



**Preliminary Tree Survey and Report**  
**Trees at**  
**Part XI Church Fields Housing and Development**  
**and Eastern Linear Park**  
**Mulhuddart**  
**Dublin 15**  
**December 2021**

**The Tree File Ltd**  
**Consulting Arborists**  
**Ashgrove House**  
**26 Foxrock Court**  
**Dublin 18**  
**086-3819011**



## Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Subject</u>
<b>1</b>	<b>Report Summary</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Introduction</b>
	<b>Survey and Impact Assessment Brief</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Appendix 1 - The Survey</b>
	<b>Nature of Survey and Report</b>
	<b>Drawing Reference</b>
	<b>Site Description</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Survey Data Collection and Methodology</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Survey Key and Explanations</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Table 1 - Tree Survey Table</b>

This report should be read in conjunction with the “Tree Constraints Plan” drawing “Mulhuddart Tree Constraints Plan (West and East)”



## **1.0 Summary of Findings**

- 1.1 The review of trees and woody vegetation at the subject site has revealed a combination of historic relics together with extensive natural regeneration.
- 1.2 Throughout the survey, there is evidence of an agricultural format Thorn based hedge associated with east-west drainage ditch feature. Though many such hedges are heavily overgrown, the standard format of stock proof type hedging perched on the raised edge of a ditch is still notable at various points.
- 1.3 A lack of management over time, assumed to be some decades at present, has led to massive natural regeneration and in many instances, a broadening of the hedge profile. The original Hawthorn is now complemented by species such as Ash, Sycamore, Blackthorn, Elder, Bramble and Ivy, sometimes to the exclusion of the original Thorn.
- 1.4 Most notable is the fact that in some instances, the original Thorn hedge has sometimes been usurped and dominated by tree species, particularly Ash. There is evidence to suggest that Elm would have been present in large numbers in the past, however, most Elms found at this stage are either dead or debilitated by Dutch Elm disease and offer no realistic sustainability.
- 1.5 Considering the above, Ash is the dominant species throughout the survey area. This apparent monoculture dominance raises particular concern in light of the threat presented by Ash Dieback (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*). The disease has become widespread across county Dublin in 2021, with symptomatic evidence suggesting it is present on the subject site. Accordingly, it is advised that the sustainability of Ash cannot readily be relied upon and indeed, there is a distinct possibility that many of the Ash recorded on the site could be lost to the disease in the near future.
- 1.6 When dealing with a monoculture, diversification and additional planting must be considered as of paramount importance. For this site, and considering the potential for tree loss, then broadening the species palette as well as phasing any proposed planting over time to create a more diverse species and age profile will be of benefit.
- 1.7 In respect of the reviewed tree population, it is natural development and lack of management has resulted in mechanical issues. Many of the young trees are multi-stemmed, heavily forked and overcrowded. This has created tree forms that are often tall, spindly and may be unsuitable for retention in isolation or may become subject to mechanical failure if exposed or in later life. Intervention at this time may be of benefit, for example by the progressive application of population thinning to isolate out stronger and better-quality specimens.
- 1.8 The site area includes vast swathes of natural scrub regeneration, most notable about the centre and north of the site. In this area, we find vast numbers (hundreds) of young trees, some in close-knit groups, others as individuals spread over large areas. This material is often dominated by Pedunculate Oak, possibly associated with seed distribution by Jays. These trees are typically of good health and under certain circumstances would offer immense sustainability. However, many trees have arisen in dense groups and others adjoining built structures, while most arise from broken and disturbed ground. In Arboricultural terms, the trees would be regarded as offering

minimal constraint to development, on the grounds that they are small and readily replaceable. This does not infer that they are without value or that they should be removed. However, retention must consider their ultimate size (potentially 20 metres plus) and the fact that they will likely suffer widespread disturbance in making good the broken ground from which they arise.

- 1.9 At various points in the survey, note was made that the original field drainage ditch formats present as substantial earthworks and topographical features. In some instances, such features have been eroded and or graded out however in others they constitute large, steep sided features. In such instances, consideration should be given to the incorporation of such features into future landscape, particularly with regard to safety. Should it be necessary to modify such features, and particularly the banks upon which much of the associated vegetation is positioned then there will be an unavoidable repercussion on vegetation retention.

