

ADC PARKS & GREENSPACE ARBORICULTURE

FROM: Dafydd Lloyd

TO: Ross Leal

PLANNING APPLICATION: WA/32/15/TC

ADDRESS: Willow Tree Cottage, The Street Walberton BN18 0PH

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: Fell 1 No. Cherry (Ornamental) tree within the Walberton Village Conservation Area

INSPECTION DATE: 20/07/2015

RECOMMENDATION:

Objection ☐ No Objection ☒ Split Decision ☐

Comment ☒ Recommendation ☒ Suggested Conditions ☐

Tree Replacement ☐ Dead/Dangerous ☐ CA & Amenity Value ☐

T1 Species: Cherry *Prunus spp* **Height:** 6 meters **Average Branch Spread:** 3.5 meters **Crown Condition:** fair to poor **Form:** fair **Age Class:** mature

Comments:

- The tree that has been outlined in this application is located in the front garden of Willow tree Cottage.
- The outlined cherry tree is not subject to an active TPO order; however the tree is situated in a conservation area.
- The outlined tree is barley visible from the main highway outside.
- Form the site inspection; it is clear that **T1** is in a poor overall condition. It is also clear that **T1** is likely to have a retention span of less than 20 years.

Recommendation:

- As T1 does not have the attributes to warrant a TPO order, **I would have no objection to the proposed felling of T1.**

Dafydd Lloyd
Arun District Council
Tree Officer

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: <u>20/7/2015</u>		Surveyor: <u>Daryl Lloyd</u>	
Tree details		Common Beech	
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Tree/Group No:	Species: <u>Fagus sylvatica</u>	
Owner (if known):	Location:		

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

4 • tree appears to be in good health & good vigour

* 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

2 • mature specimen

* 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

4 • clearly visible from the street outside

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

1

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:

12

Decision: TPO

defensible

Location of Beech tree



Willow tree Cottage, Walberton
© Arun District Council and Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence No: 100018487, 2015
Production Date: 21 July 2015

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 20/7/2015 Surveyor: Datydd Lloyd

Tree details
 TPO Ref (if applicable): _____ Tree/Group No: _____ Species: Weeping Willow
 Owner (if known): Willow-free cottage Location: Front Garden of Willow-free cottage, Walberton
Salix alba cristis

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenities 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 • Tree in great health
 • great vigour

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 • mature specimen

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 |

- Highly suitable
 Suitable
 Suitable
 Barely suitable
 Probably unsuitable

Score & Notes
4 • clearly visible from the street outside

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
<u>1</u> |
| 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 | |

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

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

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:

13

Decision: TPO defensible

Location of Willow tree



The Street, Walberton

© Arun District Council and Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence No: 100018487, 2015

Production Date: 21 July 2015

www.arun.gov.uk

