

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 1/12/2023 Surveyor: E Hood (SURVEY DATA SHEET COMPLETED AFTER SITE VISIT DATE 20/4/2023)

Tree details

TPO Ref: _____ Tree/Group No: **T1** Species: **Copper Beech**
 Owner (if known): _____
 Location: **Residential Garden of 51 Lawton Road**

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 - 5

High quality and high canopy tree which expresses good vitality. The tree contains an included union with no signs of incipient failure noted when viewed from ground level. The tree has also been awarded a high quality A Category rating (BS5837:2012) in supporting Arb Report submitted with planning application.

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 - 1

The tree has accepted existing future growth potential in excess of 40 years although is noted to be sited between 2 properties and adjacent to a garage in the garden of a neighbouring property. Rating for longevity and suitability has been reduced from a score of 1 (10-20 just suitable) to address the nuisance element of supporting guidance notes as the closest structure is considered secondary (not habitable) and its unknown whether any damage has occurred.

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 - 4,

The tree is clearly visible from nearby roads to the south, west and north.

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 - 1

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 + 11 = 16

Score & Notes - the 5 is awarded due to the intention being expressed that the tree will now need to be removed to accommodate an undetermined planning application
23/0380C

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:
16

Decision: Tree definitely merits a TPO having met the requirement for a score of 14 +. The TEMPO assessment was not carried out at the date of the site visit as the tree was originally proposed for retention, and not believed to be at risk of removal. The change in circumstances prompted an assessment for suitability for a TPO