

Arboricultural Report Trees at Proposed Development Former Techrete Site Dublin Road Howth Co Dublin November 2019 The Tree File Ltd Consulting Arborists Ashgrove House Kill Avenue Dun Laoghaire Co Dublin 01-2804839

Contents

| Page | Subject |
|------|---|
| | |
| 1 | Report Summary |
| 3 | Introduction |
| | Survey and Impact Assessment Brief |
| 4 | Appendix 1 - The Survey |
| | Nature of Survey and Report |
| | Drawing Reference |
| | Site Description |
| 5 | Survey Data Collection and Methodology |
| 6 | Survey Key and Explanations |
| 7 | Tree Protection and Management within Scope |
| 8 | Table 1 - Tree Survey Table |

This report should be read in conjunction with the "Tree Constraints Plan" drawing "D1-TCP-Howth-11-19"

Report Summary, Findings and Recommendations

<u>Summary</u>

Considering significant contextual and sustainability issues it is advised that no attempt be made at retaining the sites existing tree population, in favour of the development of a new, design led and sustainable planting scheme.

Site Tree Review

The tree survey has found a diverse population of trees concerning context and health. Many trees are of poor quality because of health or defect and therefore are not suitable for retention. Many other trees are of better health but are compromised by their current context, growing at positions close too or often in contact with existing structures and surfaces, where their retention and future growth will inevitably result in structural damage. Other trees, such as the group of Leyland Cypress, are considered unsustainable because of species-typical management issues that see them broadly regarded as unsuitable for use or retention within a developed context. Also, a notable proportion of the review population remains small enough to allow for relatively simple replacement with new stock.

The tree survey has included a review of the existing roadside trees running along the roadside boundary of the site. These tend to include Norway Maple and Whitebeam as the predominant species, arising from very a narrow grass verge between the roadway and a cement footpath. At its widest, the grass verge is circa 1.10 m wide that reduces to circa 600mm as one progresses in an easterly direction. Such a scenario where trees planted within the verge are arising from a highly restricted area, and in some instances, growth has already resulted in distortion of the footpath surface. In other instances, the footpath surface has been encroached upon and indeed enveloped by growth. Considering the species involved and their potential for growth, then sustainability is considered wholly impaired, with the integrity of the existing footpath already being undermined. Such proximity issues are as expected and advised by Table "A1" of BS5837:2012 that cautions regarding the installation of planting new trees close to "lightly laden structures".

Accordingly, and while poor health means that a proportion of these trees are unsuitable for retention, equally important is the fact that while others are of good health, they are not sustainable over the longer-term.

The disused factory areas revealed varying Arboricultural issues. Some of the trees offer notable visual significance relative to the road corridor; however, no trees reviewed were considered sustainable or indeed suitable for retention. Examples of this would relate to "Tree Line 1", its composition of Leyland Cypress and management issues that inevitably attached to this species. This tree line, though remaining healthy at present is not sustainable beyond the short-term, and indeed evidence at the easternmost end of the line suggests that through failure, the alignment could already present a tangible threat.

Many trees arise from constrained locations. Particularly, tree Nos 28 to 46 arise from positions in extreme proximity to the existing roadside boundary walls, where future growth will inevitably result in damage/disruption of the existing structure and is likely to result in disturbance of the existing footpath. Equally, the inevitable removal or replacement of the wall will unavoidably disturb the trees.

Elsewhere, the remaining vegetation is considered spurious and small-scale, typically arising as a result of non-management of the open areas or buildings. Such material is typically of such small sizes as to be irrelevant in respect of retention.

Tree Sustainability

In line with the above notes, it is advised that little of the material encountered on the site can be regarded as sustainable. Most is already compromised by its existing context and proximity to features that will be damaged through ongoing tree growth. Equally, the demolition, removal or disturbance of adjoining features will fundamentally disturb the existing trees. Therefore, and in consideration of the immense sizes as might be attained in time by some of the noted individuals, it is advised that the existing trees are neither sustainable nor suitable for retention from the existing context into a new and design led context.

