



ARBORICULTURAL WORKING GROUP – MINUTES
Planning & Regeneration Services including Building
Consultancy
Wed 23rd July 2014
4.00pm – 5.30pm – Room 134

ATTENDEES		
Internal Attendees:		
Borough of Poole – Planning and Regeneration:		
Richard Genge – (RTG) Chair – Planning and Regeneration Manager		
Russ Fisher – (RF) – Senior Arboricultural Officer		
Rory Gogan – (RG) – Arboricultural Officer		
Adam Cooper – (AC) – Assistant Arboricultural Officer		
Borough of Poole – Environmental and Consumer Protection:		
Andy Osborne – (AO) Senior Arboricultural Officer		
External Attendees:		
Martin Saxon (MS) – Apex Tree Surgeons		
Steve Cox (SC) – Tree Call Consulting		
Andrew Scott (AS) – Scott Tree Services		
APOLOGIES:		
Internal:		
Stephen Thorne (ST) – Head of Planning & Regeneration inc Building Consultancy		
Gabriella Cobelli (GC) – Business Support / PA to Stephen Thorne		
Sue Ludwig (SPL) – Business Manager		
External:		
Mark Hinsley (MH) – Mark Hinsley Arboricultural Consultants		
Wayne Doe (WD) - W.T.Doe Tree Surgeon Ltd		
Jonathan Fulcher (JF) - Alderwood Consulting Ltd		
Mark Hunter (MHu) - Hunters Treework		
Jeremy Barrell / Phil Brophy (JB) (PB) - Barrell Tree Consultancy		
AGENDA ITEMS		ACTION
1.	Introduction and Minutes of Meeting of 8th January 2014	
1.1	Intro	
	RTG began by relaying MH’s apologies. A brief discussion took place regarding new membership of the group, it was agreed that new membership particularly within the contractor sector should be promoted by existing members of the group. MS also pointed out the potential benefits of the Arb Working Group to Arboricultural Association members and CPD hours. The issue of inviting Richard Nicholson on an ad hoc basis was discussed, but he is now leaving in August. Action: The invitation would still be open to a member of green space development. Action: RTG also encouraged internal and external members of the group to submit agenda items. GC to send reminder in advance of the next meeting. The involvement of interest groups, residents associations and particularly the Community Working Group was discussed. It was decided that relevant information should be relayed, by the group	Note for All RF to pursue GC

	members, to contractors/consultants and then down to the client to keep them informed.	
1.2	Item 1.2 in Jan '14 Minutes – Decision Notices	
	The wording of tree works decision notices particularly 'poor arboricultural practice' was raised by MS he said that the situation had been resolved and that the wording was used less. RTG requested that further positive or negative comments about decisions notices be forwarded to him.	Note for all
1.3	Item 1.4 in Jan '14 Minutes – Crown Reduction and Thinning	
	A meeting between RF and MS looking at examples of tree works specification i.e. identifying particular branches or defects, had been helpful and that applications in general were becoming more specific and defined. RF suggested a two or more phased approach to crown reduction and thinning with several years between operations to allow time for the tree to recover. SC agreed and gave an example of a 2 stage reduction that he had successfully specified and had been accepted by the Tree Officer. AO reminded the group that this should be age/species reliant and should be based on the merits of the individual tree. RG confirmed that this would involve a process of 2 or more separate applications with the first app outlining the future management of the tree.	Note
1.4	Item 1.6 in Jan '14 Minutes – Bio Security	
	All decision notices requiring replacement tree(s) will state, within the Informative Notes that all replacement trees should where possible be obtained from a UK source and will be of local provenance. It was agreed within the group that this information will raise awareness and demand from applicants/customers.	Note
1.5	Item 6.4 in Jan '14 Minutes – Future Arboricultural Meetings	
	RF raise the issue of the group inviting tree officers from other authorities (e.g. Nick Hayden – East Dorset) or rather leave it 'as is', to invite when particular items need to be raise/discussed. Discussions concluded that the situation should remain 'as is' and that there was a need to widen the group by inviting contractors, agents and consultants.	Note
2	Guidance Note of Appropriate Trees	
2.1	Guidance Note	
	RTG recapped on the history of the requirement for guidance on appropriate tree species due to calls from the Sensible Tree Management Forum for more information. A wide ranging discussion took place on the question of how best to progress the guidance note taking into account character of area, growing conditions, public perception/acceptance, soil, exposure , proximity to buildings, etc. in order to enable the public to make an informed decision. AS produced a recommended tree species list, similar to that produced by SC although with more emphasis on tree/building relationships, for group scrutiny	

	<p>AO raised the issue of shrinkable soils (clay) within the Borough in relation to tree species and the existence of a Geographic Information System application that will highlight areas of high risk that may in the future allow public access to this type of information. It was suggested that insurance claims could be a good indication of areas with potential shrinkable soil.</p> <p>RF raised the need for the provision of suitable larger tree species to be specified and planted closer to building to combat climate change i.e. for the cooling and shading benefits of trees. He also said that more tree species information would inform landscape scheme design in new developments to ensure good building/tree relationships.</p> <p>RTG concluded the discussion by suggesting that the two lists, produced by SC and AS, are circulated and an amalgamation of the two lists is made. Action: AO, SC and AS agreed to meet outside of the meeting to discuss further and to start the process of amalgamating of the two lists.</p>	AO/SC/AS
2.2	Formative Pruning	
	<p>RF raised the need for discussion about formative pruning of young trees and the lack of tree applications for this type of work. Also stating that if a tree is mature then it is too late, both for the tree and an application (that is likely to be refused at this stage in the tree's life). SC advised of a paper written by Ed Gilman about formative pruning that was informative and interesting.</p>	
3	AOB	
3.1	Cellular Confinement Systems	
	<p>SC proposed this as a discussion point. There was a brief discussion of the merits of various materials on the market and how best to specify them. Action: This will be discussed as an agenda item at the next meeting. GC to add to next agenda.</p>	GC
3.2	The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.	
	<p>AO proposed an item on how the Council deals with The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. This legislation has been used as a last resort in the past. How does the council work with this legislation and which department will be responsible? clarification as to its use is needed. RF also requested that Section 202 notifications be discussed. Action: GC to add both items to the next agenda. The meeting finished at 17:30 HRS.</p>	GC
<p>Date of Next Meeting: Wed 15th October 2014 – 4.00pm-6.30pm Cattistock Room</p>		