## **2.0 Introduction**

### **2.1 Dermot Foley Landscape Architecture**

Blackpitts,  
The Liberties,  
Dublin,  
D08 DD56

### **2.2 The survey has been prepared by- Andy Worsnop Tech Arbor A, NCH Arb (PTI LANTRA)**

**The Tree File Ltd**  
Brookfield House  
Carysfort Avenue  
Blackrock  
Co Dublin

## **Report Brief**

- 2.3 In accordance with the request for information, the intention of the tree survey is to register, describe and evaluate the trees regarding their current health status and current condition within their current context. The survey is based upon and has been compiled considering the recommendations of BS5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.

## **Report Context**

- 2.4 In line with the recommendations of “BS5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations”, this assessment has been advised by the results and findings of a tree survey, the findings of which are included as “Appendix 1” to this report.
- 2.5 In line with client instructions, this report comprises a simple qualitative tree survey and a summary report describing the material of Arboricultural interest, upon and adjoining the subject site.
- 2.6 This information has been provided without any review of possible construction or development works. Accordingly, this information does not include any “Arboricultural Implication Assessment”, nor does not provide an “Arboricultural Method Statement” or “Tree Protection Plan” and therefore is not a full Arboricultural report.
- 2.7 It does however provide some of the basic information that would assist in the compilation of such information and documentation, should it be requested/required in the future.
- 2.8 This tree report should be read in conjunction with the combined tree constraints plan “Mulhuddart Tree Constraints Plan”. This drawing provides a graphic representation of the tree survey depicting the constraints and the spatial retention requirements of the trees, as well as colour coded categorisation their condition and potential value.

- 2.9 Accordingly, and in line with BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations, this documentation does provide an invaluable “design tool” in respect of the review of potentially sustainable trees on a particular site.
- 2.10 To avoid duplication, the drawing set associated with this report includes information reproduced courtesy of Arborist Associates. Reference should be made to their documentation in respect of tree descriptions and findings.

### **Report Limitations**

- 2.10 This report is based on the Arborists interpretation of information provided to his prior to report compilation and gained from the site during the undertaking of the site review. The site review data is subject to the limitation as set out under “Inspection and Evaluation Limitations and Disclaimers” in “Appendix 1” to this report. The findings and recommendations made within this report are based upon the knowledge and expertise of the inspecting Arborist.

### **3.0 Management Recommendations**

- 3.1 Preliminary management recommendations have been put forward within the context of the survey table (see column PMR). Such recommendations are based on the current and “do nothing” site scenario. They do not consider any possible construction activity or site developments that may affect the trees.
- 3.2 In the case of construction or development works, it will be necessary for the project Arborist to re-assess all trees in respect of development impacts and implications, including shelter loss and exposure and any other changes in site context.
- 3.3 Regardless of any possible site development, it is advised that all retained trees be reviewed on regular basis and particularly, after any actions that may affect the trees, be those site development works, or tree management works that involve tree removal or pruning.
- 3.4 It should be appreciated that some of the concerns raised in the tree survey were based on evidence suggesting ongoing decline or mechanical failure. Such deterioration may well continue to a point where additional trees need to be removed. For this reason, trees must be reviewed regularly so that early intervention and action can be applied in a timely manner.
- 3.5 Additionally, many of the site’s trees were affected by Ivy development. Whilst itself not an indicator of ill-health, Ivy cover can readily obscure signs and symptoms of ill-health or physical defect. Therefore, and whilst nominal assessments have been made for the purposes of this survey, the true condition of trees affected by Ivy cover might not be fully known until Ivy cover has been dealt with, either by cutting resulting in shedding or by the undertaking of climbing inspections.

### **4.0 Development Implications**

- 4.1 This document comprises only a review of trees that exist upon or adjoining the site in

respect to its existing context and relating to the “do nothing” scenario. It is appreciated that site development works may alter this scenario or may affect the suitability of various trees to be retained.

- 4.2 In respect of this, any development proposals must be reviewed under the auspices of an “Arboricultural Implication Assessment” that will review the development proposals and provide an assessment of the potential for tree retention within the new context. This information can then be used to develop an “Arboricultural Method Statement” and a “Tree Protection Plan” to control and guide site works in a manner that will be least detrimental to tree health and thus may maximise tree sustainability.

