



ARBORICULTURAL WORKING GROUP – MINUTES
Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy
Wednesday, 28th October 2015
16:00 hrs – 17:45 hrs in Room 134

ATTENDEES	
<p><u>Internal Attendees:</u> <u>Borough of Poole – Planning and Regeneration:</u> Richard Genge – (RTG) – Planning and Regeneration Manager (Chair) Sue Ludwig (SPL) – Business Manager Russ Fisher – (RF) – Senior Arboricultural Officer Rory Gogan – (RG) – Arboricultural Officer Adam Cooper – (AC) – Assistant Arboricultural Officer Clare Taylor (CPT) – Business Support / PA to Stephen Thorne</p>	
<p><u>External Attendees:</u> Mark Wadey (MW) - Barrell Tree Consultancy Jeremy Barrell (JB) – Barrell Tree Consultancy Martin Saxon (MS) – Apex Tree Surgeons Andrew Scott (AS) – Scott Tree Services Mark Hinsley (MH) – Mark Hinsley Arboricultural Consultants</p>	
APOLOGIES	
<p><u>Internal:</u> Stephen Thorne (ST) - Head of Planning & Regen including Building Consultancy Andy Osborne (AO) – Senior Arboricultural Officer</p> <p><u>External:</u> Steve Jones – (SJ) Arborcare Wayne Doe (WD) - W.T.Doe Tree Surgeon Ltd Steve Cox (SC) – Tree Call Consulting Jonathan Fulcher (JF) - Alderwood Consulting Ltd Mark Hunter (MHu) - Hunters Treework Andy Luddington (AL) – Tree Calling Consulting</p>	
AGENDA ITEMS	ACTION
<p>1. <u>Introduction and Minutes of the last Regular Arboricultural Working Group Meeting dated 1st July 2015</u></p> <p><u>Outstanding Actions</u></p> <p>1.1 <u>Richard Nicholson</u> The note was for RTG to invite Richard Nicholson to a meeting sometime in the future once he has settled into his new role at East Dorset District Council. RTG opened this issue up to those present at the last regular Arboricultural Working Group and it was suggested to invite Nick Jackson who is based At Bournemouth Borough Council and also Jeremy Kelsey who is a retired Tree Officer.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> RTG and CT to discuss with a view to extending invitations to future meetings when issues require.</p> <p>8. <u>Action:</u> RF to investigate any Arborists, who have submitted tree work applications over the last couple of years with a view to making contact with them to become members of the Arboricultural Working Group. This matter was discussed and recommendations are welcomed to introduce further attendees to the group, a few suggestions were made including contacting Will Jones and Cyrus.</p>	<p>RTG/CT Ongoing</p>

