

# Arboricultural Assessment

Nangor House,  
New Nangor Road,  
Gallanstown,  
Dublin, D12 F726

Project No.	Project name	Date	Revision
-------------	--------------	------	----------

TDIA002	Diageo	30/09/21	-
---------	--------	----------	---

## 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](mailto:cmkhortandarb@gmail.com)  
Mobile: 087 1182343

# CMK

Hort + Arb Ltd.

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1. Client brief and Methodology</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>2. General description of trees</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Impact of proposed development</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Tree protection</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>5. Limitations of survey</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>6. Relevant legislation</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>7. Terminology</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>8. Tree condition analysis &amp; preliminary recommendations</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>8.1 Tree measurements</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>9. References</b> .....	<b>13</b>

## 1. Client brief & Methodology

CMK Hort + Arb were commissioned by Byrne Looby on behalf of Diageo Baileys Global Supply to undertake an assessment of trees within the Diageo campus on the New Nangor Road, Dublin 12. This report and supporting drawings TDIA002 101, 102 & 103 are designed to provide the client, design team and planning authority on the nature of trees on the site and the impact of the proposed works on these trees.

The site was assessed on the 11th of September 2020 and further updated in 2021. 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 survey areas encompass a parcel of land on the Diageo campus. The survey area shown on drawing TDIA002 101 is located on the western boundary of the campus. The trees all appear to have been planted during the original development of the site for screening and shelter. The species mix is relatively varied but reflects the purpose of the planting and includes willow (*Salix alba*), Aspen (*Populus tremula*), Norway maple (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) and hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*). The condition of the trees is generally good (refer to table 1 and section 7 of this report for a detailed analysis of individual trees) however the willow in particular are becoming susceptible to storm damage as they extend above the canopies and shelter of neighbouring trees. This report recommends a small number of trees for removal based on poor condition with the retention of standing deadwood considered the preferred option to encourage invertebrates, fungi and birds etc to inhabit these features. Some crown management should be undertaken to manage the willow in particular as limbs become end-weighted with potential for failure. The impact of the proposed development is outlined within section 3 of this report and illustrated on drawing TDIA002 102 (Arboricultural Impact).

Category	Number	% of total
A	0	0
B	19	86
C	2	9
U	1	5

Table 1. Tree Categories



Image 1. Subject trees adjacent to parking bay

### **3. Impact of the proposed development on trees**

The proposed project is to build a flavour warehouse of 32 x 14 x 7.5m in size. The project involves diversion of utility service, levelling and resurfacing the area around the building site to match the road level, provision of walkways, handrails and pedestrian road crossing as well as drainage system.

The site of the proposed structure (refer to drawing TDIA002 102) extends into the areas where trees are located therefore there be a need to remove fourteen trees. This represents 64% of the total trees within the survey area. The loss of these trees represents a loss of ecosystem services however the impact will not effect the visual screening provided by the trees as those being retained are located adjacent to the boundary.

### **4. Tree protection**

Tree protection is shown on drawing TDIA002 103. It is proposed to retain the services of an arboriculturist to, in the first instance locate the positions of tree protective fencing, and then to monitor the works in the vicinity of trees. Excavations will be necessary in close proximity to retained trees to provide levels for the proposed structure. There will be challenges in terms of understanding the impacts on retained trees and differentiating roots from trees removed as part of the enabling works from those being retained and those potentially impacted upon by any excavations. All of these works will be monitored by the site arboriculturist with appropriate actions undertaken as necessary.

### **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.

## 6. 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 other;

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 any queries arise re tree felling in general it is recommended that advice is sought from Felling Section of the Forest Service or the local [forestry development officer](#) for further information.

Trees may contain bats. Bats are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife Act 1976 and Schedule 1 of the European Communities (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1997. Professional advice from a licenced surveyor should be sought prior to any works commencing on trees.

