

# ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT & IMPACT REPORT

# RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPEMNT STEPASIDE PARK STEPASIDE CO. DUBLIN

Project No. TSTE003 Project name STEPASIDE SHD **Date** 27/06/22

Revision A

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	.3
5. Relevant legislation	.3
6. Terminology.	.4
7. References	.6

### Appendices

i Tree condition analysis & preliminary recommendations ii TSTE003 101 Arboricultural Assessment & Constraints drawing iii TSTE003 102 Arboricultural Impact & Tree Protection drawing



#### 1. Client brief & Methodology

CMK Hort + Arb Ltd. were commissioned by McGarrell Reilly Homes Ltd. to provide base-line data on the composition and condition of trees at a site at Stepaside, Co. Dublin (image 1). This report outlines these finding and assesses the impact on these trees of the proposed development of the site. The initial fieldwork was undertaken in November 2020 and updated in February 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 (Redline boundary for illustrative purposes only)

#### 2. General description of trees

The subject site is located to the north of Stepaside Park (image 1) and is mainly

stripped of topsoil and derelict. The tree population within the site is composed of a double line of Monterey cypress (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) (image 2). These trees are relatively well developed but serve no real purpose in the context of the site. They run on a north / south axis rather than forming a boundary screen or other purposeful planting.

There are a number of trees outside of the site which are in close proximity to the western boundary. These form part of the older estate plantings of beech



**Image 2.** Monterey cypress toward the northern section of the site

(*Fagus sylvatica*) which have been incorporated into the open space area of Stepaside Park. Their locations and the constraints they impose on the subject site are shown on the Arboricultural Assessment & Constraints drawing TSTE003 101.



#### 3. Impact of the proposed development

The subject site gross application area is 1.97 hectares in size with the proposed development consisting of:

- I. the construction of 118 no. residential units comprising:
- ii. the provision of podium level communal open space with a Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 1,454sq.m to serve the apartments in Block 1.
- iii. the provision of 4,002 sq.m of public open space.
- iv. the construction of a 2-storey childcare facility with a GFA of 156sq.m. with an associated play area and set-down car parking spaces.
- v. all ancillary site development works including plant, waste storage areas, landscaping, green roofs, boundary treatments, SuDS measures, ESB substation, public lighting, and solar PV panels.

The proposed development will necessitate the removal of the Monterey cypress #1485 hedge which falls within the road alignment.

Underground service alignments are proposed to run between tree groups located outside of the site on the North-western boundary. It is considered that these services can be installed without impacting on these trees as they are located outside of the trees' RPAs. Drawing TSTE003 102 Arboricultural Impact & Tree Protection Rev A shows the RPAs of trees closest to the proposed works to illustrate this point. Tree protection fencing locations are shown on drawing TSTE003 102 Arboricultural Impact & Tree Protection Rev A. These are designed to provide a clear barrier between site works and existing trees which are outside of the site boundary. All works in the vicinity of trees adjacent to the site will be monitored by the project arborist.

#### 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. Relevant legislation

There are no Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) on any of the trees on this site. However, unless planning permission which clearly identifies trees for removal has been granted then under Section 7 of the Forestry Act 2014 a person wishing to fell trees must apply to the minister for a licence to do so.

Exempted trees: Section 19 states that the requirement for a felling licence for the uprooting or cutting down of trees does not apply where:

• The tree in question is standing in an urban area



- The tree is considered dangerous and hazardous.
- The tree is within 10m of a public road and regarded as hazardous
- The tree in question is less than 100 ft. / 30m from a dwelling other than a wall or temporary structure;
- The tree in question is a hazel, apple, plum, damson, pear, or cherry tree grown for the value of its fruit or any ozier;

Other exceptions apply in the case of local authority road construction, road safety and electricity supply operations.

The Act is administered by the Forest Service (Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food). The Felling Section of the Forest Service is based in Johnstown Castle, Co. Wexford (053-9160200 or 1890-200223).

If you have any queries about felling in general or are unsure whether or not the trees fall under any of the above cases, it is recommended that you seek the advice of the Felling Section or of your local forestry development officer for further information.

#### 6. 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.



#### Terminology cont.

- 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.
- 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.



#### 7. 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
1485	Monterey cypress Cupressus macrocarpa	Mature	Good	A double line of trees / overgrown hedge at 2m spacings. Canopies restricted due to competition within group.	No action necessary	В2	20-30	390 av	10	4,4,4,4	0