

# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 12-12-19    Surveyor: Sal Bridges
---

<b>Tree details:</b>		
<b>TPO Ref/ Address:</b> White Horse Inn Kenilworth Road Balsall Common COVENTRY CV7 7DT	<b>Tree No.</b> T1	<b>OAK</b>

Refer to guidance note for all definitions

### Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees are in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

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

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> 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      |

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> 4
-------------------------------

\* includes trees which are 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 |

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> 5
-------------------------------

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                                | <table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Score &amp; Notes</b><br/>3: Habitat importance</td> </tr> </table> | <b>Score &amp; Notes</b><br>3: Habitat importance |
| <b>Score &amp; Notes</b><br>3: Habitat importance   |  |   |
| 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 (including those of indifferent form) |  |   |

### 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         |

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> 5- Risk of intrusive, excessive pruning by neighbouring planning application
--

### 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 |

<b>Add Scores for Total:</b> 20
------------------------------------

<b>Decision:</b> Definitely merits TPO
---