

ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT & IMPACT REPORT

GLEBE HOUSE
CRUMLIN VILLAGE
DUBLIN 12

Project No.

TGLE002

Date

11/04/22

Revision

-

Report Prepared by

Ciaran Keating
BSc Pl. Sci. & Ecol
H.N.D. Hort
AA Tech Cert Arb, PG Dip. Arb & Urban Forestry

E-mail: cmkhortandarb@gmail.com

Mobile: 087 1182343,
Drumone, Oldcastle, Co. Meath

CONTENTS

1. Client brief and Methodology	2
2. General description of trees	2
3. Impact of the proposed development	3
4. Limitations of survey	4
5. Terminology	4
6. References	5

Appendices

- i Tree Condition Analysis & Preliminary Recommendations**
- ii TGLE002 101 Arboricultural Assessment & Constraints drawing**
- iii TGLE002 102 Arboricultural Impact drawing**
- iv TGLE002 103 Tree Protection drawing**
- V Tree Protection Strategy document**

1. Client brief & Methodology

CMK Hort + Arb Ltd. were commissioned by Seabren Developments Ltd and Circle VHA CLG to provide base-line data on the composition and condition of trees and the impact on trees of the proposed development at Glebe House, Crumlin, Dublin 12. The initial fieldwork was undertaken on the 15th of March 2022.

The survey methodology, supporting drawings and documentation follow the recommendations contained within BS 5837 (2012). The analysis of the trees was undertaken using the VTA methodology as developed by Mattheck and Breloer (1994).



Image 1. Site location (red line denotes site boundary)

2. General description of trees

The site which contains a historic property and industrial buildings contains four mature trees on its northern boundary (3 x Horse chestnut, 1 x sycamore) with one additional mature sycamore tree on the western boundary. All the trees have been pollarded / topped in the past leading to the development of extensive decay in most instances and strong vertical regrowth at pruning points. There are also signs of bark damage to one tree #1575 (image 2).

Past management actions and age-related issues have reduced the quality of the trees (table 1). The development of strong vertical re-growth from pruning points following topping can lead to structural weaknesses

which are difficult to identify with any degree of certainty. It requires that future management actions are mindful of these factors and inevitably requires the trees to be periodically topped / pollarded to reduce hazardous structural weaknesses developing. Tree #1574 (image 3) which is located on the western boundary has extensive areas of decay and is also damaging the boundary wall.

Tree # 1579 has the appearance of an old pollard with an interesting form. It has potential to be a valuable landscape asset within the re-development of the site and is arguably the form which should be aimed for with any retained trees.

Category	Number	% of total
A	0	0
B	2	40
C	2	40
U	1	20

Table 1. Tree Categories



Image 2. Bark damage to base of tree #1575



Image 3. Sycamore #1574 on western boundary

The existing tarmac around the base of the trees is likely to be an impediment to root growth in these areas and could allow scope for works to encroach on the standard root protection area (RPA) for trees of this size. The location of individual trees and their RPAs with the tarmac identified as an impediment to root spread are shown on drawing TGLE002 101 Tree Survey & Constraints.

3. Impact of the proposed development

The proposed development consists of 150 no. apartments, a creche and café with an overall gross floor area of 15,767 sq.m.

The proposed development will directly impact on one mature sycamore tree (#1574) which is in conflict with the access road.

Tree #1578 has been identified as being vulnerable to failure due to extensive decay at two points within the tree's trunk and is recommended for removal on this basis.

The loss of the two mature trees is not considered to be significant. It is very likely that both trees would require removal based on their impact on the western boundary wall (#1574) and potentially hazardous condition adjacent to a public road (#1578) in the near future.

The retention of three mature trees on the boundary of the site is considered to be positive in terms of their visual contribution to the urban landscape in this area of low tree cover. However, they will require ongoing and regular inspection to determine their management needs.

The impact of the proposed development is shown on drawing TGLE002 102 Arboricultural Impact

Measures to protect trees are outlined within the Tree Protection Strategy document with tree protection fencing locations shown on drawing TGLE002 103 Tree Protection.

4. Limitations of Survey

This survey should be regarded as a preliminary assessment of the trees and deals with the current condition as identified during this survey only. Every attempt was made to identify hazardous trees in this report, however; this survey was carried out from the ground and therefore cannot be held to have identified elements of decay, which may be hidden out of sight within the crown or beneath ivy or other obstructions. To counter this limitation in the survey process it is vital that during tree works any additional defects found by the climbing arborist are communicated to the consulting arborist to allow appropriate action to be taken.

The details within this survey are based on the condition of the trees during the survey period only. The findings in this survey cannot be held to be valid after any site disturbance, man-made or natural, which may have an adverse effect on any trees present.