AGENDA ITEMS		ACTION
2.	<p><u>Tree Species Leaflet</u></p> <p>The drafted tree species leaflet was discussed at length. It is an A3 leaflet, which will be triple folded, and the space for information is very limited. The leaflet was circulated around the table. The idea of the leaflet is to list the species of trees contributing to the area of Poole. RTG advised that the leaflet could be 4/5 pages online, as long as people can read and understand it. It was noted that the Branksome Park website could incorporate the leaflet online. The tree species leaflet could be area specific online. The information on the back page was discussed and it was thought that perhaps this would not be used.</p> <p>In distributing the trees species leaflet, we will in effect be telling the public what we want them to plant in their garden, this could cause issues. RTG explained that we could tell them what we wouldn't want planted, although it was felt that this would not be a good idea. It was felt that we need to encourage buying from UK nurseries, we would want the trees to be locally grown.</p> <p><u>Action: RF to continue to work with Leaflet with a view to presenting a final version as the AGM</u></p>	
3.	<p><u>Pruning to abate a nuisance - discussion</u></p> <p>AS raised the matter of pruning to abate a nuisance, mainly if a tree is overhanging the boundary and whether the neighbour could trim without local authority application. If it is your own property and a third party needs to put up scaffolding in order to carry out felling, due to branches touching the building, what are the legal implications? There is a risk of damage to the building, if a tree was to fall and land on the house. The distance from the building for foliage clearance is 2m.</p> <p>RTG advised that the level of applications has increased and we need to consider streamlining our processes. It was felt that, although TPO's are a statutory requirement, some applications are unnecessary and cause higher workload. BoP should be looking at these areas.</p> <p>After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that RF and RTG would investigate this matter further, check legislation and advise in due course.</p> <p><u>Action: RF and RTG to investigate this further, check legislation and advise in due course</u></p> <p>Perpetual Permissions were discussed and it was agreed that RF would research this matter in more depth. The pruning distance from the building to allow for scaffolding was discussed.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS		ACTION
4.	<p><u>Pre-Commencement Site Meeting Checklist</u></p> <p>RF gave an overview of the new Pre-Commencement Site Meeting Checklist and circulated a form, which he originally designed for his own benefit but felt it would be a very useful tool for arborists. The idea of the form is to ensure maintenance is in place and safety guidelines are followed. RF advised that, previously, the request for pre-commencement site meetings was disorganised. There is a requirement for discharge of conditions through AMS approved, a fee is applicable before the pre-commencement check. RF explained that changes/re-arranges not included in the AMS causes difficulty. RF has been testing this procedure and it seems to work well.</p> <p>AS – when would BoP want tree felling carried out, not prior to a meeting? This causes the site works to stop.</p> <p>RTG advised that when planning consent is granted, it includes any tree felling works. Furthermore, the method in which the trees are going to be felled, plus how the site will be built is included in the method statement. . The point at which the consent becomes invalid was discussed. The matter of TPO'd trees and trees being removed and the issues surrounding this was also discussed.</p> <p>The protection of the approval for the works, RTG advised that this is covered off in the conditions.</p> <p>The level of descriptions contained with the forms were discussed and it was felt that it could be more of an aide memoire. The issues addressed on site, record of site works and record given to the site manager were discussed.</p> <p>The items covered in the pre-commencement checklist are items that are not covered under the AMS. It helps re-enforce the reports and the form assists to ensure everything is covered on site. SPL advised that the form is to go out following the AMS, as a heads up that other things will come up from the form. RF added that information needs to be passed back to the site manager and needs to be available on site.</p> <p>It was noted that, in some instances, planning permission is granted with discharge of conditions, the developer decides to sell and not build on the land.</p> <p>RTG explained regarding PD rights, e.g. services such as gas/electric.</p> <p>It was felt that the pre-commencement form is a good idea. However, there is a concern with obtaining the clients' agreement to carrying out a pre-commencement meeting, this could be an issue.</p> <p>The wording of the form needs to be slightly amended: AMS on site – has it been read by the site agent, perhaps a tick box that it has been seen and understood.</p> <p>The works laid out in the AM and whether, how it's been laid out, will actually work was discussed.</p> <p>A guidance note would be useful, which could be published on the website. RTG advised that, once the form has been agreed, this can be carried out.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS		ACTION
	<p>A letter to Architects, Developers etc., could be sent. RTG advised that this could be raised at the next Agents and Developers Working Group as a notification to them about improving the way in which BoP work.</p> <p>JB suggested BoP hold a seminar inviting Architects, Agents etc., from planning records already held. A speaker could be invited and BoP could present on a topic of interest. RTG advised regarding the restraints BoP are faced with holding such an event, we would have timing and resource issues. JB also suggested obtaining sponsorship from companies willing to do this in order to promote their products and give an update on these.</p> <p>RTG advised that he would investigate holding a seminar, which BoP could promote as a workshop.</p> <p>AS advised regarding trees that fall on highways and the fact that the costs cannot be recovered. However, if dead/dangerous trees are notified previously, the costs can be recovered.</p>	
5.	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>a. RTG advised regarding the PAS Resource Review and BoP's quest to improve and speed up the process, eliminating delayed registrations. JB advised that delays does cause problems for developers.</p> <p>b. RTG advised that he would investigate holding a seminar, which BoP could promote as a workshop.</p>	
	<p>c. JB gave an overview of two brochures, which are available online and can be downloaded on the website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees in Hard Landscape – A Guide to Decisions • Trees in the Townscape – A Guide for Decision Makers <p>JB advised that there are some good topics in these brochures, including improving the efficiency of the planning procedure, plus some good case studies.</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting ended at 17:45 hrs.</p>	
<p><u>Date of Next Meeting:</u> The next Arboricultural Working Group is to be held on Wednesday, 13th January 2016 from 16:00 hrs to 18:30 hrs in Room 134, Borough of Poole, Civic Centre, Poole, Dorset</p>		