

To: Planning and Climate Change Policy Board

On: 7 November 2023

Report by: Chief Executive

Heading: Tree Preservation Order Requests

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report seeks to provide an update to the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) requests which were considered at previous meetings of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board.
 - 1.2 In addition, this report also seeks to respond to requests to apply a TPO designation to trees at Inchinnan Road, Renfrew.
 - 1.3 The report also details requests for TPO designations which will be considered in due course and reported back with recommendations to future meetings of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board.
 - 1.4 The requests submitted are considered in line with the relevant legislation, namely, Section 160 of The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 as amended by the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006, and within the procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order and Trees in Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Regulations 2011.
 - 1.5 The report recommends that the tree preservation order at Dykebar Hospital is not confirmed.
 - 1.6 The report recommends that the tree preservation order is made in relation to specific trees along Inchinnan Road, Renfrew.
-

2. Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that the Board:

- (i) Agree that the tree preservation order in respect of the land within the grounds of Dykebar Hospital, Paisley is not confirmed and is withdrawn.
 - (ii) Note that the TPO designations agreed at the meeting of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board in August 2022 in respect of the sites at Potterhill Avenue, Paisley, St Marks Church, Paisley and Land to the south of Stanely Reservoir which are all currently subject to a period of public consultation. All will be returned to a future meeting of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board for confirmation or otherwise of the order.
 - (iii) Approve the need for tree preservation orders in respect of a number of trees and groups of trees at Inchinnan Road, Renfrew and agree that officers proceed to prepare the order, serve it on relevant parties and make the order available to the public and seek representations.
-

3. Land at Dykebar Hospital, Paisley

- 3.1. At the meeting of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board in January 2023, it was agreed that TPO designations would be placed on trees at Dykebar Hospital, Paisley.
- 3.2. In respect of the site noted above paragraph and in line with the Renfrewshire Planning and Development Tree Policy 2022, and the relevant legislation relating to Tree Preservation Orders, Officers have, undertaken the following:
 - Prepared the relevant order and made them available online for review;
 - Served the order on relevant parties including landowners;
 - Published a public notice in the local press advising of the order; and
 - Provided an opportunity for comments to be made by any interested party in relation to either of the orders.
- 3.3. The consultation period has now ended in respect of the site at Dykebar Hospital and as such three comments were received in relation to the TPO designation.
- 3.4. The comments received can be summarised as follows:
 - NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde object to the imposition of the Dykebar Tree Preservation Order (No. 1) 2023 over land currently within their ownership.
 - It is not clear from the report which was presented to a previous meeting of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board how or why the protection of the trees in question are justified in the interest of amenity.
 - The assessment of the trees in question has not been shared with the developers.

- The issue of amenity was previously assessed through the allocation of the site via the Local Development Plan and through the recent approval of planning permission.
- The site has been an allocated housing site in the Local Development since August 2014.
- Permission was recently granted for residential development on the site which is intended to meet the Renfrewshire Housing Land Supply Target and as such the proposal will involve the removal of the majority of the tree groups and woodlands contained within the TPO area with significant compensatory planting proposed.
- The planning permission respects the 1993 TPO with condition 18 requiring the submission and approval of an arboricultural method statement and long-term tree/woodland management and maintenance plans for the entire site including compensatory planting.
- The Reporter when considering the proposal commented that the site *“would, with mitigation, not result in any residual harm in terms of landscape and visual impacts or to habitats, protected species or other flora and fauna.”*
- The Reporter also acknowledged the public benefit which would be derived from replanting proposed as part of the development, in addition to the benefits this would also bring in respect of habitat creation and biodiversity gain.
- The comments from the Reporter have been overlooked and does not reflect the established position that the woodlands and tree groups do not have such a high amenity value which merit their retention.
- Legal advice confirms that granting a TPO cannot prevent work on or removal of trees where this is authorised by planning permission. Given the planning consent the TPO would have no practical effect in ensuring the retention of the trees in question.
- The practical effect of the TPO will be to place an additional burden on NHSGGC until such time as the land is transferred to the developers to implement the extant permission.
- The Council would be required to review the TPO post development to reflect the accurate position of the trees which may mean it is varied significantly or revoked.
- There is no basis upon which the 2023 TPO could be lawfully confirmed and in doing so would make the Council vulnerable to a potential legal challenge at some future date.

