



ARBORICULTURAL WORKING GROUP – MINUTES
Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy
Wednesday, 1st July 2015
16:00 hrs – 17:30 hrs in Room 134

ATTENDEES	
<p>Internal Attendees: Borough of Poole – Planning and Regeneration: 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>External Attendees: Mark Wadey (MW) - Barrell Tree Consultancy Martin Saxon (MS) – Apex Tree Surgeons Andy Luddington (AL) – Tree Calling Consulting</p>	
APOLOGIES	
<p>Internal: Stephen Thorne (ST) - Head of Planning & Regen including Building Consultancy</p> <p>External: Andrew Scott (AS) – Scott Tree Services Steve Jones – (SJ) Arborcare Wayne Doe (WD) - W.T.Doe Tree Surgeon Ltd Steve Cox (SC) – Tree Call Consulting Mark Hinsley (MH) – Mark Hinsley Arboricultural Consultants Jonathan Fulcher (JF) - Alderwood Consulting Ltd Mark Hunter (MHu) - Hunters Treework</p>	
AGENDA ITEMS	ACTION
<p>1. <u>Introduction and Minutes of the last Regular Arboricultural Working Group Meeting dated 7th January 2015 and the last A&D and Arboricultural Working Group AGM dated 4th March 2015</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>RTG/CT Ongoing</p>
<p>2. <u>Tree Species Leaflet</u></p> <p>It was noted that Steve Cox and Andy Osborne had presented the Tree Species Leaflet previously. AL advised that he had nothing else to add. RTG distributed the leaflet and advised that this had changed a vast amount. The leaflet is an aide for residents. However, concerns were raised by the group as to how this may be interpreted by residents. It was felt that the diagram on the reverse of the leaflet is a useful tool.</p> <p>RF advised the meeting that the leaflet is to be submitted following TPO applications. It was felt that this is a good initiative to get to this stage but issues of size of trees close to buildings, future growth, shading and global warming was debated. In general it was considered that the leaflet needs further work and that a meeting is needed to future proof the leaflet.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS		ACTION
	<p>Further suggestions included a potential list of species, and for these to be categorised. AL suggested a blacklist of species, not to be planted close to the building, as these could cause issues. RTG stressed that some trees are characteristic to certain areas.</p> <p>The soil/site – having a good understanding and getting advice or seeking information on what can and cannot be planted/re-planted, the leaflet should assist with this.</p> <p>RF to review the leaflet, also landscape schemes.</p> <p>RTG advised that he will meet with RF, once the minutes have been agreed, in order to progress the leaflet.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Change to Method of Notification of Compliance with Conditions</u></p> <p>RF explained the new system with the method of notification of compliance with conditions, this is now:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 3 day notification of tree work. b. Notification of replanting form. <p>It was unanimously agreed that the above new system works well, as apposed to the previous blue and green cards, it is more efficient. RTG added that it is electronic and easier to manage.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Dead and Dangerous Tree Notifications</u></p> <p>RTG explained the guidance on the web and enquired if this is reasonable, can applicants understand it? It was unanimously agreed that this works well.</p>	
5.	<p><u>Cellular Confinement Systems</u></p> <p>RF advised of the new product on the market, seeking views of the group on whether this new product was acceptable to protect tree roots. This produces being;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Arborar b. Cell Web Confinement System <p>AL advised that BoP are significantly way ahead with ensuring correct system goes in compared to other authorities.</p> <p>Are we being over-prescriptive? In approving a cellular confinement system sometimes applicants will use a cheaper system than on application, after obtaining permission – the issue for the Authority is whether we can demonstrate that a less proven system is harmful – till will see.</p>	
6.	<p><u>The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and Section 202 Notifications</u></p> <p>RF advised that Andy Osborne had raised this previously. Miscellaneous provisions can be used, sometimes this does not happen, e.g. a neighbour dispute. RF stated that we will only use this as a last resort but, under normal circumstances, it is not necessary to use the miscellaneous provisions.</p> <p>If there are risks involved to person(s) by dangerous trees and if all else fails then BoP will step in. Regulations relating to this were discussed.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS		ACTION
