

APPENDIX A
**TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)
 SURVEY DATA SHEET AND DECISION GUIDE**

Date: 13 th August 2020	Surveyor: Steve Perry
------------------------------------	-----------------------

Tree Details	TPO Ref: 4901.351	Tree/Group No. W1	Species: Mixed species including Ash, Sycamore, Willow, Alder, Birch, Holly.
Owner:			
Location: Langhurst Road off Ashgate Road			

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) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

*relates to existing context & is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

Score and notes	3	The woodland as a whole unit is highly suitable but downgraded as individual trees are of a lower grade.
-----------------	----------	--

b) Remaining longevity (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 |

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

Score and notes	4	
-----------------	----------	--

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 | High 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) Small trees, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score and notes	4	The trees are highly visible from Langhurst Road and the public footpath and cycle route off Holme brook.
-----------------	----------	---

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) Tree groups, or 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 (incl. those of indifferent)

Score and notes	4	The trees as a whole unit contribute to the amenity of the area and River corridor.
-----------------	----------	---

Part 2: Expediency assessment
Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

Score and notes	5	An enquiry was been made to check the protection status of the trees for felling to allow the land to be cleared for development.
-----------------	----------	---

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: 20
--

Decision: MERITS TPO
