

58400 Tree Preservation Order - Broughton Street

The amenity assessment criteria, scoring, or matrix used to determine that the tree met the required threshold for a TPO;

The Council does not use any quantitative scoring system to determine the amenity value of a tree. Amenity is a qualitative attribute, and the amenity value of a tree is judged based on the professional opinion of our tree officers, considering a range of factors such as the tree's size, shape, condition, species, potential remaining lifespan, position, prominence, visibility, significance in the local landscape and other nearby canopy cover.

All officer notes, records, consultation responses or internal correspondence relevant to the decision;

Please see attached. Third party personal information has been redacted from the document provided.

Any visual assessment, viewpoint analysis, or photographic record used to support the claimed public amenity value;

A visit was made by a tree officer on 31/07/25 to carry out a visual assessment of the parts of the tree that are visible from the public domain. A summary of findings from the visit is found in the attached document.

Any expediency assessment, risk assessment or justification purporting to show that a TPO was "necessary" under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and the 2010 Regulations;

The making of the TPO was expedient because three conservation area notices have been submitted this year for its removal (25/03893/TCO, 25/03769/TCO and 25/04834/TCO). The tree owners have made it clear that they intend to remove it. There is therefore a threat to the tree, and it is expedient to protect it.

Any alternative options considered prior to serving the TPO (e.g., reliance on the existing Section 172 notification).

For the first two notices relating to this tree (25/03893/TCO and 25/03769/TCO), the planning authority took an alternative approach by negotiating a withdrawal and an amendment to avoid the removal of the tree. However, a third notice was then submitted (25/04834/TCO), which showed that the owners still intended to remove the tree despite the previously agreed withdrawal and amendment. At this point a TPO was the only option available to the planning authority to ensure retention of the tree. "Reliance on the existing section 172 notification" would lead to the opposite result.