

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 17/04/19 Surveyor: Catherine Nuttgens

Tree details

TPO Ref: 482 Tree/Group No: 1 Species: *Quercus sp.* (Oak)
 Owner (if known): Owners of Middlewood Grange
 Location: Middlewood Grange

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) Dead/Dying/Dangerous Unsuitable

Score & Notes: 5 – Good. Tree is in good health and structure and is of a significant age as has 80-100cm stem diameter

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

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 – The health and structure of this tree gives it a considerable longevity and the possibility of developing into an ancient tree

* 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; 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

4 – A large tree next to a footpath bordering greenbelt land

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
- 4) Members of groups of trees 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

3 – This is an old tree in full maturity and good health. It has some veteran features which will support high biodiversity

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify; refer to Guidance Note

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance

Score & Notes

5 – section 211 notice of felling received

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:

Decision:
Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 17/04/19 Surveyor: Catherine Nuttgens

Tree details

TPO Ref: 482 Tree/Group No: 2 Species: *Acer pseudoplatanus*
 Owner (if known): Owners of Middlewood Grange
 Location: Middlewood Grange

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) Dead/Dying/Dangerous Unsuitable

Score & Notes: 3 – Fair. Tree is in good health, with no visible decay or disease. but has been pruned very hard in the past which has left the tree's structure very long and thin with small cavities.

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

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

3– The tree is healthy, but the structure of the tree means that it has a shorter longevity than it would have had it not been pruned so hard in the past

* 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; 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

4 – A large tree which is highly visible on the brow of the hill in front of Middlewood Grange

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
- 4) Members of groups of trees 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; refer to Guidance Note

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance

Score & Notes

5 – section 211 notice of felling received

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:

16

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 17/04/19 Surveyor: Catherine Nuttgens

Tree details

TPO Ref: 482 Tree/Group No: 3 Species: *Acer pseudoplatanus*
 Owner (if known): Owners of Middlewood Grange
 Location: Middlewood Grange

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) Dead/Dying/Dangerous Unsuitable

Score & Notes: 3 – Fair. Tree is in good health, with no visible decay or disease. but has been been pruned very hard in the past which has left the tree’s structure very long and thin with small cavities.

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

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

3– The tree is healthy, but the structure of the tree means that is has a shorter longevity than it would have had it not been pruned so hard in the past

*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; 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

4 – A large tree which is highly visible on the brow of the hill in front of Middlewood Grange

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
- 4) Members of groups of trees 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; refer to Guidance Note

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance

Score & Notes

5 – section 211 notice of felling received

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:

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 17/04/19 Surveyor: Catherine Nuttgens

Tree details

TPO Ref: 482 Tree/Group No 4 Species: *Tilia sp.*
 Owner (if known): Owners of Middlewood Grange
 Location: Middlewood Grange

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) Dead/Dying/Dangerous Unsuitable

Score & Notes: 3 – Fair. Tree is in good health, with no visible decay or disease, but has been pruned hard in the past.

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

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

2– The tree is healthy, but the structure of the tree means that it has a shorter longevity than it would have had it not been pruned so hard in the past

*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; 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

4 – A large tree which is highly visible on the brow of the hill in front of Middlewood Grange

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
- 4) Members of groups of trees 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; refer to Guidance Note

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance

Score & Notes

5 – section 211 notice of felling received

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:

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 17/04/19 Surveyor: Catherine Nuttgens

Tree details

TPO Ref: 482 Tree/Group No:5 Species: *Acer pseudoplatanus*
Owner (if known): Owners of Middlewood Grange
Location: Middlewood Grange

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) Dead/Dying/Dangerous Unsuitable

Score & Notes: 3 – Fair. Tree is in good health, with no visible decay or disease. but has been pruned very hard in the past which has left the tree's structure very long and thin with small cavities.

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

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

3– The tree is healthy, but the structure of the tree means that it has a shorter longevity than it would have had it not been pruned so hard in the past

*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; 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

4 – A large tree which is highly visible on the brow of the hill in front of Middlewood Grange

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
- 4) Members of groups of trees 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; refer to Guidance Note

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance

Score & Notes

5 – section 211 notice of felling received

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:

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

This page is intentionally left blank