## **5.0 Bibliography**

- 5.1 British Standards Institution (2010) BS 3998:2010: Tree Work - Recommendations. London: British Standards Institution.
- 5.2 British Standards Institution (2012) BS 5837:2012: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations. London: British Standards Institution.
- 5.3 Jackson, R.B et al (1996) A Global Analysis for Root Distribution in Terrestrial Biomes *Oecologia*, 108 (1996) pp389-411, Springer Verlag
- 5.4 Lonsdale, D. (2005) *Principals of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management*, London, TSO
- 5.5 Mattheck, C. and Breloer, H. (1994) *The Body Language of Trees*, London, TSO
- 5.6 Roberts, J. and Jackson, N. and Smith, M. (2006) *Tree Roots in the Built Environment*, London, TSO
- 5.7 Strouts, R.G. and Winter, T.G. (1994) *Diagnosis of Ill-Health in Trees*, London, HMSO
- 5.8 Teagasc (2021) Development of ash tree genetic resources, <https://www.teagasc.ie/crops/forestry/research/ash-resistance-to-ash-dieback/>
- 5.9 Woodland Trust (2021) Ash Dieback, <https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/trees-woods-and-wildlife/tree-pests-and-diseases/key-tree-pests-and-diseases/ash-dieback/>



## **A1 Appendix 1 – Tree Survey**

### **Nature of Survey**

- A1.1 This survey has been based upon many of the criteria put forward in BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations. The data collected has been represented in table form as “Table 1” within “Appendix 1” to this report. This appendix includes a Survey Methodology, Survey Key, Survey Abbreviations, Condition Category Definitions.
- A1.2 The survey relates to the site and the conditions thereon at the time of the survey. It is likely that changes in site usage, development or other environmental changes will require an amendment of recommendations and, in some instances, may require the re-classification of a tree’s category and/or suitability for retention.

### **Drawing References**

- A1.3 The survey must be read in conjunction with the drawing “Mulhuddart Tree Constraints Plan”. This provides a scaled graphic representation of tree positions, crown forms, “RPA” (root protection area) extents and a colour reference to category systems. Where tree positions were not indicated on the supplied topographical drawing, their positions may have been given a “sketched” location within the “Mulhuddart Tree Constraints Plan” (Sheets 1 to 6). It is advised that any such trees are accurately located by professional means so that the constraints such trees have upon the site can be accurately gauged.
- A1.4 Each tree is represented by a coloured spline, scaled to represent the north, east, south and west crown radii as denoted in the survey table. Each tree (categories A-green, B-blue and C-grey only) have been apportioned a “Root Protection Area” (RPA) denoted as a dashed orange circle. This circle represents the nominal minimum area requiring protection from the effects of development activity. It should, for the purposes of design, be considered, as approximating the position of the tree protection fencing that must be erected prior to the commencement of any site works, thus excluding all site activities other than those dealt with by way of the “Arboricultural Implication Assessment” and “Arboricultural Method Statement”.

### **Survey Intent and Context**

- A1.5 Intention of this document is to describe the extent, nature and quality of material of Arboricultural interest on the site in question.

### **Site Description**

- A1.6 The site in question comprises an arbitrary area to the north of the Wellview Estate and south of Damastown Avenue, that relates to a zone of development as opposed to being defined by any particular landscape features.
- A1.7 Notwithstanding the above, the site area retains many features that relate to a historic agricultural format, including hedge lines and field drainage ditches. Many of these

ditches retain thorn based agricultural hedges that are in varying states of continuity and quality.

- A1.8 Large areas of the site have been previously modified with notable areas that appear to have been graded or used for historic dumping of spoil and rubble as well as road building. Such activities appear to have occurred in the order of 10 – 20 years ago, resulting in widespread and extensive natural regeneration and overgrowth of thicket material.

### **Survey Intent and Context**

- A1.9 This document intends to highlight the extent and nature of the material of Arboricultural interest on the site in question.

