

# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 19 May 2016	Surveyor: Martin Minta
-------------------	------------------------

<b>Tree details</b> TPO Ref: TPO3 2016 Owner (if known): Site is being promoted by Pigeon Investments Location: land to the north of Station Road, Lakenheath	Tree/Group No: various Species: various
--	--

### 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              |

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> Tree belt A1 Fair Other trees at least fair  3
---

#### 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      |

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> Typically 20+  2
--

#### 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     |

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> 3 or 4 trees will increase in prominence once site is developed
---

#### 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 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            |

<b>Score &amp; Notes</b> Tree belt 4 Pine line 5 Others 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 |

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

### Part 3: Decision guide

- |       |                       |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO      |
| 1-6   | TPO indefensible      |
| 7-10  | Does not merit TPO    |
| 11-14 | TPO defensible        |
| 15+   | Definitely merits TPO |

<b>Add Scores for Total:</b> All trees within the range 14 - 19
--

<b>Decision:</b> Confirm TPO
---------------------------------