

Working Paper 4 – TEMPO Amenity assessment report

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 14 September	Surveyor: J Fisher
Tree details	
TPO Ref: 2015 2	Tree/Group No: Species: various
Owner (if known):	
Location: LAND OFF BURY ROAD AND GAZELEY ROAD, KENTFORD	

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 – range from 5 -1 (3)

The trees are in various conditions as assessed in the tree report that accompanies a planning application relating to this site. The vast majority of the trees are BS category B (moderate) or C (low) however those C category trees are retained as they make a contribution to a larger group

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)

In general the life expectancy of the trees is categorized as BS 2 or 3. This corresponds to a life expectancy of 20+ or 10+ years

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) or 3 becoming 4 if the 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

Score & Notes

The trees make a contribution to the sylvian nature of the village which has many tree belts forming a backdrop to development 4

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

Score & Notes 5

There is a known threat as most of the trees were shown to be removed in the first iteration of the layout for the site

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 |

Add Scores for Total:

19

Decision:

TPO in defensible