LAND PLANNING & DESIGN

CUNNANE STRATTON REYNOLDS

TREE SURVEY

R617 Proposed Realignment,
Blarney,
Co Cork.

July 2026

BLR-2-02-XX-XX-RP-CSR-TR-002

CUNNANE STRATTON REYNOLDS
LAND PLANNING & DESIGN
www.csrlandplan.ie

CONTENTS

Summary

1. Introduction

2. Description of Existing Trees

3. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4. Recommendations – AMS

Limitations & References

Appendix 1: Tree Survey Schedule

SUMMARY

This report presents an inspection record of existing trees located along the southern side of the R617 road as it approached Blarney, which is proposed for realignment.

Trees have been surveyed as individuals or tree groups in accordance with *BS 5837 (2012) "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction".* The site tree survey was undertaken on 3rd July 2026 by Cunnane Stratton Reynolds arborist;

Keith Mitchell Diploma Arboriculture (Level 4)
Technician Member Arboricultural Association (UK)
Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (International Society of Arboriculture)
MA(Hons) Landscape Architecture
Member of the Irish Landscape Institute
Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (UK)
Diploma EIA Management

This survey and report are based on the topographic site survey information supplied.

A full survey record is presented in Appendix 1, together with accompanying drawings Tree Constraints Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-104, Arboricultural Impact Assessment Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-105 and Tree Protection Plan Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-106. After introducing the terms of reference and the methodology of the survey, the report summarises the survey findings in an overview of the existing tree cover adjacent to the existing R617 road alignment

A total of twenty-six individual trees, one tree group and one hedgerow were recorded within or adjacent to the proposed road alignment. It is proposed to remove one hundred and three individual trees to facilitate the road realignment, (one hundred and one of which are considered of low arboricultural value).

Every effort has been made to access all trees for inspection, however where site conditions prevent full physical access, some measurements may be visually estimated. Where trees are heavily obscured by existing ivy growth a best assessment is made however this must considered preliminary until full visual access is available.

The report concludes with recommendations for protection measures to ensure the conservation of retention trees during the proposed development.

1. INTRODUCTION

Terms of Reference

Cunnane Stratton Reynolds (CSR) were instructed to undertake a tree survey, to inform the design team of a proposed road realignment.

CSR undertook a site survey and considered those trees that might potentially be impacted by the proposed road realignment and produced a subsequent tree survey report presenting our findings, together with recommendations for their best practice management in relation to the proposed development.

This involved a survey of the principal trees / tree groups concerned in accordance with BS 5837 (2012).

Documents supplied to CSR for purposes of conducting a tree survey include:

- Topographic Survey Dwg
- Engineers Proposed Road Layout Dwg

Site Inspection & Methodology

The site was surveyed on 3rd July 2026 by a qualified Arborist. A visual inspection from the ground was performed on all relevant existing trees / tree groups on site. Where access allowed principal individual trees were examined, with critical measurements taken and observations made.

A description was recorded of each tree, their species, age class, all relevant measured dimensions (height, stem diameter, crown spread radii and crown clearance height) and an assessment of the tree health / vitality, structural form, life expectancy and quality categorisation. Any recommended remedial works required were outlined. Hedgerows and significant tree groups within/bounding the site are subject to group description and assessment, in accordance with BS 5837 (2012).

The findings of the survey are recorded and presented in this Tree Survey Report and Tree Schedule (Appendix 1). A Tree Classification and Constraints drawing was produced to inform the design process. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Proposals were considered in relation to the proposed scheme.

This report is subject to the scope and limitations as given at the end of the report.

Accompanying Drawings

The tree survey report should be read in conjunction with;

- Tree Classification & Constraints (Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-104).
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-105).
- Tree Protection (Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-106).

A1 size colour coded drawings accompany this report, (monochrome drawings should not be relied upon). These drawings are based upon the topographical drawings supplied to CSR.

2. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING TREES

Site Location

2.1 The survey area is the section of the R617 road between Castle Close Lawn junction to the west and Killard Road, (between yellow arrows Fig 1).



