimsburyTPOAssessmentT1-TPOAssessment_Form.rtf$

Site address and pa	arish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Prima	ry School to the north of North Road, Timsbury					
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary						
Tree species: Ash	Tree species: Ash						
Map ref:	T2	SCORE: 53					
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014					

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I Amenity					
1.1	Seen by the general public	Easily	Sometimes	No	3 2 1	
1.2	Presence of other 'local' trees	< 4	< 10	> 10	32 <mark>1</mark>	
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
3.1	Health Considerations Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	321	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive	3 2 1	
3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak	3 <mark>2</mark> 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	Average	Poor	3 2 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
3.10	Tree species/size	Large	Average	Small	321	
	comparison	-			_	
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	321	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al 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	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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 (46 or 51				53	
	a a ra\ A liata r\ Da au ra a rata\ I li					

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAllisterTreesCurrent ProjectsB&NESTimsbury TPO AssessmentT2 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf$

Site address and pa	arish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Prima	ry School to the north of North Road, Timsbury					
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary						
Tree species: Oak	Tree species: Oak						
Map ref:	Т3	SCORE: 49					
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014					

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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>	
	I 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	lth, vigour, cha I	aracter and inte	rdepende I	nce of all the relevant trees
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 2 1	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive	3 21	
3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak	321	
3.6	Main branch structure	Good	Average	Poor	321	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 2 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
3.10	Tree species/size	Large	Average	Small	321	
	comparison	-			_	
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	
	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	321	
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al 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	321	
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 (46 or 51	1		1	49	
0.11						

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAllisterTreesCurrent ProjectsB&NESTimsbury TPO AssessmentT3 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf$

Site address and pa	Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary						
Tree species:Silver	Tree species:Silver Birch						
Map ref:	Τ4	SCORE: 54					
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014					

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I Amenity					
1.1	Seen by the general public	Easily	Sometimes	No	3 2 1	
1.2	Presence of other 'local' trees	< 4	< 10	> 10	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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	
	I 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	lth, vigour, cha I	aracter and inte	rdepende I	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 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	321	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 2 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
3.10	Tree species/size	Large	Average	Small	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	comparison	-			_	
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	
	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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al 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 (46 or 51	1		1	54	
0.11						

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAllisterTreesCurrent ProjectsB&NESTIMSbury TPO AssessmentT4 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf$

Site address and pa	Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary						
Tree species: Comr	Tree species: Common Lime						
Map ref:	Τ5	SCORE: 50					
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014					

