

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE (See Guidance Notes)

Date: 28/11/2024 Surveyor: E Hood

Tree details

TPO Ref: TPO/002/24

Tree/Group No: T1

Species: Lime

Owner (if known):

Location: Land to rear of 82 King Street

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO:

Refer to Guidance Note for definitions

- | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Unsafe | Unsuitable |
| 0) Dead | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes - 3

Moderate quality, high canopy tree which expresses good vitality

b) Remaining longevity (in years) & suitability for TPO:

Refer to 'Species Guide' section in Guidance Note

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

Score & Notes - 2

The tree has accepted existing future growth potential considered likely to be in excess of 40 years. As the tree is sited approximately 6-7 from the closest property the rating for longevity and suitability has been reduced from a score of 4 (40-100 - Very suitable) to a score of 2 (10-20 - Suitable) to address the nuisance element of supporting guidance notes.

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO:

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use; refer to Guidance Note

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 5) Very large trees, or large trees that are prominent landscape features | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only | Just suitable |
| 2) Small trees, or larger trees visible only with difficulty | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 1) Young, v. small, or trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes - 3,

The tree is clearly visible from nearby dwellings, businesses and walkways, although not visible from the closest roads.

d) Other factors

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

- | |
|--|
| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees |
| 4) Members of groups of trees that are important for their cohesion |
| 3) Trees with significant historical or commemorative importance |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual |
| 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features |

Score & Notes - 1

Sub - total Part 1 - 9

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify; refer to Guidance Note

- | |
|--|
| 5) Known threat to tree |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree |
| 1) Precautionary only |
| 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance |

Sub-total 2 = 5 + 9 = 14

Score & Notes - the 5 is awarded due to the submission of Sec 211 notification 24/4411/TCA which expresses the intention to fell the tree

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-10 | Does not merit TPO |
| 11-13 | Possibly merits TPO |
| 14+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for
Total: 14

Decision: Tree definitely merits a TPO having met the requirement for a score of 14 +.