5. Terminology

Tree categories

- A Trees of high quality and value due to their size, age, condition, historical/visual merit and/or conservation potential (a minimum of 40 years).
- A1 Mainly arboricultural values. Particularly good examples of species, essential components of groups or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features.
- A2 Mainly landscape values. Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effects to the locality in relation to views into or out of site, or those of particular visual importance.
- A3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation. Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, comparative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture).
- B Trees of moderate quality and value (a minimum of 20 years).
- B1 Mainly arboricultural values. Trees that might be included in high categories but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remedial defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage).
- B2 Mainly landscape values. Trees present in numbers, usually as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals but which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal features (e.g. trees of moderate quality within an avenue that includes better A category specimens) or trees situated internally to the site, therefore individually having little visual impact on the wider locality.
- B3 Mainly cultural values including conservation. Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits.
- C Trees of low quality and value (a minimum of 10 years).
- C1 Not qualifying in higher categories.

Terminology continued

- C2 Trees present in groups or woodlands but without conferring on them greater landscape value and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit.
- C3 Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits.
- U Trees in such condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management. Trees that are dead, dying or showing immediate and irreversible decline.

Comments: Refers to the tree's condition and suitability for the site.

Common name: Most widely used non-botanical name.

Co-dominant: Two branches assuming the role of leading shoots. When growing close together may form a weak attachment (included bark) at their point of contact. Trees with this defect may be in danger of splitting at this weak attachment.

Crown Spread: Measured in meters north, south, east and west.

Decay fungi: Refers to those species of fungi which degrade living wood and which may, depending on the degree of degradation, render the tree structurally unsound.

Defects: Refers to cracks, storm damage and any other damage mechanical or biological.

Diameter: Diameter of the trunk (millimetres) at 1.5m. M.S. after the measurement refers to the tree being multi-stemmed.

Genus & Species: Refers to the botanical names for the tree.

Height: Measured in meters.

Monitor: Refers to trees which need to be re-surveyed on a yearly basis to assess their condition. This timescale may be sooner where works or adverse weather conditions have impacted negatively on the trees.

Overhaul: A reference to standard tree surgery work which consists of the removal of deadwood, crossing branches and balancing where appropriate.

Recommendations: Indicates surgery work necessary for the retention or, where necessary, removal of the tree.

Tree No. Refers to numbered tag fixed to tree during survey.

4. References

BS 5837 (2012). Trees in Relation to Design Demolition and Construction

Mattheck and Breloer (1994). The body language of trees

APPENDIX I. TREE CONDITION ANALYSIS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Tag number	Species	Age Class	Vigour	Comments	Preliminary Recommendations	Category	Long-term potential (years)	Dbh mm	Height m	Spread m N, E, S, W	Clear Stem m
1574	Sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus	Mature	Good	Located on western boundary and abutting boundary wall. A large cavity at 4m to north beneath point of crown topping. A very large pruning cut to trunk at 3m to south with associated decay. The decay at both points could be connected. Long-term potential limited as a result. The retention of this tree would require continual crown management and an investigation of potential decay within trunk.	Reduce canopy by 3m	C2	10-15	12	750	3,4,4,3	1.75E
1575	Horse chestnut Aesculus hippocastanum	Mature	Good	Located on northern boundary. Tarmac road surface at base to south may restrict root development in this direction. Extensive bark damage at base. Large limb removal at 2.15m to south with localised decay. Topped at 3.25m with resulting strong multiple re-growths.	Remove larger re-growths.	C2	10-15	11	800	3,2,4,4	2N

Tag number	Species	Age Class	Vigour	Comments	Preliminary Recommendations	Category	Long-term potential (years)	Dbh mm	Height m	Spread m N, E, S, W	Clear Stem m
1576	Sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus	Mature	Good	Located on northern boundary in very close proximity to boundary wall. Heavy ivy growth up trunk obscuring view for assessment. Topped at 3.5m with multiple re growths present. Upper canopy relatively well developed.	Reduce canopy by 3m	B2	30-40	11	630	3,2,3,1	4N
1578	Horse chestnut Aesculus hippocastanum	Mature	Fair	Located on northern boundary. A large limb removed at 3m to north has led to cavity formation with a further large cavity at 2.5m to south. There is potential for these cavities to be linked thereby creating a significant structural weakness at this point.	Fell	U	<10	8	750	4,4,4,3	4N
1579	Horse chestnut Aesculus hippocastanum	Mature	Good	Located on northern boundary of site. Topped at 4.5m with extensive regrowth present. Multiple pockets of decay at pruning points in lower canopy but unlikely to be significant at present.	No action necessary	B2	15-20	10	780	3,3,3,3	4.25N