Figure 1: Low resolution satellite image of approximate tree survey area in red (courtesy of Google Earth).

This section of the R617 has a more or less continuous tree group along its southern edge.

The vast majority of which are mature Sitka Spruce, (but there are also a smaller number of Leyland Cypress and Monterey Cypress, which are located along the southern edge of the tree group next to the adjoining fields to the south), constituting Tree Group 1.

These trees are non-native coniferous evergreen species, which were likely planted for their screening value. Most have now reached close to their maximum potential size and many are relatively poor condition, with a significant number dead or in decline, while others have been storm damaged or partially or fully blown over.

Amongst these non-native coniferous evergreen species, are a small number of primarily native deciduous trees, (these have been individually tagged).

Their location, size and quality category may be reviewed with reference to the accompanying Tree Survey Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-104 and the tree survey (Appendix 1).

2.2 Photographic Summary of Trees Surveyed



T2381



T2382



T2383



T2384



T2385



T2386



T2387



T45



Tree Group 1 (Sitka Spruce)



Tree Group 1 (Cupressus Leylandii)



Tree Group 1 - Uplifted root plate due to windthrow.



Tree Group 1 - Fallen dead trees



Tree Group 1- windblown trees





Tree Group 1- windblown trees



T2530 & T2529



T2528



T2527



T2526



T2524



T2523 to T2519



T2518



T2516 & T2517

2.3 The trees present are primarily non-native coniferous evergreen trees composed primarily of Sitka Spruce but also with Leyland Cypress and Monterey Cypress present. Many of the Leyand & Monterey Cypress are storm damaged. Many of the Sitka Spruce are in decline or close to the later stages of their useful lifespan. Some Sitka Spruce have also been fully or partially blown over.

In addition there are a small number of native deciduous trees, primarily located at the eastern and western end of the proposed road realignment scheme.

The age profile varies from young to over mature. The majority of trees are non-native evergreens conifers which are of low value. A small number are mature Oak of high value are present and should be prioritized for retention.

Trees generally become more valuable as collective groups, than they might be when considered solely as individuals in isolation - a grouping or woodland being generally of significant visual and ecological value. As such it should be noted that the cumulative value of evaluated Tree Groups often reflects an increased catergorised value than might be awarded to the constituent trees if they were assessed in isolation as individuals.

3. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.1 This section discusses the potential impact of the proposed development on the existing tree cover on site and considers the need for mitigation measures, in accordance with BS 5837 (2012), for sustainable development.

3.2 Category 'U' trees are recommended for immediate removal, (fell or monolith to safe height), on general management grounds, irrespective of site development – no such trees were identified within the site during this survey.

Direct Loss of Trees

3.3 The proposed development layout seeks to retain and incorporate as many trees as possible, however there are some conflicts which will necessitate loss of some trees.

The proposed scheme is currently in direct conflict with forty individual trees, making their retention unviable in the context of the proposed development, details of which can be seen in table below.

Tag No	Tree Species	Tree Class	Number of trees
TG1	Sitka Spruce (Picea sitchensis)	C1	Approx' 100
T2921	Oak (Quercus robur)	A1	1
T2523	Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)	B1	1
T2522	Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)	C1	1

Indirect Impacts

3.4 Cognisance must also be given to indirect impacts - in particular care must be taken to ensure the proposed development and ancillary works do not represent an unacceptable conflict with the calculated 'Root Protection Area' of the existing trees proposed for retention.

Disturbance of 'Root Protection Area' may just as readily kill or destabilise a tree over time, by means of root damage/severance and or earth compaction/covering preventing essential transfer of water, air and nutrients to roots.

Good planning and site management therefore will be required during construction works to ensure these areas are not adversely impacted by construction activities. It is important that the site manager carefully review the tree protection drawing Dwg BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-106, prior to commencement of works on site and raise any queries prior to commencement of works.