3.5. The comments above are noted and as such the results of the independent assessment are of relevance. The assessment used the Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation Orders (TEMPO), which is the most widely used appraisal system.

3.6. In undertaking the assessment the four identified tree groups and the four identified woodland groups are all identified as definitely meriting a TPO designation. The assessment notes that the TEMPO evaluation suggests that the four groups and four woodlands identified are worth retaining within any large scale future development.

- 3.7. It is accepted that the site in question benefits from planning permission as granted by the Reporter in March 2023 following an appeal. In this regard the comments in relation to the legal position require to be considered with some significance.
- 3.8. Officers have previously obtained external legal advice in relation to the potential functioning of a TPO on a site where planning permission has been granted for development.
- 3.9. It is considered that applying a TPO designation to the tree groupings and woodland groupings at the site at Dykebar Hospital would have no notable effect in regard the preservation of trees and would carry significant legal risks, given the grant of planning permission in March 2023.
- 3.10. The legislation granting the ability to make a TPO specifies that any TPO made cannot prevent work on or removal of trees where this is authorised by planning permission. Any TPO made at this site would therefore have no effect in regard to trees that are scheduled to be removed or altered in terms of the plans approved by the Reporter.
- 3.11. It is also noted that in considering the appeal in relation to the development at Dykebar Hospital, the Reporter considered the loss of trees and noted that losses were significant both individually and cumulatively and noted that compensatory planting cannot always replace these assets which take time to mature. The Reporter noted an inconsistency with policy LDP ENV2 and NPF4 policy 6 and found that the proposal was not compliant overall with policy 6. Notwithstanding the above, the Reporter granted planning permission and attached planning conditions securing compensatory planting equal to the area of woodland to be removed and also requiring a scheme of landscaping to be submitted.
- 3.12. In light of the above and taking account of the legal advice previously received, it is considered that there is no basis upon which a TPO could be made at this site. In all regards, progressing matters to confirm the TPO would leave the Council open to a legal challenge, potentially liable for significant compensation and would carry significant reputation risk.
- 3.13. For the reasons outlined above, it is recommended that the TPO designation known as Dykebar Tree Preservation Order (No. 1) 2023 is not confirmed.

4. TPO Requests Previously Considered

- 4.1. At the meeting of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board in August 2023, it was agreed that TPO designations would be placed on the following sites:
 - Land to the south of Stanely Reservoir, Paisley
 - Trees at Potterhill Avenue, Paisley
 - Trees at St. Marks Church, Paisley

- 4.2. In respect of the sites noted above and in line with the Renfrewshire Planning and Development Tree Policy 2022, and the relevant legislation relating to Tree Preservation Orders, Officers have undertaken the following:
- Prepared the relevant orders and made them available online for review;
 - Served the orders on relevant parties including landowners;
 - Published public notices in the local press advising of the orders; and
 - Provided an opportunity for comments to be made by any interested party in relation to either of the orders.
- 4.3. The 28 day consultation period has not yet concluded and as such interested parties are still able to make comment on the orders. The deadline for any comments to be submitted is 8th November 2023.
- 4.4. Following the conclusion of the consultation period any comments received will be considered and a further report brought back to a future meeting of the Planning and Climate Change Policy Board to confirm or otherwise the tree preservation orders.

5. TPO Requests

- 5.1. A request for a tree preservation order has been received in relation to trees at Inchinnan Road, Renfrew.
- 5.2. A TEMPO assessment has been undertaken by an independent arboriculturist who recommends that tree preservation orders are applied to the following:
- 12 individual trees;
 - 1 grouping of trees
- 5.3. The 12 individual trees comprise the following:
- Young lime in satisfactory condition with long future life expectancy - a TPO is considered to be defensible;
 - Early mature lime in good condition – the tree is found to definitely merit a TPO;
 - Young lime in satisfactory condition with long future life expectancy – a TPO is considered to be defensible;
 - Mature weeping willow on lawn which would benefit from maintenance to ensure statutory clearance over highway – a TPO is considered to be defensible;
 - Early mature lime in good condition – the tree is found to definitely merit a TPO;
 - A large, mature sycamore in satisfactory condition – the tree is found to definitely merit a TPO;
 - Early mature oak in satisfactory condition – the tree is found to definitely merit a TPO;
 - A large, mature sycamore in satisfactory condition – the tree is found to definitely merit a TPO;