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.4 Cavities Good Average Weak 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 1 3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 1 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average High 3 1 1 3.14 Future maintenance Low Average <		Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes	
1.2 Presence of other 'local' rees < 4								
rees rees rees rees 13 Visual impact close by High Average Low 3 1 14 Visual impact at a distance High Average Low 3 2 1 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group quality at a distance Gord Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality at a distance Gord Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 3.4 Garup functions by Great Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stars structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6								
1.4 Visual impact at a distance High Average Low 3 2 Visual impact as a group 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality dista a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 8 2 1 1 3.6 Main stem structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 1 <td></td> <td>trees</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>> 10</td> <td>_</td> <td></td>		trees			> 10	_		
Visual Impact as a group Cool Moderate Poor 3 2 1 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.2 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 3.4 Group duality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations Tree Health Considerations 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.			•	Average				
2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 2.2 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact tat a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 3.4 Group impact tase by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations Cood Moderate Poor 3 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 1 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 1 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 1 1 3.6 Main branch struct		•	High	Average	Low	321		
2.2 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Somali 3 2 1 3.10 Tree specice/size Large <								
2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group uality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations 0 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Small 3 2 1 1 3.1 Maturity SW/Mat F Mature O Mature								
2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Image: Considerations Image: Considerations Image: Considerations 3.1 Visual health at alisance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 Image: Considerations 3.2 Visual health at alisance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 Image: Considerations 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Weak 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Small 3 2 1 3.1 Tree species/size Large Average Imaptropriate 3 2 1 3.1 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3								
Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations Image: Constraint of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Nore Kareage Small 3 2 1 3.10 Tree species/size Large Average Inappropriate 3 2 <th1< th=""> 3.11</th1<>								
Tree Health Considerations Image: Constraint of the set of the s								
3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Good Average Weak 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 1 3.9 Fulgi present None Minor Extensive 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.13 Life expectancry >40 year			count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha I	aracter and inte	rdepende I	nce of all the relevant trees	
3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Weak 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 1 3.10 Tree species/size Large Average Imapropriate 3 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 1 3.14 Future maintenance Low Average High 3 1	3.1		Good	Moderate	Poor	321		
3.3Main stem structureGoodModeratePoor313.4CavitiesNoneSomeExtensive213.5ForksGoodAverageWeak313.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor313.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor313.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor313.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3113.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate313.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor			
3.4CavitiesNoneSomeExtensive213.5ForksGoodAverageWeak3213.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3213.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3213.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3213.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor			
3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 2 1 3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years < 40 years	3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive			
3.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 2 13.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 10 years	3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak			
3.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor313.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor313.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.6	Main branch structure	Good	-	Poor			
3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 2 1 3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 2 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years < 40 years	3.7	Extension growth	Good	•	Poor			
3.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 23.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2 113.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.8	-	Good	•	Poor	_		
3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 2 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years < 40 years				•	Extensive			
comparisonCCC3.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years		-						
3.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years		comparison	-			_		
3.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years< 10 years3213.14Future maintenanceLowAverageHigh3213.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow321Impact considerationsImpactHighAverageLow3214.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m		-		F Mature				
3.14Future maintenanceLowAverageHigh3 2 13.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow3 2 1Impact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m		-		°,				
3.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow321Impact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m		Life expectancy	> 40 years	,	-			
Impact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	3.14	Future maintenance	Low	Average	High	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12mHigh <6m3 2 14.2On the servicesLow >12mMod <12m	3.15	Future visual impact	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
4.2On the servicesLow >12mMod <12mHigh <5m3 2 14.3On a wallLow >12mMod <12m								
4.3On a wallLow >12mMod <12mHigh <5m3 2 14.4On a buildingLow >30mMod <30m					-			
4.4On a buildingLow >30mMod <30mHigh <6m3 2 1The harmony of the tree and its surroundings (size, growth rate, shade and past ground works) at the time of inspection may add or deduct .5 of a pointSpecial Interest FactorsImage: Colspan="4">Image: Colspan="4"Solspan= Solspan="4">Image: Colspan="4"Colspan= Colspan="4"Solspan= Solspan="4" <td colspa<="" td=""><td>4.2</td><td>On the services</td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td></td>	<td>4.2</td> <td>On the services</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>	4.2	On the services			-		
The harmony of the tree and its surroundings (size, growth rate, shade and past ground works) at the time of inspection may add or deduct .5 of a pointSpecial Interest FactorsImage: Common state of the species5.1Rarity of the speciesRare5.2Species rarity for the local soilRare5.3SSSI> OneOne5.4Historic interestGreat5.5Other factors> One5.6Other factors> One5.7OneOne5.8State of the species5.9Other factors5.9Other factors5.9Other factors5.1One5.2Other factors5.3Other factors5.4Other factors5.5Other factors5.5Other factors5.5Other factors	4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	32 <mark>1</mark>		
Special Interest FactorsImage: Common and	4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321		
5.1Rarity of the speciesRareModerateCommon3 2 15.2Species rarity for the local soilRareModerateCommon3 2 15.3SSSI> OneOneNone3 2 15.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1			oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection	
5.2Species rarity for the local soilRareModerateCommon3 2 15.3SSSI> OneOneNone3 2 15.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1								
soilSoilOneNone3 2 15.3SSSI> OneNone3 2 15.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1	5.1							
5.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1	5.2	soil		Moderate		_		
5.5 Other factors > One One None 3 2 1	5.3	SSSI	> One	One	None	321		
	5.4	Historic interest	Great	Moderate	None	32 <mark>1</mark>		
6 Total Score (46 or 51 50	5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	32 <mark>1</mark>		
	6	Total Score (46 or 51				50		

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAlistedTreesCurrentProjectsB&NESTimsburyTPOAssessmentT5-TPOAssessmentForm.rtf$

