

RELATES TO:- DAMIAN SULLIVAN - LU/40/14/TC

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 28/02/2014	Surveyor: BELME HARVESEN	
Tree details		
TPO Ref (if applicable): none yet	Tree/Group No: 11	Species: Sweet Chestnut
Owner (if known): Glenis	Location: Winterton Lodge, Goda Road, LITREHAMPTON	Castanea sativa

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

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

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 4) Fair | Suitable |
| 3) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

5

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irreparable 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

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 | 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 (inc. those of indifferent form) | |

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 | |

5

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 |

Add Scores for Total:

18

Decision:

DEFINITELY MERITS
A TPO

RELATES TO :- DAMIAN SULLIVAN - LU/40/14/TC

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS -TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date:	26/02/2014	Surveyor:	BERNIE MARVELSON
Tree details			
TPO Ref (if applicable):	NONE YET	Tree/Group No:	Gr. 2
Owner (if known):	CLARENCE MANAGEMENT	Species:	HOLM OAKS x 2 of Quercus ilex
		Location:	WINTERTON LODGE, GORDA ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

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

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

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

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

5) 100+	Highly suitable	Score & Notes 4
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

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	Score & Notes 4
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	

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
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 (inc. those of indifferent form)	

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

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

Part 3: Decision guide

Any 0	Do not apply TPO	Add Scores for Total 22	Decision: DEFINITELY MERIT A TPO
1-6	TPO indefensible		
7-11	Does not merit TPO		
12-15	TPO defensible		
16+	Definitely merits TPO		