Development Implications

The proposed development will occur at a site bounded to the south by the Howth Road, to the east by a private dwelling, to the north by the DART line, and to the west by Local Authority lands. The site incorporates the former Techrete manufacturing facility, the former Beshoff's Motors showroom, and the former Howth Garden Centre.

The proposed development will include the demolition of all structures on site (c.8,162sqm GFA) and excavation of a basement. The proposed development comprises of the provision of a mixed use development of residential, retail/restaurant/cafe uses and a creche in 4 no. blocks (A to D), over part basement. Blocks A, B, C and D with a height up to a maximum of seven storeys of apartments over lower ground floor and basement car parking levels (a total of eight storeys over basement level). The residential component will consist of 512 no. residential units. The proposed development includes the provision of two vehicular entrances on to Howth Road, excavation of basement to provide for car parking, plant, waste storage and ancillary use. Additional car parking spaces shall be provided at lower ground floor level. A total of 439 no. car parking spaces and 1,335 no. bicycle parking spaces, including 49 no. bicycle spaces to cater for the retail units and creche shall be provided. One vehicular access is located at Block A, serving car parking spaces. The second is at Block C, providing access to the basement, residential and retail parking, and a service area for the retail units. A service route will be provided along part of the northern perimeter of the site with access from the western end of the site at a junction with Howth Road and at the main vehicular entrance at Block C;

A publicly accessible walkway/cycleway to the north of the site shall be provided at podium level. A civic plaza will be provided between Blocks D and C, and a landscaped park to the west of Block A. A channel to the sea for the Bloody Stream with associated riparian strip shall be incorporated as a feature within a designed open space between Blocks A and B. Communal gardens will be provided for Blocks A, B and C;

The residential component consists of 512 no. residential units, which includes 4 no. studio, 222 no. one bed, 276 no. two bed, 10 no. three bed apartments, and communal facilities of 708 sqm. Ground floor units onto the Howth Road will have own door access. The units will be served by balconies or terraces on all elevations;

Block A, with a maximum height of seven storeys of apartments over lower ground level car park (a total of eight storeys), will provide for 234 residential units, with residents' amenities to include a gym, residents' lounge, residents' support office, and 2 no. residents' multi-purpose rooms. Block B, with a maximum height of seven storeys of apartments over lower ground floor and basement car park (a total of eight storeys over basement), shall provide for 154 no. units, residents' lounge, residents' multi-purpose room, and creche of 236 sqm with outdoor play area. Own door access will be provided at ground floor. Block C, with a maximum height of seven storeys over basement car parking (a total of seven storeys) will provide for 83 no. residential units in two wings over a retail unit and Block D, with a maximum of 6 storeys over basement, shall provide for 41 no. residential units over retail units;

The commercial component in Blocks C and D consists of 4 no. units with 2,637 sqm gross floor area. In Block C, it consists of a 1,705 sqm anchor unit, accessed from the civic plaza. In Block D, it consists of a restaurant (243 sqm) and retail unit (603 sqm) and café (86 sqm). The restaurant and retail units are accessed from Howth Road, and the café is accessed from the upper level of the civic plaza.

The proposed development includes the provision of public and communal open space, green roofs, landscaping, boundary treatments, set down locations, substations, meter rooms, waste management and all ancillary site works, including upgrading of the public paths along Howth Road and relocation of bus stop in new setback with a bus shelter. Two set down areas are provided at either end of the site;

The gross floor area of the proposed development is 48,252 sqm (excluding enclosed car parking) on a site of 2.68 ha.

Considering the scale of the development as outlined above, together with the notes tree quality and sustainability issues, it is advised that tree retention from the current context is not attempted, in favour of design led replacement planting. Therefore, the principal Arboricultural implication of the development can be viewed as both positive and negative, in that it will inherently require the loss of all existing trees, but will at the same time allow for the existing contextual issues to be addressed by the creation of a new, design led and sustainable tree population.