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury					
Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Silve	Tree species: Silver Birch				
Map ref:	Τ6	SCORE: 51			
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014			

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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>	
	Il 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
3.1	Health Considerations Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	321	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive	3 2 1	
3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak	321	
3.6	Main branch structure	Good	Average	Poor	321	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	321	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	3 2 <mark>1</mark>	
3.10	Tree species/size	Large	Average	Small	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	comparison	-			_	
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	321	
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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al 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	321	
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 (46 or 51				51	
Cillears Alister Desuments I lilleide Tress Current Dreisets DRNES Timebury TDO Assessment TC						

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAllisterTeesCurrent ProjectsB&NESTIMSbury TPO AssessmentT6 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf$

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property: Western boundary						
Tree species: Beech	Tree species: Beech					
Map ref:	Τ7	SCORE: 51				
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014				

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes	
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>		
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>		
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, ch	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees	
Tree 3.1	Health Considerations Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
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	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	32 <mark>1</mark>		
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	321		
4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321		
4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321		
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321		
	armony of the tree and its surro	undings (size,	l growth rate, sł	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection	
	add or deduct .5 of a point ial Interest Factors						
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	321		
5.2	Species rarity for the local	Rare	Moderate	Common	321		
5.3	soil SSSI	> One	One	None	321		
5.4	Historic interest	Great	Moderate	None	321		
5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	321		
6					51		
	6 Total Score (46 or 51 51						

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAlistedTreesCurrentProjectsB&NESTimsburyTPOAssessmentT7 - TPOAssessmentForm.rtf$

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury				
Location in property: Western boundary				
Tree species: Ash				
Map ref:	Τ8	SCORE: 54		
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014		

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I Amenity					
1.1	Seen by the general public	Easily	Sometimes	No	3 2 1	
1.2	Presence of other 'local' trees	< 4	< 10	> 10	32 <mark>1</mark>	
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	Il 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	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	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	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive	3 2 1	
3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak	321	
3.6	Main branch structure	Good	Average	Poor	321	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	321	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	3 2 <mark>1</mark>	
3.10	Tree species/size	Large	Average	Small	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	comparison	-			_	
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	321	
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	32 <mark>1</mark>	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al 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	321	
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 (46 or 51	1		1	54	
Cill Jacres Alister Decumentes I lilleide Trees Current Dreisets DR NESS Timeburg TDO Accessment TO						

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAllisterTeesCurrent ProjectsB&NESTIMSbury TPO AssessmentT8 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf$

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury					
Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Syca	Tree species: Sycamore				
Map ref:	Т9	SCORE: 49			
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014			

