

Amenity Evaluation Rating for TPOs

| | |
|---|--|
| TPO: 586 TREE SPECIES: Cedar ADDRESS: Epworth House 3 Stuart Street AMENITY VALUE RATING: 16 REASON FOR TPO: It is proposed to fell the tree which is considered suitable for a TPO | SITE VISIT DATE: 6 June 2016 EFFECTIVE DATE: N/A TPO DESIGNATION: Individual SURVEYED BY: Graham Toon |
|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|----|
| 1 Size 1 Very small 2-5m ² 2 Small 5-10 m ² 3 Small 10-25 m ² 4 Medium 25-50 m ² 5 Medium 50-100 m ² 6 Large 100-200 m ² 7 Very large 200 m ² + | 4 | | 6 Suitability to area 1 Just suitable 2 Fairly suitable 3 Very suitable 4 Particularly suitable | 2 |
| 2 Life expectancy 1 5-15 years 2 15-40 years 3 40-100 years 4 100 years + | 3 | | 7 Future amenity value 0 Potential already recognised 1 Some potential 2 Medium potential 3 High potential | 1 |
| 3 Form -1 Trees which are of poor form 0 Trees of not very good form 1 Trees of average form 2 Trees of good form 3 Trees of especially good form | 1 | | 8 Tree influence (current or future) -1 Significant 0 Slight 1 Insignificant | -1 |
| 4 Visibility 1 Trees only seen with difficulty or by a very small number of people 2 Back garden trees, or trees slightly blocked by other features 3 Prominent trees in well frequented places | 3 | | 9 Added factors If more than one factor relevant maximum score can still only be 1 1 Screening unpleasant view 1 Relevant to the Local Plan 1 Historical Association 1 Considerably good for wildlife 1 Veteran tree status | |
| 5 Other trees in the area 0 Wooded surroundings 1 Many 2 Some 3 Few 4 None | 3 | | 10 Rating | 16 |

Typical useful life expectancy of common trees.

- 300+ Yew
- 200-300 Oak, Sweet Chestnut, Plane, Sycamore, Lime
- 150-200 Scots Pine, Hornbeam, Beech, Tulip Tree, Norway Maple, Lebanon Cedar
- 100 -150 Ash, Spruce, Walnut, Red Oak, Horse Chestnut, Field Maple, Monkey Puzzle, Mulberry, Pear
- 70 - 100 Rowan, Whitebeam, Apple, Gean, Catalpa, Robinia, Ailanthus
- 50 - 70 Poplars, Willows, Cherries, Alders, Birches.

ADD EACH FACTOR TOGETHER 1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9 = Rating
 (The suitable benchmark rating for inclusion within a TPO is 15)

Methods for evaluating the amenity of trees placed under TPOs

1. Size of tree

Size of tree is measured as the area when viewed from one side. The height and diameter of the crown itself is estimated omitting the height of any clear stem. Multiply the two together to calculate the total area m².

Where two or more trees grow close together or as a group, they form a single visual unit and are valued as one tree.

2. Life expectancy

All identifiable problems surrounding the trees should be considered in order to assess the potential life expectancy, such as localised conditions and the proximity of the tree to obvious factors that may have a bearing on its future health. The score rating in this category must be made on arboricultural grounds by a suitably qualified professional.

Typical useful life expectancy of common trees:

300+ Yew

200-300 Oak, Sweet Chestnut, Plane, Sycamore, Lime

150-200 Scots Pine, Hornbeam, Beech, Tulip Tree, Norway Maple, Lebanon Cedar

100 -150 Ash, Spruce, Walnut, Red Oak, Horse Chestnut, Field Maple, Monkey Puzzle, Mulberry, Pear

70 - 100 Rowan, Whitebeam, Apple, Wild Cherry, Catalpa, Robinia, Ailanthus

50 - 70 Poplars, Willows, Cherries, Alders, Birches.

There are of course exceptions to the list and each tree must be judged on its merits, but these figures do give guidance.

3. Form

The form of the tree is difficult to define precisely, but one should consider what is being offered in terms of its physical and structural attributes and how highly pleasing that may be in the aesthetic sense. Trees with good natural characteristics or trees that contrast well with their location can be examples of trees with good form. The judgements for these characteristics must be made by professionally qualified arboriculturalists.

4. Public amenity assessment

The public amenity assessment is based on how much of the tree or trees can be seen, and from which point. The appropriate criteria are identified within the rating form.

5. Other trees in the area

The percentage of tree cover within the visual area considers the overall contribution of trees in the nearby surrounding area. It is intended to represent a visual impression as seen from ground level from different public viewpoints. The lower the surrounding tree population, then the higher the amenity value and vice-versa.

Woodland surrounding More than 70% of the visual area covered by trees, & at least 100 in total

Many more than 30% of the visual area covered by trees and at least 4 trees in total

Some more than 10% of the visual area covered by trees, and at least 4 trees in total

Classification: OFFICIAL

Few Less than 10% of the visual area covered by trees, but at least one other tree present
None No other trees present in the area under consideration.

6. Suitability to the area

As a general rule, one should aim to have the most suitable tree, or group that the available space will conveniently contain or maybe one with a suitable growing habit. Sometimes a tree or group of trees is particularly suitable to a certain setting or area with a particular character i.e. Weeping Willows hanging down over water or a row of oak trees in a country lane.

7. Future amenity value or potential to contribute

An assessment must be made on the tree's future, i.e. does the tree or group have room to develop, will it develop into a potentially large tree or group and will it eventually be seen by many to offer a reasonable degree of amenity value. There are several things to consider here, and knowledge of the tree's potential growth under various conditions is necessary to reach a reasonably accurate rating.

0 Potential already realised - If the tree or trees are of considerable size their amenity value is likely to have been realised, therefore it is fair to assume no rating is necessary

1 Some potential - The tree or trees will develop to contribute some amenity in the future but are possibly blocked by lots of other features i.e. building or other trees

2 Medium potential - The tree or trees will develop to contribute significantly to amenity in the future but are possibly blocked by some other features i.e. buildings or other trees

3 High potential - The tree or trees are in an appropriate place where they will develop well and eventually contribute well to the local amenity and landscape.

8. Tree influence

Trees in urban situations are often found in close association with existing buildings and structures. This can lead to a perceived conflict between the differing features which can be difficult to quantify, but is, none the less real. For the purpose of this assessment what is being considered is the relationship between the tree and nearest inhabited building.

-1 Significant - The tree or trees are medium to large or have potential to become so and have a significant influence over a nearby inhabited building

0 Slight - The tree or trees are small to medium, or they only have potential to become so, and so have only a slight influence on inhabited buildings nearby

1 Insignificant - The tree or trees are either too small or far enough away from an inhabited building to be a significant influence.

9. Added factors

Where there is some special value to the tree which has not been considered by the previous factors additional value ratings can be used. The factors included on the rating form include; important screening value, relevance in The Local Plan, wildlife potential and historical association. Other factors may be suggested by individual circumstances but it is important to be clear that such factors really do add an extra value to the trees under consideration.

It is important that if more than one factor is relevant, then it should still score just one point. It is considered that the amenity value should have already been recognised in the other eight factors and that this extra score is only help maintain its importance and not to help it reach the benchmark.

Classification: OFFICIAL