### **Survey Data Collection and Methodology**

#### **The Survey**

- A1.10 The original survey was carried out in May of 2021. This survey portion of the overall report is not an Implication Assessment though but provided some of the basic information regarding its compilation. The compilation of this survey was guided by the recommendations of BS 5837: 2012. This survey typically includes trees of stem diameters exceeding 150mm at approximately 1.50 metres from ground level. The survey relates to current site conditions, setting and context.

- A1.11 Each tree in the survey has a consecutive number that relates directly to the survey text. Measurements are metric and defined in metres and millimetres. All trees referred to in the survey text have been measured to provide information regarding canopy height and canopy spread (north, east, south, and west radii), level of canopy base and stem diameter at 1.50 meters from ground level. The dimensions provided are intended to provide a reasonable representation of a tree's size and form. While efforts are made to maintain accuracy, visual obstruction, especially regarding trees in groups, requires that some tree dimensions be estimated only.

#### **Inspection and Evaluation Limitations and Disclaimers**

- A1.12 The information set out in this report relates to the review of a tree population on the site in question. As such, the information provided is based on a general review of trees and does not constitute a detailed review of any one of the individual specimens. Such an evaluation (tree report) would require the gathering of substantially more information than that dealt with in this survey.

- A1.12 The survey is not a safety assessment, and the parameters reviewed within this survey context would be substantially deficient in extent to provide for a reliable safety assessment. The survey is intended to provide a general and qualitative review to assist in gauging the suitability of an individual tree for retention within a development context. All trees are subject to impromptu failure and damage. The assessment of risk

as may be presented by a tree requires the review of numerous factors more than those noted herein and as such, remains outside the scope of this document and any attempt to use the information herein for such purposes will render the information invalid.

A1.14 A competent and experienced Arborist has completed all inspection and tree assessment. The inspection involves visual assessment only, which has been carried out from ground level. No below ground, internal, invasive, or aerial (climbing) inspection has been carried out.

A1.15 Trees are living organisms whose health, condition and safety can change rapidly. All trees should be re-evaluated regarding their condition on an annual basis or after substantial trauma such a storm event, other damage, or injury. The results and recommendations of this survey will require review and reassessment after one year from the date of execution. This survey does not constitute a review of tree or site safety. Attempts to use the contents herein for such purposes will render the contents invalid.

A1.16 Throughout the undertaking of the survey, several factors acted against the inspectors, contriving to reduce the accuracy of the survey.

### **Seasonality**

A1.17 The surveys were carried out during the spring periods. Some of the signs, typically symptomatic of ill-health or defect within a tree, may not have been available to view at the time of the survey or may have been obscured by seasonality related factors. Some of the fruiting bodies of various fungi, parasitic upon or causing decay or disease in trees, may have been out of season and unavailable to view. This survey can only comment upon symptoms of ill-health or defects visible at the time of the inspection.

### **Survey Key**

<b>Species</b>	Refers to the specific tree species
<b>Age</b>	Referred to in generalized categories including: -
Y - Young	A young and typically small tree specimen.
S/M - Semi-Mature	A young tree, having attained dimensions that allow it to be regarded independently of its neighbours but typically, would be less than 50% of its ultimate size.
E/M - Early-Mature	A specimen, typically 50% - 100% of ultimate dimensions but with substantial capacity for mass and dimensional increase remaining.
M - Mature	A specimen of dimensions typical of a full-grown specimen of its species. Future growth would tend to be extremely slow with little if any dimensional increase.
O/M - Over-Mature	An old specimen of a species having already attained or exceeded its naturally expected longevity.

V - Veteran An extremely old, veteran specimen of a species, usually of low vigour and typically subject to rapid decline and deterioration or of very limited future longevity.

**Tree Dimensions** All dimensions are in meters. See notes regarding limitation of accuracy.

**Ht.** Tree Height

**CH** Lowest canopy height

**N, E, S, W** Tree Canopy Spread measured by radii at north, east, south, and west

**Dia.** Stem diameter at approx. 1.50m from ground level.

**RPA** Root Protection Area, as a radius measured from the tree's stem centre.

**Con** Physical Condition

G Good A specimen of generally good form and health

G/F Good/Fair

F Fair A specimen with defects or ill health that can be either rectified or managed typically allowing for retention

F/P Fair/Poor

P Poor A specimen whom through defect, disease attack or reduced vigour has limited longevity or maybe un-safe

D Dead A dead tree

**Structural Condition** Information on structural form, defects, damage, injury, or disease supported by the tree

**PMR – Preliminary Management Recommendations** Recommendation for Arboricultural actions or works considered necessary at the time of the inspection and relating to the existing site context and tree condition. Works considered as urgent will be noted.