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

3.4CavitiesNoneSomeExtensiveI-3.5ForksGoodAverageWeak313.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3213.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3213.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3213.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2113.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years3213.14Future maintenanceLowAverageLow3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years3213.14Future visual impactHighAverageLow3213.13If expectancyLow >12mMod <12mHigh <6m3213.14On the highwayLow >12mMod <12mHigh <6m3214.1On the servicesLow >12mMod <12mHigh <6m3214.3On a wallLow >30mMod <2mHigh <6m321 <td< th=""><th></th><th>Tree/Group</th><th>3</th><th>2</th><th>1</th><th>Score</th><th>Notes</th></td<>		Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes	
1.2 Presence of other "local" res < 4								
rees rees rees rees 13 Visual impact close by High Average Low 3 2 1 14 Visual impact at a distance High Average Low 3 2 1 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Gored Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality at a distance Gored Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees 7 Tree Health Cose to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Sood Average Weak 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Sood Average Poor 3 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1								
1.4 Visual impact at a distance High Average Low 3 2 Visual impact as a group 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality dista a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees 7 Tree Health Considerations Impact at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 Impact at a distance 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 Impact at a distance 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1 Impact at a distance 3.6 Main stem structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 Impact at a distance 3.7 Extension growth		trees			> 10	_		
Visual Impact as a group Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.2 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 3.4 Group impact at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>Average</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			•	Average				
2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 2.2 Group quality at distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact ta distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 3.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the heatth, vigour, character and interferement resentere of all the relevant trees Tree Heatth Considerations 60od Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health at adistance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Small 3 2 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive		•	High	Average	Low	32 <mark>1</mark>		
2.2 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Average Weak 3 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main present None Minor Extensive 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average S 1 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average <								
2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations 0 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Weak 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Small 3 2 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 2 1 3.10 Tree species/size Large Average								
2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations Image: Consid								
Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees Tree Health Considerations Image: Construct of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the relevant trees 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 1 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
Tree Health Considerations Image: Constraint of the set of the s								
3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Weak 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 1 3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Inappropriate 3 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years <10 years			count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha I	aracter and inte	rdepende I	nce of all the relevant trees	
3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Weak 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 1 3.10 Tree species/size Large Average Small 3 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 1 3.14 Future maintenance Low Average Low 3 <td></td> <td></td> <td>Good</td> <td>Moderate</td> <td>Poor</td> <td>3 <mark>2</mark> 1</td> <td></td>			Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
3.3Main stem structureGoodModeratePoor3 2 13.4CavitiesNoneSomeExtensive2 13.5ForksGoodAverageWeak3 2 13.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 2 13.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor			
3.4CavitiesNoneSomeExtensiveI213.5ForksGoodAverageWeak3113.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3213.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3213.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3213.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2113.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3113.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor			
3.5ForksGoodAverageWeak313.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3213.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3113.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3113.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall313.11MaturitySW/MatF MatureO Mature213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate313.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.4	Cavities	None	Some	Extensive			
3.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3 23.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3 213.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3 213.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2 113.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 10 years	3.5	Forks	Good	Average	Weak			
3.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor313.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor313.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature2213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	3.6	Main branch structure	Good	-	Poor			
3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 2 1 3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 2 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years < 40 years	3.7	Extension growth	Good	•	Poor			
3.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 23.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years		-		•		_		
3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SW/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 2 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years < 40 years				•				
comparisonCCOMatureQDMature3.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate313.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years		-						
3.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years		comparison	-			_		
3.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years< 10 years3213.14Future maintenanceLowAverageHigh3213.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow3211mpact considerationsImpactHighAverageLow3214.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	3.11	Maturity	SM/Mat	F Mature	O Mature			
3.14Future maintenanceLowAverageHigh3 2 13.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow3 2 1Impact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	3.12	Past management	Appropriate	°,				
3.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow3 2 1Impact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	3.13	Life expectancy	> 40 years	< 40 years	< 10 years			
Impact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	3.14	Future maintenance	Low	Average	High	3 <mark>2</mark> 1		
4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12mHigh <6m3 2 14.2On the servicesLow >12mMod <12m	3.15	Future visual impact	High	Average	Low	32 <mark>1</mark>		
4.2On the servicesLow >12mMod <12mHigh <5m3 2 14.3On a wallLow >12mMod <12m								
4.3On a wallLow >12mMod <12mHigh <5m3 2 14.4On a buildingLow >30mMod <30m	4.1				High <6m	32 <mark>1</mark>		
4.4On a buildingLow >30mMod <30mHigh <6m3 2 1The harmony of the tree and its surroundings (size, growth rate, shade and past ground works) at the time of inspection may add or deduct .5 of a pointSpecial Interest FactorsImage: Colspan="4">Image: Colspan="4"SolsSolsImage: Colspan="4"SolsSolsSols <td co<="" td=""><td>4.2</td><td>On the services</td><td>Low >12m</td><td>Mod <12m</td><td>•</td><td>32<mark>1</mark></td><td></td></td>	<td>4.2</td> <td>On the services</td> <td>Low >12m</td> <td>Mod <12m</td> <td>•</td> <td>32<mark>1</mark></td> <td></td>	4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	•	32 <mark>1</mark>	
The harmony of the tree and its surroundings (size, growth rate, shade and past ground works) at the time of inspection may add or deduct .5 of a pointSpecial Interest FactorsImage: Common state of the species5.1Rarity of the speciesRare5.2Species rarity for the local soilRare5.3SSSI> OneOne5.4Historic interestGreat5.5Other factors> One5.6Other factors> One5.7Other factors> One5.8State of the species5.9Other factors5.9State of the species5.1State of the species5.2State of the species5.3State of the species5.4State of the species5.5Other factors5.6Other factors5.7State of the species5.8State of the species5.9State of the species5.1State of the species5.2State of the species5.3State of the species5.4State of the species5.5State of the species5.5 <td< td=""><td>4.3</td><td>On a wall</td><td>Low >12m</td><td>Mod <12m</td><td>High <5m</td><td>32<mark>1</mark></td><td></td></td<>	4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	32 <mark>1</mark>		
may add or deduct .5 of a pointSpecial Interest FactorsImage: Colspan="6">Image: Colspan="6"	4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321		
5.1Rarity of the speciesRareModerateCommon3 2 15.2Species rarity for the local soilRareModerateCommon3 2 15.3SSSI> OneOneNone3 2 15.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1			oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection	
5.2Species rarity for the local soilRareModerateCommon3 2 15.3SSSI> OneOneNone3 2 15.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1								
soilSoilOneNone3 2 15.3SSSI> OneNone3 2 15.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1	-							
5.4Historic interestGreatModerateNone3 2 15.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1	5.2	soil		Moderate		_		
5.5 Other factors > One One None 3 2 1	5.3	SSSI	> One	One	None	321		
	5.4	Historic interest	Great	Moderate	None	32 <mark>1</mark>		
6 Total Score (46 or 51 49	5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	32 <mark>1</mark>		
	6	Total Score (46 or 51				49		

