TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 2.6 1	May 21 Surveyor: P. Simpson
Tree details TPO Ref (if ap Owner (if kno	applicable): Tree/Group No: Species: Sycamore sown): Not Known Location: Main Street Beighton
	REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS Sycamore in gar
art 1: Amenity) Condition & s	v assessment suitability for TPO
) Good) Fair/satisfacto) Poor) Dead/dying/o * <i>Relates to exis</i>	Unlikely to be suitable S form Save Lee il co don Kon
	oan (in years) & suitability for TPO
5) 100+ 4) 40-100 2) 20-40 1) 10-20 0) <10* *Includes trees significantly nee	Highly suitable Very suitable Suitable Just suitable Unsuitable Which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are agating the potential of other trees of better quality
Consider realist 5) Very large tro 4) Large trees, (3) Medium tree 2) Young, small	rees with some visibility, or prominent large trees or medium trees clearly visible to the public ses, or large trees with limited view only ll, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty sible to the public, regardless of size Score & Notes Vees dominant in Score & Notes Suitable Barely suitable Probably unsuitable
d) Other factor	Total = 11 we accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify
4) Tree groups3) Trees with i2) Trees of par1) Trees with i	omponents of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees s, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance urticularly good form, especially if rare or unusual none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location
Part 2: Expedi	iency assessment ave accrued 10 or more points to qualify
Part 3: Decision	on guide
Any 0 1-6 7-11 12-15 16+	Do not apply TPO TPO indefensible Does not merit TPO TPO defensible Definitely merits TPO TPO

To Plan