**Retention Period**

S – Short Typically, 0 -10 years

M – Medium Typically, 10 -20 years

L – Long Typically, 20 – 40 years

L+ Typically, more than 40 years

**Category System** The Category System is intended to quantify a tree regarding its Arboricultural value as well as a combination of its structural and physical health.

Category U Particularly poor quality, dangerous or diseased trees that offer no realistic sustainability

Category A A typically a good quality specimen, which is considered to make a substantial Arboricultural contribution

Category B Typically including trees regarded as being of moderate quality

Category C Typically including generally poor-quality trees that may be of only limited value.

The above categories are further subdivided regarding the nature of their values or qualities.

Sub-Category 1 Values such as species interest, species context, landscape design or prominent aspect.

Sub-Category 2

Mainly cumulative landscape values such as woods, groups, avenues, lines.

Sub-Category 3

Mainly cultural values such as conservation, commemorative or historical links.

## Survey Key

<b>Species</b> .....	Refers to the specific tree species
<b>Age</b> .....	Referred to in generalized categories including: -
Y - Young.....	A young and typically small tree specimen.
S/M - Semi-Mature.....	A young tree, having attained dimensions that allow it to be regarded independently of its neighbours but typically, would be less than 50% of its ultimate size.
E/M - Early-Mature.....	A specimen, typically 50% - 100% of ultimate dimensions but with substantial capacity for mass and dimensional increase remaining.
M - Mature.....	A specimen of dimensions typical of a full-grown specimen of its species. Future growth would tend to be extremely slow with little if any dimensional increase.
O/M - Over-Mature.....	An old specimen of a species having already attained or exceeded its naturally expected longevity.
V - Veteran.....	An extremely old, veteran specimen of a species, usually of low vigour and typically subject to rapid decline and deterioration or of very limited future longevity.
<b>Tree Dimensions</b> .....	All dimensions are in meters. See notes regarding limitation of accuracy.
<b>Ht</b> .....	Tree Height
<b>C-Ht</b> .....	Lowest canopy height
<b>FSB</b> .....	Level of First Significant Branch
<b>Sp: R</b> .....	Tree Canopy Spread measured by radii at north, east, south and west
<b>Dia</b> .....	Stem diameter at approx. 1.50m from ground level.
<b>RPA</b> .....	Root Protection Area, as a radius measured from the tree's stem centre.
<b>Con</b>	Physical Condition
G Good.....	A specimen of generally good form and health
G/F Good/Fair.....	
F Fair.....	A specimen with defects or ill health that can be either rectified or managed typically allowing for retention
F/P Fair/Poor.....	
P Poor.....	A specimen whom through defect, disease attack or reduced vigour has a limited longevity or may be un-safe
D Dead.....	A dead tree
<b>Structural Condition</b>	Information on structural form, defects, damage, injury or disease supported by the tree
<b>PMR – Preliminary Management Recommendations Retention Period</b>	Recommendation for Arboricultural actions or works considered necessary at the time of the inspection and relating to the existing site context and tree condition. Note is also made of works considered as urgent.
S – Short.....	Typically 0 -10 years
M – Medium.....	Typically 10 -20 years
L – Long.....	Typically 20 – 40 years
L+.....	Typically in excess of 40 years
<b>Category System</b> .....	The Category System is intended to quantify a tree regarding its Arboricultural value as well as a combination of its structural and physical health. Note should be made of the fact that tree categorization relates to the current site and tree locations therein. As site changes occur, it may become necessary to re-evaluate trees regarding their relationship to new features.
Category U.....	Typically relates to trees that are dead, dying or dangerous. Such trees may present a threat of suffer from a defect or disease that is considered irreparable.
Category A.....	A typically a good quality specimen, which is considered to make a substantial Arboricultural contribution
Category B.....	Typically including trees regarded as being of moderate quality

- Category C..... Typically including generally poor-quality trees that may be of only limited value.
- The above categories (A, B and C) will be further subdivided regarding the nature of their values or qualities. A tree may be awarded one or more value categories as below, but such attributes do not infer any additional value and it may be possible for a tree may qualify for one or more of the categories as below.
- Sub-Category 1..... Values such as species interest, species context, landscape design or prominent aspect.
- Sub-Category 2..... Mainly cumulative landscape values such as woods, groups, avenues, lines.
- Sub-Category 3..... Mainly cultural values such as conservation, commemorative or historical links.