 $\label{eq:c:UsersAlisterDocumentsAlistedTreesCurrentProjectsB&NESTimsburyTPOAssessmentT9-TPOAssessment_Form.rtf$

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property: Western boundary						
Tree species: Ash	Tree species: Ash					
Map ref:	T10	SCORE: 51				
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014				

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes		
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>			
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees		
	Health Considerations	Cood	Madarata	Deer	2 2 4			
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
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	32 <mark>1</mark>			
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321			
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	321			
4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321			
4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321			
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321			
	armony of the tree and its surro	undings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection		
	al Interest Factors							
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	321			
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	321			
5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	321			
6	Total Score (46 or 51	l	I	L	51			

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\T10 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury					
Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Beec	Tree species: Beech				
Map ref:	T11	SCORE: 51			
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014			

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes		
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>			
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees		
	Health Considerations	Cood	Madarata	Deer	2.0.4			
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
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	32 <mark>1</mark>			
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1			
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321			
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 2 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	321			
4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321			
4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321			
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321			
	armony of the tree and its surro add or deduct .5 of a point	oundings (size,	growth rate, sł	hade and past g	Iround wo	rks) at the time of inspection		
Spec	al 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	321			
5.4	Historic interest	Great	Moderate	None	321			
5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	32 <mark>1</mark>			
6	Total Score (46 or 51	I	I	L	51			

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\T11 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Beecl	า					
Map ref:	T12	SCORE: 51				
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014				

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
	Health Considerations	Cood	Madarata	Deer	2.0.4	
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
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 2 1	
3.14	Future maintenance	Low	Average	High	3 2 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	321	
4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321	
4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321	
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321	
	armony of the tree and its surro add or deduct .5 of a point	oundings (size,	growth rate, sł	hade and past g	Iround wo	rks) at the time of inspection
Spec	al 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	321	
5.4	Historic interest	Great	Moderate	None	321	
5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	321	
6	Total Score (46 or 51	I	I	L	51	

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\T12 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury					
Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Beech	h				
Map ref:	T13	SCORE: 51			
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014			

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
	Health Considerations	Cood	Madarata	Deer	2 2 4	
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
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	321	
4.2	On the services	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321	
4.3	On a wall	Low >12m	Mod <12m	High <5m	321	
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	321	
	armony of the tree and its surro	undings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al Interest Factors					
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	321	
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	321	
5.5	Other factors	> One	One	None	321	
6	Total Score (46 or 51	I	I	L	51	

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\T13 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Scots	Tree species: Scots Pine					
Map ref:	T14	SCORE: 54				
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014				