- Semi mature sycamore in satisfactory condition – a TPO is considered to be defensible;
 - A large, mature sycamore in satisfactory condition – the tree is found to definitely merit a TPO;
 - Semi mature sycamore in satisfactory condition – a TPO is considered to be defensible;
 - Semi mature sycamore in satisfactory condition – a TPO is considered to be defensible;
- 5.4. In addition, one grouping of trees comprising 3 semi mature sycamores in satisfactory condition is identified where a TPO is considered to be defensible.
- 5.5. The other trees which were assessed were considered not merit a TPO designation or where a TPO would be indefensible.
- 5.6. A copy of the assessment undertaken can be found at Appendix 1.
- 5.7. In all regards, it is recommended that TPO designations are progressed in relation to the 12 individual trees noted above and the one grouping identified.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1. A TPO is prepared in respect of the following:
- each of the 12 individual trees identified above, located at Inchinnan Road, Renfrew;
 - the tree grouping noted above, located at Inchinnan Road, Renfrew.

Thereafter the order will be served on the respective landowners and made available to the public for comment.

- 6.2. Following a period of public consultation, each of the above noted TPO's will be returned to Board to take account of any comments received and to confirm, or otherwise the order.

Implications of the Report

1. **Financial** – None.
2. **HR & Organisational Development** – None.
3. **Community/Council Planning** –
4. **Legal** – The recommendations in the report would require tree preservation orders to be made in relation to the sites in question. Should the orders be confirmed they would require to be lodged with the Land Register of Scotland.
5. **Property/Assets** – None.

6. **Information Technology** – None.

7. **Equality & Human Rights** -

(a) The Recommendations contained within this report have been assessed in relation to their impact on equalities and human rights. No negative impacts on equality groups or potential for infringement of individuals' human rights have been identified arising from the recommendations contained in the report. If required following implementation, the actual impact of the recommendations and the mitigating actions will be reviewed and monitored, and the results of the assessment will be published on the Council's website.

8. **Health & Safety** – None.

9. **Procurement** – None.

10. **Risk** – None.

11. **Privacy Impact** – None.

12. **COSLA Policy Position** - None.

13. **Climate Risk** – None.

Appendix 1: TEMPO Assessment of Trees at Inchinnan Road, Renfrew

Author: David Love, Chief Planning Officer
Tel: 07483410182; Email: david.love@renfrewshire.gov.uk



Tree Consultancy Group

Arboriculture - Urban Forestry - Planning

**'TEMPO' ASSESSMENT
OF
TREES
AT
INCHINNAN ROAD
RENFREW**

Client: Renfrewshire Council

Date: October 2023



Crownhead, Stobo,
Scottish Borders, EH45 8NX
t: 01721 760268
e: mail@treeconsultancygroup.com
www.treeconsultancygroup.com

Principal Consultant:
Kenneth Harvey MICFor. M.Arbor.A. Dip.For.
Chartered Arboriculturist

1 INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 We have been instructed by Mr David Love, Head of Planning at Renfrewshire Council, to assess the suitability of trees within a specified area adjacent to Inchinnan Road (A8) for inclusion within a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The assessment to be carried out according to the TEMPO evaluation method for TPOs developed by Julian Forbes-Laird MICFor.
- 1.2 The trees to be assessed includes all those next to the highway and on the adjacent lawns and open spaces along the southern side of Inchinnan Road, from the White Cart Water to the roundabout junction with Argyll Avenue (see attached map).

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 A TPO suitability assessment starts with a walkover assessment carried out from places to which the public have access, as the purpose of protecting trees by a TPO is primarily to preserve their visual amenity in the landscape. This process involves identifying the most significant trees and then considering the expediency of making them the subjects of a TPO.
- 2.2 In order to be able to decide which trees are suitable for inclusion in a TPO and which aren't, the use of some kind of system is recommended to ensure, as far as possible, that selection is carried out in a fair, consistent, objective, and repeatable manner. It helps the Council explain to landowners why their trees have been included in a TPO (or, conversely, why they have not), and also helps to avoid including large numbers of low value trees within the TPO system which the Council then has to manage.
- 2.3 The most widely used appraisal system developed for this purpose is the *Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation Orders - TEMPO*. It is an easy to use field guide to decision-making which also provides a written record of the process. It is presented as a single-page pro forma, and allocates scores to various relevant criteria. When these scores are added together, it gives a total figure which informs whether the tree merits protection by a TPO and, if so, whether the making of a TPO is justifiable (i.e. defensible).
- 2.4 As Woodland TPOs are essentially different in nature and intent to 'normal' TPOs, TEMPO has been produced in two forms - one for individual trees and groups of trees, and one for woodlands. In the assessment of the trees at Inchinnan Road, we have used the former.

