25/10/	2019			
	Land to the rear 48 – 84 Southfield Road			
	Amenity assessment ition & suitability for TPO; wh	ere trees in good or fair co	ndition have poor form, de	duct 1
5 Good	Highly suitable		Notes:	i
3 Fair	Fairly Suitable		į	
1 Poor	Unlikely to be suitable			
O Dead or dangero	us* Unsuitable		<u> </u>	i
* Relates	s to existing context and is intende	d to apply to severe irremedia	ble defects only	
b) Rete	ntion span (in years) & suitabi	lity for TPO		
			Notes:	
100+	Highly suitable		ļ	<u> </u>
40-100 20-40	Very suitable Suitable		i	4
20-40 10-20			į	j
10-20 <10*	Just suitable Unsuitable		ļ	<u> </u>
			<u> </u>	
	s trees which are an existing or ne e significantly negating the potent	-		context, or
-	ive public visibility & suitabilit realistic potential for future visibi	=		
-	ge trees with some visibility, or	Highly suitable	Notes:	·i
Large tre	prominent large trees Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public Suitable			į
	trees, or large trees with limited	view Suitable		5
Young, s	mall, or medium/large trees visibl n difficulty	e Barely suitable		
Trees no	t visible to the public, regardless o	of size Probably unsuitable	<u> </u>	!
d) Othe	r factors			
Trees mu	ust have accrued 7 or more points	s (with no zero score) to qualif	y	13
-	components of arboricultural fea			
_	Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion			
	Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance			
	particularly good form, especially th none of the above additional re		of indifferent form)	
Part 2:	Expediency assessment			
	ust have accrued 9 or more points	s to qualify		17
5 Immedia	ate threat to tree		Notes:	
	able threat to tree			5
	d threat to tree onary only			
			<u>ا ا ا ا ا</u>	
Part 3:	Decision guide			
Any 0	Do not apply TPO			
1 - 6	TPO indefensible			
7-11	Does not merit TPO			22
12-15	TPO defensible			
16+	Definitely merits TPO			