

**TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):****SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE**

Date: 28 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	Surveyor: Callum Henderson
----------------------------------	----------------------------

<b>Tree details</b>		
TPO Ref:	Tree/Group No: T1 to T6	Species: Pine
Owner (if known): 25 Queens Road		
Location: 25 Queens Road, Belmont, Surrey, SM2 6BZ		

**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**

5- Visually prominent, high amenity value and contribution to street-scene

**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**

4 – No significant defects

**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**

5 -visible from Queens Road and The Crescent

**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 | <b>Score &amp; Notes</b><br>1 |
| 4) Members of groups of trees that are important for their cohesion  |                               |
| 3) Trees with significant historical or commemorative 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; refer to Guidance Note

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 5) Known threat to tree                    | <b>Score &amp; Notes</b><br>2 – Trees are a constraint as part of a planning application at the property. Perceived risk that the trees will be felled to remove this constraint |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree              |  |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree                |  |
| 1) Precautionary only                      |  |
| 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance |  |

**Part 3: Decision guide**

- |       |                       |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO      |
| 1-6   | TPO indefensible      |
| 7-10  | Does not merit TPO    |
| 11-15 | Possibly merits TPO   |
| 15+   | Definitely merits TPO |

**Add Scores for Total:**

17

**Decision:**

TPO warranted

This page is intentionally left blank