3 SITE VISIT AND METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 We visited the site to carry out an assessment of the trees on 3rd October 2023. They were visually assessed from ground level as far as access and site conditions allowed. No climbing or specialist investigations were undertaken.
- 3.2 The trees to be considered include several large, mature, free-standing street trees (i.e. those planted adjacent to the highway, and groups of younger trees planted nearby as part of later landscaping schemes. Due to the diverse range of species and age classes present, it was not viable to consider the trees as a collective whole, and they do not form a woodland, so they were considered and assessed as 20 individual trees and 9 distinct groups.

4 ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

- 4.1 Of the 20 individual trees assessed, 6 were found to be definitely worth a TPO, 6 were found where the making of a TPO would be defensible, 4 which did not merit the making of a TPO, and 4 where a TPO would be indefensible.
- 4.2 Of the 9 groups, none were found to be definitely worth a TPO, only one where the making of a TPO would be defensible, 2 which did not merit the making of a TPO, and 6 where the making of a TPO would be indefensible.
- 4.3 Most of the trees and groups where the making of a TPO would be indefensible are Horse chestnuts which, as a species, are now so vulnerable to endemic diseases such as Bleeding Canker (caused by the bacteria *Pseudomonas syringae*) and various defoliating pests that their planting is now rarely considered to be worthwhile. They are also prone to significant decay when wounded by pruning or injury, and most at the site are already in poor condition. Consequently none can be depended on to have even 10 years future life expectancy.
- 4.4 A plan of the site showing the trees' approximate locations is attached, along with a schedule giving the relevant TEMPO scores for each. Rather than completing a separate evaluation sheet for each tree and group (which would have made this document unnecessarily cumbersome and repetitive) we have compiled the results for all into one spreadsheet. For information, a blank copy of the relevant TEMPO sheet is also attached.
- 4.5 The TEMPO appraisal includes an amenity assessment at Part 2, which allocates scores depending on the level of threat to the tree(s). As we have not been advised of any known threat, we have used the lowest "precautionary only" category (i.e 1 point) for all trees having accrued the necessary scores at that stage of the process. If an immediate threat, a foreseeable threat, or even a perceived threat arises, the relevant score(s) should be increased accordingly.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The mature and semi-mature limes and sycamores present are mostly in satisfactory condition and suitable for inclusion in a TPO if a realistic threat materialises. The mature Horse chestnuts are not worth protecting, even though they have significant amenity value at present. Very few of the later, younger landscape plantings are of long-term value and worth preserving.

Kenneth Harvey MICFor. MArborA. Dip.For.
Chartered Arboriculturist
Registered Consultant of The Institute of Chartered Foresters

9th October 2023

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date:	Surveyor:
-------	-----------

Tree details		
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Tree/Group No:	Species:
Owner (if known):	Location:	

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair/satisfactory | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

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

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

* 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

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only | Suitable |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups 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 (inc. those of indifferent form)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

Score & Notes

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

Score & Notes

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

Decision:

Tree / Group	Comments	1a Condition & suitability for TPO	1b Retention span (years) & suitability for TPO	1c Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO	1d Other factors (must have 7+ points + to qualify.	2 Expediency Assessment	3 Total Score and Decision Guide
T1	A semi-mature Silver birch. Planted as part of landscaping scheme.	Fair 3 points	20 - 40 2 points	Medium, not clearly visible 3 points	n/a	n/a	8 points Does not merit TPO
T2	A young Lime in satisfactory condition with long future life expectancy.	Satisfactory 3 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	13 points TPO defensible
T3	Early-mature lime in good condition.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	Good form. 2 points	Precautionary only 1 point	16 points Definitely merits TPO
T4	Mature Horse chestnut with limited future life expectancy.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Large, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
T5	Mature Horse chestnut with limited future life expectancy.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Large, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible

