

ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT & IMPACT REPORT

‘Mountgorry Large-Scale Residential Development’

Project No.	Project name	Date	Revision
TMON003	Mountgorry	25/09/23	D

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. Arboricultural Impact	3
3.1 Project description	4
3.2 Arboricultural Impact	4
4. Tree Protection	4
5. Limitations of survey	4
6. Terminology.	5
7. References	6

Appendices

- i Tree Condition Analysis & Preliminary Recommendations**
- ii TMON001 101 Arboricultural Assessment & Constraints drawing**
- iii TMON001 102 Arboricultural Impact drawing Rev D**
- iv TMON001 103 Tree Protection drawing Rev B**

1. Client brief & Methodology

CMK Hort + Arb Ltd. were commissioned by Barta Propcro 23 Limited to provide base-line data on the composition and condition of trees within an area of land at Mountgorry, Swords, Co. Dublin. This report outlines these finding and assesses the impact on trees of the proposed development.

The fieldwork was undertaken on the 17th of November 2023.

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).

2. General description of trees

The trees which form the basis of this report are located on an area of land to the north of the R106 at Mountgorry, Swords (image 1). Also referred to are trees within the neighbouring open space area at Seamount View.

A total of seven trees were identified within the subject site. These trees are early-mature self-seeded scrub willow (*Salix alba*), sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) and ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) located toward the western boundary of the site (image 2). The quality / condition of these trees is generally low to poor due to competition between trees, more occasional structural defects and squirrel damage. A birch (*Betula pendula*) and a small number of juvenile oak (*Quercus robur*) are located near the southern boundary with the R106. None of these trees are of arboricultural significance.



Image 1. Main development site. Note presence of trees within neighbouring site to west.

Trees overhang the western boundary of the subject site from the FCC open space area adjacent to the Seamount View estate. The trees are primarily oak (*Quercus robur*) and more occasionally Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) at an average height of 13m (image 2). A section of this boundary contains Portuguese laurel (*Prunus lusitanica*) with no trees present. The trees are closely spaced leading to them becoming drawn up for light. The planting appears stable at present but could benefit from a degree of thinning to improve the development of better quality specimens. A boundary fence separates the subject site from the neighbouring open space area. This fence constructed on small pads will not restrict roots from these trees extending into the subject site. No significant root development from the Portuguese laurel is expected to extend into the site.



Image 2. Tree #569 (arrowed) with trees within neighbouring site behind boundary fence. Note restriction on canopy growth of tree #569 from trees within neighbouring site.

3. Impact of the proposed development

3.1 Project description

Bartra Propco 23 Limited intend to apply for permission for development for a Large-scale Residential Development (LRD) at this c. 0.8731 Ha site fronting the Swords to Malahide Road (R106), Mountgorry, Swords, Co. Dublin. The site is bounded to the west by open space, with Seamount View Housing Estate further beyond, to the south by the R106, to the east by an access road to the Applegreen Service Station and to the north by Swords Business Park.

The development's surface water drainage network shall discharge from the site into the respective existing manhole located along the access road to the east of the site. The development site area and drainage work areas will provide a total application site area of c. 0.8792 Ha.

The proposed development will principally consist of: the construction of 123 No. residential units (55 No. one bed apartments and 68 No. two bed apartments). The development will be provided in a courtyard block arrangement ranging in height from part 4 No. to part 5 No. storeys. The proposed development has a gross floor area of c. 10,281 sq m.

The proposed development will also provide: vehicular access from the access road to the east; 24 No. car parking spaces; bicycle parking spaces; motorcycle parking spaces; pedestrian/cycle entrances at the south-west and north of the site, and along the western boundary connecting into the adjoining open space; a footpath and bicycle

path around the south, east and north of the site perimeter and a shared cycle/pedestrian path along the western boundary; balconies and terraces facing all directions; hard and soft landscaping; boundary treatments; green roofs; lift overrun; PV panels; lighting; ESB substation; switchroom; plant; and all associated works above and below ground.

3.2 Arboricultural Impact

In addition to one category U trees identified for removal based on its very poor condition the proposed development will necessitate the removal of two trees adjacent to the western boundary and one tree located within the verge on the R106 (refer to drawing TMON001 102 Arboricultural Impact Rev D). All the remaining trees are to be retained, protected during development and incorporated into the open space area to the west of the site. The loss of the three trees is not considered to be significant as they are moderate category B specimens (table 1).

A diverse range of tree species and cultivars are proposed within the landscape masterplan for the site. This will increase overall numbers of trees from current levels and provide a greater range of ecosystem services than currently provided by the existing tree population. In terms of mitigation it is considered that the proposed planting more than compensates for trees to be removed.

Refer to Appendix i Arboricultural Assessment & Preliminary Recommendations for details on individual trees within the site.

Tree category	Number of trees to be removed	% of total (excluding Category U)
A	0	0
B	3	42
C	0	0
U	1	NA

Table 1. Arboricultural impact

4. Tree Protection

Retained trees are to be protected for the duration of the development. Tree protection fencing is to be erected following the removal of trees identified on drawing TMON001 102 Arboricultural Impact. Tree protection fencing shall be retained in place for the duration of the development and only removed following agreement with the project arborist and/or for permitted works eg soft landscaping. If necessary, tree protection fencing shall be re-erected until all potential construction related impacts have been eliminated.

The locations of tree protection fencing is shown on drawing TMON001 103 Tree Protection Rev A.

5. 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.
 - 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.

Terminology cont.

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.

6. 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
564	Willow Salix alba	Mature	Good	A multi stemmed specimen with a restricted canopy to west due to competition from trees within neighbouring site.	No action necessary	B3	15-20	340	10	6,5,3,2
565	Sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus	Early Mature	Very Poor	A sub dominant specimen with limited canopy development. Extensive squirrel bark damage throughout canopy.	Fell	U	<10	220	4	1,3,2,1
566	Willow Salix alba	Mature	Good	A relatively well-developed specimen with a basal stem containing extensive decay. Upper canopy restricted toward west due to competition from trees within neighbouring site.	Remove basal stem	B2	20-30	350	11	6,5,6,2
567	Willow Salix alba	Mature	Good	A multi stemmed specimen with crown restricted toward west due to competition from trees within neighbouring site to west	No action necessary	B2	30-40	270	8	3,4,5,2

Tag number	Species	Age Class	Vigour	Comments	Preliminary Recommendations	Category	Long-term potential (years)	Dbh mm	Height m	Spread m N, E, S, W
568	Ash Fraxinus excelsior	Early Mature	Fair	A relatively well developed specimen with no visible defects. Strong honeysuckle up trunk and into lower canopy. Unlikely to be significant at present.	No action necessary	B2	40	280	9	5,5,5,3
569	Sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus	Early Mature	Fair	Trunk co dominant from base with a wide union between stems. Upper canopy restricted toward west due to competition from trees within neighbouring site.	No action necessary	B2	30-40	350	14	5,5,4,1
570	Birch Betula pendula	Early Mature	Good	Well developed with no visible defects. Stake in place.	Remove stake	B2	30-40	290	9.5	4,4,4,4