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I 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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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	
	I 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	count of the hea	lth, vigour, ch	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
Tree 3.1	Health Considerations Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 2 1	
					-	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	321	
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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
3.10	Tree species/size comparison	Large	Average	Small	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.11	Maturity	SM/Mat	F Mature	O Mature	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	<mark>3</mark> 21	
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	321	
4.4	On a building	Low >30m	Mod <30m	High <6m	32 <mark>1</mark>	
	armony of the tree and its surro add or deduct .5 of a point	bundings (size,	growth rate, sl	hade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al Interest Factors					
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	321	
5.2	Species rarity for the local soil	Rare	Moderate	Common	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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 (46 or 51	1	1	1	54	

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\T14 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury					
Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Holly					
Map ref:	G1	SCORE: 57			
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014			

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I Amenity					
1.1	Seen by the general public	Easily	Sometimes	No	3 2 1	
1.2	Presence of other 'local' trees	< 4	< 10	> 10	32 <mark>1</mark>	
1.3	Visual impact close by	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
1.4	Visual impact at a distance	High	Average	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	I Impact as a group					
2.1	Group quality close by	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 21	
2.2	Group quality at a distance	Good	Moderate	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
2.3	Group impact at a distance	Great	Moderate	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
2.4	Group impact close by	Great	Moderate	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	o quality/impact should take acc Health Considerations	count of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	<mark>3</mark> 21	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	321	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
3.10	Tree species/size comparison	Large	Average	Small	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.11	Maturity	SM/Mat	F Mature	O Mature	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	<mark>3</mark> 21	
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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sh	nade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	add or deduct .5 of a point al Interest Factors					
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	321	
5.2	Species rarity for the local soil	Rare	Moderate	Common	32 <mark>1</mark>	
5.3	SSSI	> One	One	None	321	
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 (46 or 51 required	1	1		57	
	1					

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\G1 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Beec	h					
Map ref:	G2	SCORE: 56				
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014				

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

	Tree/Group	3	2	1	Score	Notes
	I Amenity					
1.1	Seen by the general public	Easily	Sometimes	No	3 2 1	
1.2	Presence of other 'local' trees	< 4	< 10	> 10	32 <mark>1</mark>	
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	
	I Impact as a group	Quad	Madavata	Deer		
2.1	Group quality close by	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
2.2	Group quality at a distance	Good	Moderate	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
2.3	Group impact at a distance	Great	Moderate	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
2.4	Group impact close by	Great	Moderate	Low	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
	o quality/impact should take acc Health Considerations	ount of the hea	lth, vigour, cha	aracter and inte	rdepende	nce of all the relevant trees
3.1	Visual health at a distance	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.2	Visual health close to	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.3	Main stem structure	Good	Moderate	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
3.7	Extension growth	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.8	Foliage condition	Good	Average	Poor	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.9	Fungi present	None	Minor	Extensive	321	
3.10	Tree species/size comparison	Large	Average	Small	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
3.11	Maturity	SM/Mat	F Mature	O Mature	3 <mark>2</mark> 1	
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	<mark>3</mark> 21	
	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	32 <mark>1</mark>	
	armony of the tree and its surro	oundings (size,	growth rate, sl	nade and past g	round wo	rks) at the time of inspection
	al Interest Factors					
5.1	Rarity of the species	Rare	Moderate	Common	321	
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 (46 or 51 required)	L	1		56	
	. /					•

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\G2 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf

Site address and parish: Land at St. Mary's C of E Primary School to the north of North Road, Timsbury						
Location in property	Location in property: Western boundary					
Tree species: Beec	h					
Map ref:	G3	SCORE: 56				
Inspected by:	Alister Rankine	Date: 27th October 2014				

- 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.
- 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.
- A score of 4 should be given in Section 2 when assessing a single tree.
- · If the tree scores less than 7 in Section 1, 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>46</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>51</u> points.