**Table 1 – Tree Data Table**

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
143	Oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	S	G	5.50	0.00	3.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	1	251	3.02	A young and vigorous specimen of good condition. Small stature would allow for ready replacement.		L	C2
144	Oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	S	F	4.00	1.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	220	2.64	Young and vigorous, comprising a broader area of sapling regeneration. Small stature would allow for ready replacement.		L	C2
145	Oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	S	F	3.50	0.00	2.50	2.50	1.00	1.50	1	166	1.99	Suppressed as result proximity to 144.		L	C2
146	Oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	S	G/F	5.00	1.75	3.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	1	194	2.33	A young and good quality specimen. Is small enough to allow for ready replacement.		L	C2
147	Oak ( <i>Quercus robur</i> )	S	F	3.50	1.00	2.50	2.50	2.00	2.00	2	220	2.64	Young and vigorous but heavily divided from ground level. Small stature would allow for ready replacement.		L	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
148	Ash Group ( <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> )	E/M	F/P	12.00	1.00	5.00	4.50	2.50	5.00	5	780	9.36	A large, dispersed group arising from top of heavily disturbed ditch embankment with much of ditch feature excavated presumably with regard to works occurring immediately south of ditch line. Tree is multi-stem from ground level suggesting sucker regeneration from stump of previous tree. Tree has suffered substantial mechanical damage and loss of much of its southern crown. Remaining crown is of variable vigour and vitality with twiggy decline in evidence suggesting reduced vigour and or pathological issues.	Rereview during late summer period.	S	C2
149	Field Maple ( <i>Acer campestre</i> )	S/M	G	5.50	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3	312	3.74	A multi-stemmed but vigorous group. Small stature would allow for ready replacement if required.		L	C2
150	Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> )	S/M	F	7.00	1.50	4.00	3.50	2.50	3.00	1	929	11.15	Suppressed and heavily encroached upon by disturbance regarding roadworks to south and extensive mounding of soil about stem to north. Tree is currently of good vigour though sustainability is highly questionable.		S	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
151	Sycamore Group ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> )	S/M	F	7.50	0.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6	462	5.54	A community of young stems, possibly arising as sucker growth from the stump of previous tree. Current health appears good though specimen is of poor mechanical form. Presents no tangible threat at present but may offer limited sustainability in later life.		M	C2
152	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	G/F	9.00	2.25	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	1	376	4.51	Young and still vigorous but will be susceptible to Dutch Elm disease that has killed numerous Elm specimens in general vicinity.	Review annually.	M	C2
153	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	D	7.00	1.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	286	3.44	Completely dead, killed by Dutch on disease.	Remove.	N/A	U
154	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	D	7.50	7.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	271	3.25	Completely dead, killed by Dutch Elm disease.	Remove.	N/A	U
155	Ash Group ( <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> )	S/M	F	7.50	0.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	6	376	4.51	Multi-stemmed group suggesting prior cutting down and re-suckering. Specimen is mechanically poor but remains vigorous at present. Concerns exist regarding sustainability and potential for Chalara canker attack.		M	C2
156	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	F/P	8.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	1	306	3.67	Already exhibiting signs of twiggy decline within crown attributable to Dutch Elm disease.	Remove.	N/A	U