Recommendations

If permission is granted for development at this site, it is advised that the existing, compromised tree population is not considered for retention. Instead, it is advised that, in conjunction with a new, context and design led landscape scheme incorporate the installation of new trees.

It is advised that such plantings appreciate the scale and context of the proposed development and equally appreciated issues relating to sustainable tree retention, incorporating designed and engineered tree plantings possibly incorporating the use of structural soils or engineered tree pits.

Arboricultural Limitations

Considering the above, the inclusion of standard "Arboricultural Implication Assessment" and "Tree Protection Plan" are considered irrelevant in this instance. In respect of this, attention will be drawn directly to the project landscape details as provided by "Paul Hogarth Landscape Architecture"

This report was commissioned by Atlas GP Ltd.

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

<u>Report Brief</u>

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.

This tree report should be read in conjunction with the combined tree constraints and basic impacts plan drawing "D1-TCP-Howth-11-19". This drawing provides a graphic representation of the tree survey depicting the constraints of those trees potentially affected by work as well as categorisation their condition and potential value. 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 quantification of sustainable trees within any proposed development.

Report Context

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.

Report Limitations

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.

<u>Appendix 1 – Tree Survey</u>

Nature of Survey

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 and a brief resume of the typical application of Tree Protection measures as defined within the above standard and as relates to the "RPA" zones defined both within the survey table and on the "TCP" drawing.

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 suitability for retention.

Drawing References

The survey should be read in conjunction with drawing "D1-TCP-Howth-11-19" regarding the representation of tree positions, crown forms, "RPA" extents and colour reference to category systems. Where tree positions were not indicated on the supplied drawing, their positions may have been given "sketched" locations within "D1-TCP-Howth-11-19". 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.

Each tree is represented by a coloured circle, 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 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

Intention of this document is to highlight the extent and nature of material of Arboricultural interest on the site in question, notwithstanding the fact that none will be retained.

Site Description

The site in question is located between the DART line and the Dublin Road into Howth village. The site tends to be long and narrow.

Much of the site is industrial in nature, comprising disused factory and/or commercial buildings and hard standing, with an existing local authority services yard to the south of the site centre and an existing public park comprising the southern portion of the site.

The sites tree population tends to relate mostly to the public park and to the roadside edge of the main site.

Survey Data Collection and Methodology

The Survey

The primary survey was carried out in January of 2019. This survey is <u>not</u> an Implication Assessment though but provided some of the basic information regarding its compilation. The survey has been undertaken under the recommendations of BS 5837: 2012. This survey includes only tree of a stem diameter exceeding 150mm at approximately 1.50 metres from ground level. The survey relates to current site conditions, setting and context.

Identification

Each of the trees described within the text has been affixed with a consecutively numbered, alloy disk that relates directly to the survey text, positioned at approximately 1.50m from ground level.

Measurements

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 trees size and form. Whilst efforts are made to maintain accuracy, visual obstruction, especially regarding trees in groups, requires that some tree dimensions are estimated only.

Inspection and Evaluation Limitations and Disclaimers

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.

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 and 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 proposes will render the information invalid.

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.

Trees are living organisms whose health, condition and safety can change rapidly. It would be recommended that any trees (if retained) should be re-evaluated regarding their condition on an annual basis or after substantial trauma such a storm event, other damage or injury. It is advised that 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.

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

Seasonality

The survey was commenced during the winter period. 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.