## 7. Terminology

Tree categories	
<b>A</b>	Trees of high quality and value due to their size, age, condition, historical/visual merit and/or conservation potential (a minimum of 40 years).
<b>A1</b>	Mainly arboricultural values. Particularly good examples of species, essential components of groups or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features.
<b>A2</b>	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.
<b>A3</b>	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>B</b>	Trees of moderate quality and value (a minimum of 20 years).
<b>B1</b>	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).
<b>B2</b>	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.
<b>B3</b>	Mainly cultural values including conservation. Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits.
<b>C</b>	Trees of low quality and value (a minimum of 10 years).
<b>C1</b>	Not qualifying in higher categories.
<b>C2</b>	Trees present in groups or woodlands but without conferring on them greater landscape value and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit.
<b>C3</b>	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits.
<b>U</b>	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.

## Terminology (cont.)

**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.

## 8. Tree condition analysis & preliminary recommendations

Tag No.	Species	Age Category	General Condition	Comments	Preliminary Recommendations	Landscape and Arboricultural Category	Useful Life Expectancy
501	White willow Salix alba	Mature	Good	Trunk three stemmed from 0.75m with sound unions between stems. Minor storm damage in lower canopy but unlikely to be indicative of overall decline.	Remove storm damage	B2	20
502	Grey alder Alnus incana	Mature	Good	Trunk with a relatively strong lean toward east due to competition from neighbouring tree but unlikely to be significant at present. Minor mower impact damage at present of trunk but no associated decay present.	No action necessary	B2	20
503	Grey alder Alnus incana	Mature	Good	Minor bark loss at base of trunk but no associated decay present. Trunk co-dominant from 1.75m with a wide union between stems. Upper canopy relatively well developed with no visible defects.	No action necessary	B2	20
504	Grey alder Alnus incana	Mature	Good	Light suppressed deadwood in lower canopy but unlikely to be indicative of decline. Trunk co dominant from 3.75m with a wide union between stems. Upper canopy relatively well developed with no visible defects.	No action necessary	B2	20
505	Grey alder Alnus incana	Mature	Good	A well-developed specimen with no visible defects though heavy ivy growth up trunk obscuring view for assessment.	Cut ivy	B2	20
506	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Good	Trunk three stemmed from 2m with sound unions between stems. Upper canopy relatively compact due to competition from neighbouring tree. No visible defects.	No action necessary	B2	40



TDIA002

Tag No.	Species	Age Category	General Condition	Comments	Preliminary Recommendations	Landscape and Arboricultural Category	Useful Life Expectancy
507	Grey alder Alnus incana	Mature	Good	Minor mower impact damage at base of trunk but no associated decay present. Trunk with a strong lean toward east due to competition from neighbouring trees. Lean not significant in current location but removal should be considered in light of proposed construction in this area.	Consider for removal	B2	20
508	Grey alder Alnus incana	Mature	Good	Minor mower impact damage at base of trunk but no associated decay present. Trunk with a strong lean toward east due to competition from neighbouring trees. Lean not significant in current location but removal should be considered in light of proposed construction in this area.	Consider for removal	B2	20
509	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Good	Trunk three stemmed from 2m with a tight union between two stems. This is unlikely to be significant at present but should be monitored into the future to determine condition. Upper canopy relatively well developed with no visible defects.	Raise canopy to 5m to facilitate works and future building	B2	20
510	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Poor	A sub dominant specimen becoming out-competed by neighbouring trees. Limited crown development and small leaves indicative of decline	Fell / remove crown to retain ecological feature in trunk	U	<10
511	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Fair	A slightly sub dominant specimen with compact crown structure. Crown restricted toward north due to competition from neighbouring tree but not significantly so.	No action necessary	B2	40