The use of tree protection fencing to exclude construction access to root protection areas of trees and hedgerows identified for retention, as illustrated in tree protection drawing Dwg BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-106, will be critical to avoiding detrimental impacts and the long-term viability of the retained trees. Proposed tree protection measures should be in place from the outset prior to the commencement of works. Any queries should be raised with the project Arborist prior to commencement of works on site.

Provided proper tree protection measures are adhered to it is not anticipated that any further trees will require removal due to indirect impacts.

It is however suggested that the removal of all Sitka Spruce is considered as an option, partly due to their relatively low arboricultural and ecological value, but also due to the unpredictability of their long term stability - particularly following the removal of other surrounding trees. A program of replanting of native trees would readily mitigate their loss in the medium to long term.

Additional Considerations

3.5 Scrub and tree removal should take place outside the bird nesting season (1st March – 31st August).

Summary

3.6 Table 1 illustrates trees to be removed and their classification.

Table 1.

Tree Class	**Trees proposed for removal**
A Class Trees	1
B Class Trees	1
C Class Trees	101
U Class Trees	0
TOTAL	**103**

Tree Protection

3.7 Adequate protection and so successful retention of those trees to be retained within the land take area, will be achieved by rigidly excluding all construction activities from tree root protection areas by fit for purpose barriers/fencing.

3.8 Tree Protection Areas (TPAs) are proposed, as indicated on accompanying Tree Protection Plan (Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-106). Protective fence line locations and details for these fences are also illustrated on the plan.

Services

3.9 Any services that are planned as part of this project must also avoid designated ‘Root Protection Area’ of tree / tree groups for retention.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS – Arboricultural Method Statement

Recommendations for the specific measures advised regarding management of the trees in relation to this development are detailed within Appendix 1. These recommendations should inform, and be referred to in, the method statements submitted for approval prior to commencement by the responsible building/engineering and landscape contractors whose works (subject to grant of permission) will affect retained trees and the Tree Protection Areas.

1. Tree Works.

Subject to the required permissions removal / felling works as specified on Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-105, should be performed prior to project commencement, by reputable contractors in accordance with BS 3998:2010 and current best practice. (Removal of scrub vegetation and ivy clearance should be performed outside of the bird nesting season (1st March – 31st Aug). Tree felling should be preceded by a competent assessment as to the presence of any protected wildlife species, where required specialist advice should be sought if necessary).

2. Protective Fencing.

Protective fencing (barriers) should be erected in the positions and alignments as indicated on the Tree Protection Plan (Dwg No BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-CSR-TR-106) and signed off by the project arborist or landscape architect prior to commencement of works. Fencing should be in accordance with BS 5837:2012 unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority. Commencement of development should not be permitted without adequate protective fencing being in place. This fencing, enclosing the minimum tree protection areas indicated, must be installed prior to any plant, vehicle or machinery access on site. Fencing should be signed 'Tree Protection Area – No Construction Access'. Fencing is not to be taken down or re-positioned without written approval of the project Arborist. No excavation, plant or vehicle movement, materials handling or soil storage is to be permitted within the fenced tree protection areas indicated on plan.

3. Monitoring & Compliance

A professionally qualified Arborist or Landscape Architect is recommended to be consulted as required by the principal contractor or developer to monitor compliance. It is advised that tree protection fencing, any required special engineering and supervision works etc. must be included / itemised in the main contractor tender document, including responsibility for the installation, costs and maintenance of tree protection measures throughout all construction phases.

Copies of the Tree Survey and all accompanying drawings, a copy of BS 5837:2012 and NJUG 4 (2007)*'Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees'* should all be kept available on site by the contractor during development. All works are to be in accordance with these documents

Limitations and Scope of this Survey Report

This report covers only those trees individually inspected, (shown on the 'Tree Survey Drawings' and described in the 'Schedule'), reflecting the condition of those trees at the time of inspection. Inspection is limited to visual examination of the subject trees from the ground without; test boring, use of tomographic equipment, dissection, probing, coring, ivy removal or excavation to establish structural integrity. The trees were not climbed, and dimensions are approximate, but considered a reasonable reflection of the trees measurements. This survey can only therefore be regarded as a preliminary assessment.