<u>Survey Key</u>

| Species | Refers to the specific tree species |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Age | 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 |
| C-Ht | Lowest canopy height |
| FSB | Level of First Significant Branch |
| Sp: R | Tree Canopy Spread measured by radii at north, east, south and west |
| Dia | Stem diameter at approx. 1.50m from ground level. |
| RPA Con | Root Protection Area, as a radius measured from the tree's stem centre. 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 |
| Structural Condition | Information on structural form, defects, damage, injury or disease supported by the tree |
| Management | While normally making management recommendations, this project will see the removal of all material and so this column simply reiterates that fact. |
| Retention Period | |
| 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 |
| Category System | 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 irremediable. |
| 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 note 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 Sub-Category 3 | Mainly cumulative landscape values such as woods, groups, avenues, lines. Mainly cultural values such as conservation, commemorative or historical links. |

Table 1 – Tree Data Table

| No. | Species | Age | Con | Ht | СН | N | E | S | W | Stm | Dia | RPA | Structural Condition | PMR | Yrs | Cat |
|-----|--|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|---|---|-----|-----|
| 9 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S | F | 4.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1 | 68 | 1.07 | young and vigorous arising from limited planting configuration. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 10 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | F | 5.00 | 2.00 | 1.50 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 1 | 207 | 2.48 | Young and vigorous, arising regarding sustainability over time. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 11 | Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) | E/M | G/F | 6.00 | 2.00 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 1 | 376 | 4.51 | Young and still vigorous. Buttress growth has already enveloped footpath surface with major buttress roots within confined space raising concerns regarding sustainability over time review regularly. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 12 | Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) | E/M | F | 6.50 | 2.25 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 1 | 290 | 3.48 | one-sided and typically unbalanced to South. Arises from limited configuration with major buttress root growth adjoining and above pavement level regularly. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 13 | Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) | E/M | F | 5.50 | 2.25 | 1.00 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 1.50 | 1 | 251 | 3.02 | notably unbalanced to because of suppression by adjoining cypresses. Arises from limited plenty integration raising concerns regarding sustainability over time. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 14 | Rowan (Sorbus aucuparia) | S/M | D | 5.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 4.50 | 0.00 | 1 | 140 | 1.68 | dead and subject to widespread decay. Remove immediately. | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |
| 15 | Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) | E/M | F | 5.50 | 2.25 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 1 | 309 | 3.71 | One-sided and typically unbalanced to south. Buttress growth appears to partially enveloped pavement surface. Arises from limited planting configuration. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |

| No. | Species | Age | Con | Ht | СН | Ν | E | S | W | Stm | Dia | RPA | Structural Condition | PMR | Yrs | Cat |
|-----|--|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|--|---|-----|-----|
| 16 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | F/P | 3.50 | 2.00 | 0.20 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 1 | 70 | 0.84 | Heavily suppressed and unlikely to survive in position beneath. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 17 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | Р | 5.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 0.70 | 1.00 | 1 | 185 | 2.22 | Has sustained catastrophic damage to lower eastern stem presumably by way of vehicular collision. Stem is unbalanced to east. | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |
| 18 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S | F | 4.00 | 2.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1 | 121 | 1.45 | A recent installation. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 19 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides | S | F | 4.00 | 2.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1 | 127 | 1.53 | A recent installation. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 20 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | F | 5.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 4.00 | 1 | 99 | 1.18 | Heavily suppressed because of position beneath canopy of adjoining Elm stop arise from limited planting configuration. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | C2 |
| 21 | Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) | E/M | F | 5.50 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1 | 191 | 2.29 | Arises from limited planting configurations raising concern regarding sustainability over time. | Will be removed as part of development works. | M | B2 |
| 22 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | F | 4.00 | 2.00 | 0.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 4.00 | 1 | 121 | 1.45 | Vigorous, arising from limited planting configuration. Suppressed because of position beneath adjoining Sycamore. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | C2 |
| 23 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | G/F | 4.50 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 1 | 80 | 0.95 | Young and vigorous but arising from limited planting configuration with exposed buttress roots. May be of limited sustainability. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 24 | Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) | E/M | F | 5.50 | 2.25 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 1 | 274 | 3.29 | Young and still vigorous. Arises from particularly limited verge width with extensive buttress root growth enveloping kerb edge. Pavement disturbance and disruption is already evident. Tree is considered unsustainable. | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |

| No. | Species | Age | Con | Ht | СН | N | E | S | W | Stm | Dia | RPA | Structural Condition | PMR | Yrs | Cat |
|-----|--|-----|-----|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|--|---|-----|-----|
| 25 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | G/F | 6.00 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 1 | 267 | 3.21 | Young and vigorous but arising from limited planting configuration. May be of limited sustainability. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 26 | Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) | М | F | 6.50 | 2.25 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 1 | 350 | 4.20 | Arising from limited Atlantic integration with buttress root development adjoining and enveloping paving. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 27 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | F | 5.50 | 1.75 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 1 | 207 | 2.48 | Young and vigorous, arising from limited and constrained planter configurations. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 28 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F | 6.50 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.00 | 1 | 216 | 2.60 | Heavily cut in past. Arises from position in contact with wall base. Local wall damage is likely to be attributable to tree growth. Tree is wholly unsustainable at this location. | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |
| 29 | Sycamore Group (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | Р | 7.00 | 0.00 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 2 | 267 | 3.21 | 2 stems arise from position adjoining wall. Growth will see damage to wall. Tree is considered unsustainable. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 30 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | F | 7.00 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1 | 258 | 3.09 | Previously damaged. Is distorted as result of suppression. Position adjoining wall will see damage to wall structure over time. Sustainability is limited. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 31 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | E/M | F | 10.00 | 1.00 | 4.50 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 4.50 | 1 | 398 | 4.77 | Young and still vigorous. Has sustained notable damage to northern side of lower stem. Tree directly adjoins wall in position close to structural wall damage. Tree is considered unsustainable beyond immediate short-term. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 32 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F/P | 7.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 1 | 398 | 4.77 | Of distorted growth profile. Arises from position where stem is already in contact with wall. Sustainability is minimal. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |

| No | o. Species | Age | Con | Ht | CH | N | E | S | W | Stm | Dia | RPA | Structural Condition | PMR | Yrs | Cat |
|----|--|-----|-----|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|---|---|-----|-----|
| 3. | 3 Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F | 8.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 1 | 248 | 2.98 | One-sided and unbalanced to east. Arises from position where stem is already in contact with wall. Tree is of minimal sustainability. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 34 | 4 Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F | 8.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 4.00 | 2.50 | 2 | 229 | 2.75 | Distorted a multi-stemmed. Arising from position where stem is already in contact with wall. Tree is unsustainable beyond extreme short- term. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 3: | 5 Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | F/P | 7.50 | 1.50 | 2.50 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 4.50 | 1 | 261 | 3.13 | Heavily distorted and exhibiting evidence of early life damage to lower stem. Arises from position close to wall where structural damage is already evident on likely to relate to tree growth. | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |
| 30 | 5 Wych Elm (Ulmus glabra) | E/M | G/F | 10.00 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 1 | 417 | 5.00 | A young and vigorous specimen affected by substantial wounding to lower stem on northern side. Tree directly adjoins existing wall that shows evidence of growth-related structural damage. Tree will be subject to possible attack by Dutch Elm disease. Tree is considered of minimal sustainability. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 3 | 7 Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F/P | 7.00 | 1.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.50 | | 226 | 2.71 | Badly distorted and exhibiting evidence of lower stem damage. Position adjoining boundary wall raises sustainability issues in respect of likely wall damage. Tree has been compromised by prior removal of secondary stem at ground level to east that is now subject to decay. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 3 | 3 Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F/P | 7.00 | 1.75 | 3.00 | 4.50 | 3.00 | 0.00 | - | 229 | 2.75 | Heavily unbalanced to east. Lower stem is subject to notable decay. | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |

