

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date:	07.09.21	Surveyor:	Drew Leeper
-------	----------	-----------	-------------

Tree details	
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Tree/Group No: T1 Species: Common Lime
Owner (if known):	Location: Roadside verge outside no. 15 Brincliffe Crescent, Never Edge

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair/satisfactory | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes	3
--------------------------	---

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes	2
--------------------------	---

* Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only | Suitable |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes	4 Forms an avenue of limes
--------------------------	----------------------------

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|
| 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score & Notes</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </table> | Score & Notes | 4 |
| Score & Notes | | 4 | |
| 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion | | | |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance | | | |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual | | | |
| 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) | | | |
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score & Notes</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> | Score & Notes | 3 |
| Score & Notes | | 3 | |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree | | | |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree | | | |
| 1) Precautionary only | | | |

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:	16
------------------------------	----

Decision:	Definitely merits TPO
------------------	-----------------------

This page is intentionally left blank