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
157	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	D	8.00	1.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	1	477	5.73	Completely dead, killed by Dutch Elm disease.	Remove.	N/A	U
158	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	D	8.00	1.00	2.50	1.50	3.00	2.50	1	398	4.77	Completely dead, killed by Dutch Elm disease.		N/A	U
159	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	E/M	D	10.00	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	462	5.54	Completely dead, killed by Dutch Elm disease.	Remove.	N/A	U
160	Ash ( <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> )	S/M	P	5.50	1.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	1	229	2.75	Distorted and compromised by chronic compression fork that is splitting.	Remove.	N/A	U
161	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	D	9.00	1.00	4.50	5.00	3.00	3.50	1	430	5.16	Completely dead, killed by Dutch Elm disease.		N/A	U
162	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	D	7.00	1.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	239	2.86	Killed by Dutch Elm disease.	Remove.	N/A	U
166	Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> )	S/M	D	7.00	1.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	229	2.75	Killed by Dutch Elm disease.	Remove.	N/A	U
167	Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> )	S	F	9.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1	229	2.75	Young and vigorous but arising from a disturbed hedge thicket and embankment.	Review regularly.	M	C2
1	White Poplar ( <i>Populus alba</i> )	E/M	G/F	17.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	462	5.54	Upright, young and vigorous. Supports satellite, secondary stem to north-east.	Review regularly.	L	B2
2	White Poplar ( <i>Populus alba</i> )	E/M	F	13.00	1.00	7.00	2.50	1.50	5.00	2	525	6.30	Young and vigorous, combining to directly adjoining stems combined to create a singular crown form.		M	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
3	White Poplar ( <i>Populus alba</i> )	S/M	F	7.00	1.00	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.50	1	216	2.60	Badly suppressed as result proximity to near neighbours but maintaining good vigour and vitality. Ivy is developing on primary stem.	Cut Ivy.	M	C2
4	White Poplar ( <i>Populus alba</i> )	S/M	F	6.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous but slightly suppressed by larger neighbours and supporting extent of Ivy cover.	Cut Ivy.	M	C2

<b>Tree Lines and Hedges</b>										
B1	Boundary 1 Hawthorn ( <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> ) Bramble ( <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> ) Elder ( <i>Sambucus nigra</i> ) Ivy ( <i>Hedera helix</i> ) Dog Rose ( <i>Rosa canina</i> ) Hazel ( <i>Corylus avellana</i> ) Field Maple ( <i>Acer campestre</i> )	M	G/F	2.00-5.00	0.00	<p>Effectively comprising a double row planting, separated by what appears to be a mounted bank, most notable to east and west. Southern alignment is strongest, still dominated by an original Hawthorn though becoming invaded by Elder, Field Maple, Hazel. Entire alignment appears to be associated with a raised corridor of mounded soil with a broadly dry ditch to the south. Most of the material encountered arises from the northern edge of the ditch and the southern edge of the mounded soil. There is additional, typically younger material arising from positions south of the ditch. The Hawthorn alignment is in broadly good condition notwithstanding variable continuity. It does comprise a substantial vegetative corridor when combined with Elder, Bramble and developing Blackthorn thicket, that is also developing, notably to the south of the group. Retention of the hedge would require effective conservation of the ditch and the adjoining embankment to the north. Current hedge dimensions are such as to present no tangible threat of harm though it is noted that the alignment supports a number of dead and previously collapsed trees, presumed to be of Elm killed by Dutch Elm disease.</p> <p>The raised mound, to the south of the ditch raises some queries with regard to history. Whilst wholly overwhelmed in developing growth, it would appear to be younger than the associated ditch and possibly associated with the prior grading of the adjoining lands to the south.</p> <p>There is a highly intermittent and by contrast minimal secondary alignment of hedge developing associated with the northern slope of the raised embankment. This effectively comprises circa 6 individual hawthorns with the greater continuity been provided for at a lower level by Bramble thicket. Note is made that the overall thicket affect extends from the southern edge of the ditch to circa 2.00 m beyond the northern edge of the embankment.</p>	L	B2		