| No. | Species | Age | Con | Ht | CH | Ν | E | S | W | Stm | Dia | RPA | Structural Condition | PMR | Yrs | Cat |
|-----|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|--|---|-----|-----|
| 39 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F | 7.00 | 1.75 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 1 | 226 | 2.71 | Distorted as result of suppression and affected by lower stem wounding. Trees proximity to wall appears to have resulted in structural damage. Tree is of minimal sustainability. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 40 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F | 8.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 2 | 376 | 4.51 | To adjoining stems, arise from position close to boundary wall. Position is considered unsustainable beyond immediate short-term. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 41 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | E/M | F | 11.0 | 2.25 | 4.50 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 | 1 | 369 | 4.43 | Chronically suppressed by proximity of adjoining Cypress line. Tree supports minor imbalance to south. Tree arises raised ground levels relative to road with light retaining structure within 200 mm to south of stem face. Poor quality and what appear to be limited sustainability suggest minimal suitability for retention. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 42 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F | 6.00 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 1.50 | 1 | 283 | 3.40 | Appears to be naturally arising from derelict structures and surfaces. Is of dubious retention merit. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 43 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S | Р | 3.50 | 0.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 1 | 185 | 2.22 | Appears to be naturally arising from derelict structures and surfaces. Is of dubious retention merit. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 44 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | Р | 7.00 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 1 | 280 | 3.36 | In particularly poor state with large proportion of stem subject to bark necrosis. Crown structure is almost totally belt within adjoining cypress line. Is unsuitable for retention | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |
| 45 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | S/M | Р | 6.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 1 | 216 | 2.60 | In a state of chronic decline with extensive bark damage in chronic suppression of crown. Unsuitable for retention. | Will be removed as part of development works. | N/A | U |

| No. | Species | Age | Con | Ht | СН | Ν | E | S | W | Stm | Dia | RPA | Structural Condition | PMR | Yrs | Cat |
|-------|--|-----|-----|-------|------|------|------|------|------|----------|-----|------|---|---|-----|-----|
| 46 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | E/M | G/F | 11.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 1 | 899 | 8.02 | Apparently vigorous and of typically good form. Basal region supports numerous low-level suckers. Vigour and vitality remain reasonable though salt related wind scorch and is evident. Proximity to existing boundary wall may raise issues regarding growth potential. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 47abc | Common Alder (Alnus glutinosa) | S/M | F | 5.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1 | 175 | 2.10 | 3 adjoining and contiguous crowned plants apparently naturally arising from on top of spoil heap. I considered to be of dubious retention merit. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 48 | Silver Birch (Betula pendula) | E/M | F | 5.00 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.50 | – | 216 | 2.60 | Distorted and unbalanced but of good vigour arises from sloping embankment of spoil heap. | Will be removed as part of development works. | М | B2 |
| 49 | Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F | 5.50 | 0.50 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 1 | 261 | 3.13 | A small squat specimen directly adjoining wall footing. Future growth will result in wall damage. Tree is of limited sustainability. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |
| 49a | Sycamore Group (Acer pseudoplatanus) | S/M | F/P | 5.50 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1 | 398 | 4.77 | Close-knit group of plants (possibly 3 individuals) in close-proximity to one another arising from spoil heap trees close to wall will result in wall damage. | Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |

| Tree | e Lines and Hedges | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--|-----|-----|-------------|------|-----------------------|-----|------|--|---|----|
| H1 | Leyland Cypress (Cuppressocyparis leylandii) | E/M | F/P | 14.00-16.00 | 3.00 | Spread 8.00-10.00m | 382 | 4.58 | Alignment supports one emergent Ash, two emergent Norway Maple, a small emergent Sycamore and a larger Sycamore dealt with individually within the main survey. A cohesive group apparently installed and intended as a hedge line but now outgrown. All individuals appear to show growth distortions at circa 2.00 m suggesting an original intent and hedging at or about this level. Most of higher crown is now multi-stemmed. Many specimens, particularly those towards the eastern end of the alignment are subject to storm damage with evidence of entire trees having failed to the east of the current alignment end. The growth potential for the species in line with their current proximity to the existing boundary wall is considered unsustainable with inevitable likelihood of structural damage to the wall. The species natural predispositions and management related problems mean that management within the current outgrown scenario is not practicable or feasible. Accordingly, the alignment is advised as being unsustainable and unsuitable for retention in a roadside position. Will be removed as part of development works. | S | C2 |