Tree / Group	Comments	1a Condition & suitability for TPO	1b Retention span (years) & suitability for TPO	1c Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO	1d Other factors (must have 7+ points + to qualify.	2 Expediency Assessment	3 Total Score and Decision Guide
T6	A young Lime in satisfactory condition with long future life expectancy.	Satisfactory 3 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	13 points TPO defensible
T7	Mature Weeping willow on lawn. Maintenance required to maintain statutory clearance over highway.	Satisfactory 3 points	20 - 40 2 points	Large, clearly visible 4 points	Good form 2 points	Precautionary only 1 point	12 points TPO defensible
T8	Semi-mature Silver birch.	Satisfactory 3 points	20 - 40 2 points	Medium, not clearly visible 3 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	10 points Does not merit TPO
T9	Young Horse chestnut with limited future life expectancy	Fair 3 points	10 - 20 1 point	Young, limited visibility 2 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
T10	Early-mature lime in good condition.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	Good form. 2 points	Precautionary only 1 point	16 points Definitely merits TPO

Tree / Group	Comments	1a Condition & suitability for TPO	1b Retention span (years) & suitability for TPO	1c Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO	1d Other factors (must have 7+ points + to qualify.	2 Expediency Assessment	3 Total Score and Decision Guide
T11	A large, mature sycamore in satisfactory condition.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	Good form. 2 points	Precautionary only 1 point	16 points Definitely merits TPO
T12	Mature ornamental cherry in acceptable condition.	Satisfactory 3 points	20 - 40 2 points	Medium, not clearly visible 3 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	10 points Does not merit TPO
T13	Early-mature oak in satisfactory condition.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	Good form. 2 points	Precautionary only 1 point	16 points Definitely merits TPO
T14	Mature ornamental cherry in acceptable condition.	Satisfactory 3 points	20 - 40 2 points	Medium, not clearly visible 3 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	10 points Does not merit TPO
T15	A large, mature sycamore in satisfactory condition. Ivy conceals trunk.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Large, clearly visible 4 points	Good form. 2 points	Precautionary only 1 point	16 points Definitely merits TPO

Tree / Group	Comments	1a Condition & suitability for TPO	1b Retention span (years) & suitability for TPO	1c Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO	1d Other factors (must have 7+ points + to qualify.	2 Expediency Assessment	3 Total Score and Decision Guide
T16	Semi-mature sycamore in satisfactory condition.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	15 points TPO defensible
T17	A large, mature sycamore in satisfactory condition. Ivy conceals trunk.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Large, clearly visible 4 points	Good form. 2 points	Precautionary only 1 point	16 points Definitely merits TPO
T18	Semi-mature sycamore in satisfactory condition.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	15 points TPO defensible
T19	Crab apple in mediocre condition.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
T20	Semi-mature sycamore in satisfactory condition	Satisfactory 3 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	13 points TPO defensible

Tree / Group	Comments	1a Condition & suitability for TPO	1b Retention span (years) & suitability for TPO	1c Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO	1d Other factors (must have 7+ points + to qualify.	2 Expediency Assessment	3 Total Score and Decision Guide
G1	Group of early-mature Crab apples in very variable condition.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
G2	3no. Silver birch in acceptable condition.	Fair 3 points	20 - 40 2 points	Medium, not clearly visible 3 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	10 points Does not merit TPO
G3	Group of early-mature Crab apples in very variable condition.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
G4	3no. young Horse chestnuts in variable condition with limited future life expectancies.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
G5	4no. young Horse chestnuts in variable condition with limited future life expectancies.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible

Tree / Group	Comments	1a	1b	1c	1d	2	3
		Condition & suitability for TPO	Retention span (years) & suitability for TPO	Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO	Other factors (must have 7+ points + to qualify.	Expediency Assessment	Total Score and Decision Guide
G6	3no. semi-mature sycamores in satisfactory condition.	Good 5 points	40 - 100 4 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	15 points TPO defensible
G7	2no. young Horse chestnuts in variable condition with limited future life expectancies.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
G8	Group of early-mature Crab apples in very variable condition.	Poor 1 point	10 - 20 1 point	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	n/a	n/a	6 points TPO indefensible
G9	Sheltering group of semi-mature conifers, including spruces, False cypresses and Western hemlock. Mostly in poor or mediocre condition with only a few in acceptable condition. Management required to remove poorer trees.	Fair 3 points	20 - 40 2 points	Medium, clearly visible 4 points	No additional features. 1 point	Precautionary only 1 point	11 points Does no merit TPO

**Inchinnan Road, Renfrew
TEMPO Assessment
October 2023**

Key:

- **Definitely merits TPO**
- **TPO defensible**
- **Does not merit TPO**
- **TPO Indefensible**

