

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

| | |
|---|---|
| Date: 12.12.2011 | Surveyor: M Knagg |
| Tree details: 496 (2011) | |
| Tree/Group No: W1 | Species: Mixed species predominantly broadleaf species |
| Owner (if known): The Property Trust plc, Kingsgate House, 114/115 High Holborn, London WC1V 6JJ | |

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

3 – Little evidence of management in recent times, good health generally

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 – many trees have the potential to remain for extensive periods extending into multiple decades and beyond

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 – clearly visible from a number of public vantage points; important landscape features

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 – greatest value is as a woodland/scrub land area, amenity and wildlife value |
| 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 | |

Part 2: Expediency assessment

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| 5) Known threat to tree | Score & Notes 2 – significant potential for future development |
| 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 |
| 11-14 | TPO defensible |
| 15+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

17

Decision:

Merits serving with TPO