Visual Amenity c <thc> <thc< th=""> c <thc< th=""> <t< th=""><th>otes</th></t<></thc<></thc<></thc>	otes
1.2 Presence of other 'local' trees < 4	
trees	
1.4 Visual impact at a distance High Average Low 3 2 1 Visual impact as a group 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 2.2 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact should take account of the heath, vigour, character and interdependence of all the r Tree Health Considerations 3.1 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 <tr< td=""><td></td></tr<>	
Visual Impact as a group Impact as a group Impact as a group 2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 2.2 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 2.4 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the r Tree Health Considerations T T S 1 3.1 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condi	
2.1 Group quality close by Good Moderate Poor 3 1 2.2 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 1 2.4 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the r Tree Health Considerations	
2.2 Group quality at a distance Good Moderate Low 3 1 2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 1 2.4 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the r Tree Health Considerations 1 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 3 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Poor 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good<	
2.3 Group impact at a distance Great Moderate Low 3 1 2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the r Tree Health Considerations 3 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Weak 3 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.6 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.9 Fungi	
2.4 Group impact close by Great Moderate Low 3 2 1 Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the r Tree Health Considerations Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 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 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Small 3 2 1 3.10 Tree species/size Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 </td <td></td>	
Group quality/impact should take account of the health, vigour, character and interdependence of all the r Tree Health Considerations 0 3.1 Visual health at a distance Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 2 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Weak 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Tree species/size Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average </td <td></td>	
Tree Health ConsiderationsGoodModeratePoor3 2 13.1Visual health at a distanceGoodModeratePoor3 2 13.2Visual health close toGoodModeratePoor3 2 13.3Main stem structureGoodModeratePoor3 2 13.4CavitiesNoneSomeExtensive3 2 13.5ForksGoodAverageWeak3 2 13.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 2 13.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.2 Visual health close to Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 3.4 Cavities None Some Extensive 8 2 1 3.5 Forks Good Average Weak 3 2 1 3.6 Main branch structure Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.1 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 2 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years < 10 years	elevant trees
3.3 Main stem structure Good Moderate Poor 3 2 1 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 3 2 1 3.7 Extension growth Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.8 Foliage condition Good Average Poor 3 2 1 3.9 Fungi present None Minor Extensive 3 2 1 3.10 Tree species/size comparison Large Average Small 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.11 Maturity SM/Mat F Mature O Mature 3 2 1 3.12 Past management Appropriate Average Inappropriate 3 2 1 3.13 Life expectancy > 40 years < 40 years	
3.4CavitiesNoneSomeExtensive213.5ForksGoodAverageWeak3213.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3213.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3213.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3213.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3213.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.5ForksGoodAverageWeak3213.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3213.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3213.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3213.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.6Main branch structureGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 2 13.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.7Extension growthGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3 2 13.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 2 13.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.8Foliage conditionGoodAveragePoor3213.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3213.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3213.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3213.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3213.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.9Fungi presentNoneMinorExtensive3 2 13.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.10Tree species/size comparisonLargeAverageSmall3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
comparisonSM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.11MaturitySM/MatF MatureO Mature3 2 13.12Past managementAppropriateAverageInappropriate3 2 13.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years	
3.13Life expectancy> 40 years< 40 years< 10 years3213.14Future maintenanceLowAverageHigh3213.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow321Impact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerationsImpact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	
3.14Future maintenanceLowAverageHigh3 2 13.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow3 2 1Impact considerations4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	
3.15Future visual impactHighAverageLow321Impact considerationsImpact considerati	
Impact considerationsModModHigh<6m3 2 14.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12m	
4.1On the highwayLow >12mMod <12mHigh <6m3 2 14.2On the servicesLow >12mMod <12m	
4.2On the servicesLow >12mMod <12mHigh <5m3 2 14.3On a wallLow >12mMod <12m	
4.3 On a wall Low >12m Mod <12m	
4.4 On a building Low >30m Mod <30m High <6m 3 2 1 The harmony of the tree and its surroundings (size, growth rate, shade and past ground works) at the time	
The harmony of the tree and its surroundings (size, growth rate, shade and past ground works) at the time	
	of inspection
Special Interest Factors	
5.1 Rarity of the species Rare Moderate Common 3 2 1	
5.2 Species rarity for the local Rare Moderate Common 3 2 1 soil	
5.3 SSSI > One One None 3 2 1	
5.4 Historic interest Great Moderate None 3 2 1	
5.5Other factors> OneOneNone3 2 1	
6 Total Score (46 or 51 required) 56	

C:\Users\Alister\Documents\Hillside Trees\Current Projects\B&NES\Timsbury TPO Assessment\G3 - TPO_Assessment_Form.rtf