TDIA002

Tag No.	Species	Age Category	General Condition	Comments	Preliminary Recommendations	Landscape and Arboricultural Category	Useful Life Expectancy
512	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Good	Trunk three stemmed from 1.75-2m with wide unions between stems. Minor deadwood in lower canopy but unlikely to be indicative of decline. Upper canopy relatively well developed with no visible defects.	No action necessary	B2	40
513	White willow Salix alba	Mature	Good	A relatively large specimen with a wide, open crown. Deadwood scattered throughout crown but unlikely to be indicative of decline. Has suffered a degree of storm damage in the past.	Deadwood	B2	20
514	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Good	A well-developed specimen with a well-structured crown.	No action necessary	B2	40
515	Grey alder Alnus incana	Early-mature	Good	A relatively well-developed specimen though trunk with a lean toward east. Upper canopy vertical.	No action necessary	B2	20
516	White willow Salix alba	Early-mature	Dead		Cut back to 5m to retain ecological feature	U	0
517	Tag not in use						
518	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Good	A relatively well-developed specimen with a compact structure. Trunk co-dominant from 2m with a wide union between stems. Upper canopy relatively well developed with no visible defects	No action necessary	B2	40

Tag No.	Species	Age Category	General Condition	Comments	Preliminary Recommendations	Landscape and Arboricultural Category	Useful Life Expectancy
519	White willow Salix alba	Mature	Good	A large relatively well-developed specimen with an open crown. Crown restricted toward south due to competition from neighbouring tree but unlikely to be significant at present with remaining crown relatively well developed. Minor deadwood in crown. Very large extended limbs to north and east shading out neighbouring trees and potentially becoming hazardous as end weight increases.	Remove extended limbs to north and east.	B2	20
520	White willow Salix alba	Mature	Good	Trunk with a strong lean toward east butt structural limbs becoming vertical from 2.5m. Very limited lateral branch development.	No action necessary	B2	20
521	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Good	Slightly sub dominant to neighbouring tree with crown restricted toward west as a result. Minor areas of occluded bark damage /at base pruning points on lower trunk but not significant at present.	No action necessary	B2	40
522	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Fair	Becoming swamped in ivy. Crown restricted toward west due to competition from neighbouring tree.	Cut ivy	C2	20
523	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Good	Trunk co-dominant from 2.25m with a wide union between stems. Upper canopy relatively well developed though restricted toward west due to competition from neighbouring tree.	No action necessary	B2	40
524	Norway maple Acer platanoides	Early-mature	Fair	A sub dominant specimen with crown restricted toward west due to competition from neighbouring tree. Remaining crown relatively well developed. Long term potential limited due to competition from neighbouring tree	No action necessary	C2	10-15

TDIA002

**8.1 Tree Measurements**

No	Height m	Dbh mm	Crown spread m	Clear stem m	No	Height m	Dbh mm	Crown spread m	Clear stem m
501	15	800	3,6,4,6	2.5E	514	15	290	6,6,6,6	1.75S
502	12	340	4,5,2,1	3.25E	515	16	320	2,2,2,4	6W
503	12	380	4,3,3,5	2.5W	516	12	360	NA	NA
504	13	360	4,5,4,3	2.5E	517	NA	NA	NA	NA
505	10	340	3,4,4,5	3W	518	15	510	8,4,4,6	3E
506	13	340	3,3,4,5	2N	519	16	820	8,11,3,4	2.5W
507	12	330	3,7,3,1	2.5E	520	13	430	2,8,2,3	3E
508	11	320	4,6,4,0	2S	521	14	290	3,8,2,1	3S
509	12	390	4,7,3,4	2E	522	12	320	5,4,2,2	5N
510	11	220	2,2,2,2	1.5W	523	16	400	5,8,3,3	1.75E
511	13	330	2,2,2,4	2.5W	524	10	190	3,4,3,0	2E
512	14	430	5,5,5,5	1.75N	524	10	190	3,4,3,0	2E
513	22	580	6,7,5,5	1.5S	524	10	190	3,4,3,0	2E

**9. References**

BS 5837 (2012). Trees in Relation to Design Demolition and Construction  
Mattheck and Breloer (1994). The body language of trees