B2	Boundary 2 Hawthorn ( <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> ) Bramble ( <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> ) Elder ( <i>Sambucus nigra</i> ) Ivy ( <i>Hedera helix</i> )	M	F	2.00-5.00	0.00	<p>This alignment is effectively a continuation of Boundary 1. The vegetation associated with this boundary exists in a position north of a notable but dry ditch and arising from the southern edge of a raised embankment located to the north of the ditch thereby creating an “S” profile landform. The original Hawthorn is in broadly good condition but is intermittent with numerous gaps. Some gaps have been filled by Elder and at lower levels, Bramble thicket is nearly continuous. Retention of the hedge will be intrinsically linked with the retention or otherwise of the ditch and embankment from which they arise.</p> <p>Where this hedge is directly adjoined by ongoing development works to the south, it is noted that much of the ditch has undergone partial and varying degrees of disturbance.</p>	L	C2
B3	Boundary 3 Hawthorn ( <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> ) Elder ( <i>Sambucus nigra</i> ) Dog Rose ( <i>Rosa canina</i> ) Bramble ( <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> ) Ivy ( <i>Hedera helix</i> )	M	F/P	3.00-6.00	0.00	<p>Boundary 3 is effectively a continuation of Boundary 2. In comparison to boundaries 1 and 2, this boundary, though a continuation of both, is of reduced quality and continuity. There remains a number of individual hawthorns at dispersed locations, enough to suggest the original alignment however, these are often 20 m apart with a vegetative corridor comprising little more than Bramble thicket with some elder, in between.</p>	L	C2

B4	Boundary 4 Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> ) Hawthorn ( <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> ) Wych Elm ( <i>Ulmus glabra</i> ) Bramble ( <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> ) Ivy ( <i>Hedera helix</i> ) Elder ( <i>Sambucus nigra</i> )	E/M	F/P	3.00-7.00	0.00	Boundary 4 is effectively a short, isolated extension of Boundary 3. In comparison to previous boundaries, it is of reduced quality and continuity. It has been encroached upon by the new road to the south and suppressed by thicket development to the north.	M	C2
TA1	Thicket Area 1 Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> ) Ash ( <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> ) Elder ( <i>Sambucus nigra</i> ) Bramble ( <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> ) Ivy ( <i>Hedera helix</i> ) Hawthorn ( <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> )	E/M	F/P	2.00-7.00	0.00	A heavily overgrown area of this apparent and broken ground conditions. The area appears to be disturbed history but has been subject to extensive thicket development and regrowth. The area supports little material of value with all elms being affected by Dutch Elm disease and the remaining small ash and Sycamore being of typically mediocre to poor quality. The southern edge of the area retains a short section of poor-quality hedging though this appears to have been encroached upon by previous development works as well as the broader thicket development to the north. Some individual plants including some of the Ash and Sycamore as well as some Hawthorn within the broader group may prove suitable for retention however it is envisaged that extensive replacement planting will be required.	L	C2

<p>Area of Regeneration Pedunculate Oak (<i>Quercus robur</i>) Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>) Blackthorn (<i>Prunus spinosa</i>) Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>) Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) Whitebeam (<i>Sorbus aria</i>) Goat Willow (<i>Salix caprea</i>) Buddleia (<i>Buddleia davidii</i>)</p>	<p>S- S/M</p>	<p>G/F</p>	<p>1.00-4.00</p>	<p>0.00-0.50</p>	<p>In this variably dispersed area of natural regeneration, Pedunculate Oak is by far the most numerous species. Whitebeam, Ash, Hawthorn and Blackthorn have been noted at much lesser levels with a few individual Silver Birch and Goat Willow. A clear majority of these trees arise from random positions with no realistic evidence to suggest artificial planting. Accordingly, natural processes including windblown seed and or bird disbursed of seed are considered most likely. Regarding the Pedunculate Oak population, there is a high likelihood that the tree numbers and dispersal of the Oak across on the site may relate to Jay-drop. This occurs when Jays (<i>Garrulus glandarius</i>) habitually store collected acorns across nearby lands. This may explain why the naturalised but non-native Pedunculate Oak population might relate to see dispersal by Jays from the nearby Tyrrelstown House woodland to the north of the site area. As yet, all trees encountered are young and typically of small stature. In line with their young age, a clear majority are in good condition and would offer substantial sustainability within the right context. In this respect, many trees arise from uneven and broken ground, others have arisen in dense groups of close beside existing structure (roads, paths). Accordingly, their sustainability will be dependent upon their retention context and the degree of disturbance/modification required to achieve that context. It must also be appreciated that the trees while small at present, offer varying potential for growth, with the Oaks having the potential to attain more than 20 metres in height at maturity. Note should be made that this group has been classified as category “C”. This does not imply that the trees are of poor quality (though some are), but moreover that they can be regarded as being of limited constraint to development because of the ease with which they can be replaced.</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>C2</p>
---	-------------------	------------	------------------	------------------	--	----------	-----------