There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the subject trees may not arise in the future. The currency of this survey report and its recommendations is one year.

The accompanying drawings are illustrative and based on the land (topographical) survey information supplied; CSR Ltd accept no legal liability or responsibility for any errors in the information contained in the supplied drawings.

CSR Ltd accept no responsibility for the performance of trees subject to pruning or other site works (including construction activities) not performed in strict accordance with recommendations as specified in this report and/or in accordance with BS 3998:2010 and BS 5837:2012

All retained trees mentioned in this report should be subject to expert re-inspection within prior to completion of development works and public occupancy of the site.

This report was produced as a part of a planning application for the scheme; the author accepts no responsibility or liability for actions taken by reason of this report by the client or their agents unless subsequent contractual arrangements are agreed. Public disclosure or submission of any part of this report without title, or permission from the author, renders this report invalid and legally inadmissible.

References/Bibliography

BS 5837 (2012). *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations*. British Standards Institution. TSO, London.

BS 3998 (2010) *Tree Work - Recommendations*. British Standards Institution. TSO, London.

NJUG 4 (2007) *Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees (Issue 2).* National Joint Utilities Group.

TREE SURVEY KEY

Information in the attached schedule is given under the following headings:

Tree No.

Individual trees have been numbered and tagged on site with corresponding survey tag or treated as a group where appropriate (e.g. Woodlands/hedgerows) and illustrated on accompanying tree survey drawing.

Species

Latin botanical names of species are provided

Height

Overall estimated height given in meters (measured using Trupulse 200 Laser Rangefinder).

Stem Diameter

The diameter of the main trunk taken at a height of 1.5m on a single stem tree, or, on each branch of multi-stemmed (MS) trees.

Crown Spread

The largest radius of branch spread is provided in meters for North / East / South and West directions.

Height of lowest branch

The distance between ground level and first significant branch or canopy (and direction of growth) given in meters (m).

Any measurement or dimension that has been estimated (for offsite or otherwise inaccessible trees where accurate data cannot be recovered) is identified by the suffix #.

Life stage

The tree's age is defined as:

Y = Young, in first third of life (tree which has been planted in the last 10 years or is less than 1/3 the expected height of the species in question).

MA = Middle Age, in second third of life (tree, which is between a 1/3 and 2/3's the expected height of the species in question).

M = Mature, in final third of life (tree that has reached the expected height of the species in question, but still increasing in size).

OM = Over mature (tree at the end of its life cycle and the crown is starting to break up and decrease in size).

V = Veteran Tree (exceptionally old tree).

Physiological Condition

The tree's physiological condition is defined as:

Good -Good vitality: normal bud growth, leaf size, crown density and wound closure

Fair - Average to below average vitality: reduced bud growth, smaller leaf size, lower crown density and reduced wound closure

Poor - Low vitality: limited bud growth, small chlorotic leaves, sparse crown, poor wound closure

Dead - No longer living.

Structural Condition

The trees structural condition is defined as:

Good - No major structural defects observed (possibly some minor defects)

Fair - Minor defects present, (such as bark wounds, isolated decay pockets or structure affected due to overcrowding), that could be alleviated by tree surgery/management

Poor - Major structural defects present such as extensive deadwood, decay or defective to the point of being dangerous. (Significant defects are noted e.g. decay, collapsing etc).

Preliminary Management Recommendations & Timescale

Recommendations actions based on limitations of survey – (may include further investigation and or assessment of suspected defects by means and or methods not undertaken / within the remit of this survey).

Estimated Remaining contribution (Years)

Life of the tree is given as;

10 < less than 10 years remaining
10 + in excess of 10 years remaining
20 + in excess of 20 years remaining
40 + in excess of 40 years remaining

Tree Quality Assessment Category

U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.

• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning)

• Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline

• Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality

(NOTE: Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve).

A High quality

Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years

A1 Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)

A2 Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features

A3 Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)

B Moderate quality

Those trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.

B1 Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation.

