

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 29/9/16	Surveyor: Daryl Lloyd
Tree details	
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Tree/Group No: T2
Owner (if known):	Species: 1x Walnut
	Location: Angels Nursery, Yaxton rd, Barnham

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

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

Score & Notes

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 |

Score & Notes

1

*Includes trees which are an 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 |

Score & Notes

3

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 |

Score & Notes

2

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 & Notes

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 |

Add Scores for Total:

14

Decision: TPO

defensible

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 29/9/2016	Surveyor: Daisydd Cough
Tree details	Tree/Group No: G74
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Species: 3x Oak (English)
Owner (if known):	Location: Angels Nursery Yaptowrd, Burnham

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

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

Score & Notes

5

* 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 |

Score & Notes

4

*Includes trees which are an 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 |

Score & Notes

2

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 |

Score & Notes

1

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 & Notes

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 |

Add Scores for Total:

17

Decision: Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 29/9/2016	Surveyor: Dafydd Lloyd
Tree details	Tree/Group No: T42
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Species: 1x Field maple
Owner (if known):	Location: Angels Nursery, Yafon rd, Barmham

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

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

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

Score & Notes

3

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 |

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

Score & Notes

2

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 |

Score & Notes

4

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 | Score & Notes |
| 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 | |

Score & Notes

1

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree | Score & Notes |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree | |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree | |
| 1) Precautionary only | |

Score & Notes

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 |

Add Scores for Total:

15

Decision: Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 29/9/2016	Surveyor: Dafydd Lloyd
Tree details	
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Tree/Group No: T24
Owner (if known):	Species: 1x Silver Birch
	Location: Angels Nursery, Yaptan-y-Buahan

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

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

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

Score & Notes

5

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 |

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

Score & Notes

2

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 |

Score & Notes

2

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 | Score & Notes |
| 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 | |

Score & Notes

2

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree | Score & Notes |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree | |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree | |
| 1) Precautionary only | |

Score & Notes

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 |

Add Scores for Total:

16

Decision: Definitely merits TPO

Angels Nursery, Yapton Road, Barnham



Scale 1:1000

© Arun District Council and Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence No: 100018487, 2016

Production Date: 27 September 2016

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL BN/43/16/PL

www.arun.gov.uk



Angels Nusery, Yapton Road, Barnham