7.	<p><u>Crossing and Rubbing Branches – raised by Karl (KJF Consultancy)</u></p> <p>RTG raised an email received from Karl of KJF Consultancy, regarding crossing and rubbing branches, which was discussed in detail.</p> <p>When trimming crossed branches, due care and attention must be taken. Concerns were raised, as this could become open ended and an issue. It needs to be more specific in the wording from Officers.</p> <p>Diameter and number of crossing branches need to be considered. It is understanding what works are being specified, photo's are usually submitted. There needs to be a supervisory on site if there is any doubt about the works in hand.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Terms of Reference & Email Sharing</u></p> <p>RTG explained the Terms of Reference. It was noted that there is no mention of trees, this should be expanded on to include: “Green Infrastructure Outcomes” or “Green Infrastructure of Poole”.</p> <p>Email sharing was discussed and it was unanimously agreed by members that they had no objection to email sharing within the Arboricultural Working Group. RTG advised that the group could benefit from having further members. RTG stated that he would investigate any Arborists who have submitted tree work applications over the last couple of years with the intention of contacting them to become involved as members of the group.</p> <p><u>Action: 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</u></p>	RF
9.	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>a. AL stated that ST had been working on a Policy Team – Green Infrastructure Plan, regarding tree policies. RTG advised that this had been discussed previously. However, there is a vast amount of work involved and BoP does not currently have the resource to carry this out. It was noted that trees are being viewed differently.</p> <p>b. The ITree Survey Model was discussed, AH advised that there is a vast amount of information contained within this, pollution statistics, differing levels of survey, assessing value of trees etc. This has benefits across the development sites, obtaining a monetary value. It is publically available, the data is available now although this is not yet complete. AL will send a link to the website. The data is obtained using Liddor.</p> <p>c. RF – interpretation of the rates and Exemption 202 Notification of Dead or Dangerous Trees. If someone bypasses land and notices there is a dead or dangerous tree in need of removing or felling – what action can be taken? A 5-day notice to BoP can be submitted and then notified to the land owner. A DD can be served. If the person identifying the dead or dangerous tree is not the land owner, they have no powers to undertake the works, this could fail if the owner will not allow this to proceed. It is up to the contractor to ensure they are following procedures correctly.</p> <p>It was noted that reasonable steps must be taken to move a dangerous tree, notifying the authority and taking action, even if they are not the land owner.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS	ACTION
<p>It is the responsibility of BoP to write to the owners to notify them of a dead or dangerous tree, if we agree with the applicant. Note: the applicant might not necessarily be the tree owner but you have a duty to notify.</p> <p>If BoP disagree with removing the dead or dangerous tree and there is an incident, then the BoP will be responsible not the contractor. It was felt that the works should be carried out, regardless of BoP's decision, the responsibility will then be the contractors to ensure that proof is provided, to BoP, that the tree is in fact dead or dangerous.</p> <p>It was noted that notice in writing has to be given in accordance with the regulations. There is information online in respect of application for consent and the legal rights to take down a tree on another property even if they have no interest in the land.</p> <p>d. MSX raised the matter of Discharge of Conditions on developments. There is an easy way to see these – e.g. green/red, still waiting to do or not done. RTG advised that pre-commencement details are required prior to applications and that instruction to do certain way. RTG advised regarding the order of Conditions on a consent and how. It was noted that the conditions on the website should match the conditions on the email/letter.</p> <p>e. MSX – pre-commencement supervision conditions, sign off of method statements, which cannot be done due to differing conditions. MSX advised that the London Tree Officers Association are reviewing their conditions. There is no consistent way of doing conditions. The level of method statements and information required is high.</p> <p>f. The date for the next Arboricultural Working Group was discussed, as this appears to be incorrect on the Agenda, it was thought that there should be one in October 2015. CPT to check date and advise members.</p> <p><u>Action: CPT to check the date of the next Arboricultural Working Group. Following this meeting, CPT checked the date, which was found to be Wednesday, 28th October 2015 – please see below</u></p> <p>There being no further business the meeting ended at 17:30 hrs</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">CPT</p>
<p><u>Date of Next Meeting: The next Arboricultural Working Group is to be held on Wednesday, 28th October 2015 from 16:00 hrs to 18:30 hrs in Room 134, Borough of Poole, Civic Centre, Poole</u></p>	