B2 Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.

B3 Trees with material conservation or other cultural value

C Low quality

Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.

C1 Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.

C2 Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits.

C3 Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value.

APPENDIX 1

Tag	Species	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m) N/S/E/W	DiA' (mm)@ 1.5m	RPA circle radil (m)	Height lowest branch (m) & direction of growth	Life Stage	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Category of retention + sub-category	Notes
2381	Betula utilis	5	2/2/2/2	100x3	2.08	1m all	Y	40+	Good	Fair		B1	
2382	Prunus padus	5	3/3/3/3	150x4	3.60	0m all	MA	20+	Good	Fair		C1	
2383	Prunus amanagawa	7	1/1/1/1	130	1.56	1m all	MA	20+	Fair	Fair		B1	canker
2384	Prunus avium	6	4/2/4/3	300	3.60	1m all	MA	20+	Good	Fair		B1	
2385	Sorbus aria	6	3/2/2/2	210	2.52	1m all	Y	40+	Good	Fair		B1	
2386	Sorbus aucuparia	4	1/1/1/1	80	0.96	2m all	Y	40+	Good	Fair		B1	
2387	Prunus avium	7	3/3/3/1	280	3.36	2m all	MA	20+	Good	Fair		B1	
45	Quercus robur	14	4/2/3/4	360	4.32	6m all	M	40+	Good	Fair		A2	
2921	Quercus robur	16	7/7/7/7	800	9.60	6m all	MA	40+	Good	Fair		A1	
46	Acer pseudoplatanus	15	8/1/3/5	450	5.40	2m n	MA	20+	Good	Fair		B2	heavy lean over road
2530	Quercus robur	16	6/5/5/5	410	4.92	2m w	MA	40+	Good	Fair	Remove Ivy	A2	
2529	Quercus robur	20	6/6/6/6	550/600	9.77	0m e/w	MA	40+	Good	Fair	Remove Ivy	A2	codependent trunks
2528	Quercus robur	17	6/6/6/6	600	7.20	5m all	MA	40+	Good	Fair	Remove Ivy	A2	
2527	Quercus robur	16	5/7/6/6	580	6.96	4m s	MA	40+	Good	Fair	Remove Ivy	A2	
2526	Quercus robur	11	4/6/4/4	400	4.80	3m s	MA	40+	Good	Fair	Remove Ivy	A2	
2524	Quercus robur	8	4/4/4/4	580	6.96	2m all	MA	40+	Good	Fair	Remove Ivy	A2	
2523	Fraxinus excelsior	11	4/4/4/4	420/100	5.18	0m n/s	MA	10+	Poor	Fair	Remove Ivy	B2	early ash Dieback
2522	Fraxinus excelsior	10	2/2/2/2	200	2.40	3m all	Y	10<	Poor	Fair		C2	Ash dieback
2521	Quercus robur	15	5/4/4/4	480	5.76	3m all	MA	40+	Good	Fair	Remove Ivy	A2	
2520	Fraxinus excelsior	15	4/4/5/5	500	6.00	2m all	MA	10<	Poor	Fair		C2	Ash dieback
2519	Fraxinus excelsior	15	4/4/5/5	400*3	8.32	0m all	MA	10<	Poor	Fair		C2	Ash dieback
2518	Betula pendula	11	1/2/2/2	220	2.64	3m all	MA	40+	Good	Fair		B1	
2517	Betula pendula	10	2/2/2/2	210	2.52	3m all	MA	40+	Good	Fair		B1	
2516	Betula pendula	6	0/2/1/1	80	0.96	2m all	Y	40+	Fair	Poor		C1	
2531	Tilia cordata	14	4/4/4/4	480	5.76	3m all	MA	40+	Good	Fair		A1	
TG1	Picea sitchensis	Av' 20	3/3/3/3	400	4.80	15m all	M	+10	Fair/Poor	Fair/Poor	Consider removing all	C1	Some dead / declining / fallen / windblown. Cupressus macrocarpa and Cupressus leylandii also present along field edge.