



**ARBORICULTURAL WORKING GROUP – MINUTES**  
**Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy**  
**Wed 10<sup>th</sup> July 2013**  
**2.00pm - 4.30pm – Room 134**

<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	
<b><u>Borough of Poole:</u></b> Richard Genge - (RTG ) ( <i>chair</i> ) Sue Ludwig - (SPL) ( <i>minutes</i> ) Andy Osborne - (AO) Rory Gogan – (RG) Adam Cooper – (AC) Andy Holmes (AH) – Building Consultancy Manager	<b><u>External Attendees:</u></b> Martin Saxon (MSX) - Apex Tree Surgeons Mark Hinsley (MH) - Mark Hinsley Arboricultural Consultants Andrew Scott (AS) - Scott Tree Services Wayne Doe (WD) - W.T.Doe Tree Surgeon Ltd Steve Cox (SC) - Tree Call Consulting  <b><u>Guests:</u></b>
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	
<b>Borough of Poole</b> Stephen Thorne (ST) Russ Fisher (RF)	<b>External</b> Jonathon Fulcher (JF) - Alderwood Consulting Ltd Karl Forkasiewicz (KJF) – KJF Tree & Landscape Consultancy
<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Action:</b>
<b>1. <u>Introduction and Minutes of the Last Meeting</u></b>  The Chairman asked for brief introductions prior to commencing the meeting as there were new faces around the table, namely Rory Gogan – Arboricultural Officer BoP and Adam Cooper – Arboricultural Assistant BoP.  Minutes of the AWG Meeting on the 30 <sup>th</sup> January 2013 and the Annual General Meeting on the 6 <sup>th</sup> March 2013 were reviewed and agreed. Special thanks were afforded to Andy Scott for his comprehensive presentation of the work of the Group at the AGM.	
<b>2. <u>Building Control overriding Method Statements</u></b>  This item was introduced by MH who set out the issues. Concern that there have been occasions where Method Statements / Supervision Orders have been overridden by Building Surveyors and tree protection / integrity has been potentially compromised (examples sited Building Surveyor instruction to dig trenches / soak-a-ways through tree root systems etc.) Andy Holmes – Building Consultancy Manager responded that whilst different legislation applies he would like to think that building regulations supplement method statements rather than over-ride them. He did acknowledge that unless the Arb. Method Statements were submitted with a Building Regulation application or the developer mentions that there is one in place the Surveyors probably would not be aware of the requirement. Before leaving the meeting AH also referred the Group to a new on-line calculator that allows builders/developers to calculate the depth of foundations in shrinkable soils where trees are present, recently produced by the LABC which may be helpful in this regard. <a href="http://www.labcwarranty.co.uk/foundationcalculator/">http://www.labcwarranty.co.uk/foundationcalculator/</a>	<b>AH</b>  <b>RF</b>

	<p><b>ACTION: AH to raise the concerns with the Building Surveyors to heighten awareness. It was also suggested that the Tree Team receive a copy of the Building Consultancy “Daily Commencement List” which could flag potential issues that can be discussed with the Surveyors.</b></p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Terms of Reference for the Working Group</u></b></p> <p>RTG circulated comments received from the Group regarding the wording of the Terms of Reference and the suggested revised working, as follows:</p> <p>“To work together, in the best interests of Poole to ensure that the community and the Borough of Poole achieve the best quality development outcomes in an open and transparent way. To consider any proposed changes in policy and procedures, raising standards and prioritisation of delivery, improving turnaround times and raising the quality / consistency of applications.”</p> <p>The general consensus was agreement with the revised wording. However, a question was raised about including some wording around Prioritising of work. This was incorporated into the wording and therefore agreed.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Guidance on Tree Species Appropriate to an Urban Setting</u></b></p> <p>RTG advised the Group that following the resident’s petition for “Sensible Tree Management” that was considered by Member’s earlier this year, Scrutiny Committee has resolved that officers provide clear guidance for residents regarding appropriate tree species for urban and coastal environments.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Policy that would set out the Council’s aspirations Borough wide in respect of the green canopy was discussed. RTG advised that is something that we do want to achieve but it will not be happening in the short-term due to lack of budgets and resource. Members are therefore keen to put something in place in the meantime that will assist residents in choosing the right tree for the location and environment.</p> <p>A lively discussion then ensued to agree a way forward. Examples were cited of Authorities where sensible tree management takes place, including New Forest, Burley, and Christchurch locally.</p> <p>SC noted that whilst putting together a guidance leaflet might appear to be relatively simple it is in fact very complicated and will need care and thought in its research and preparation.</p> <p>It was mentioned that the Arb. Association produce a guide called “Small Trees for Small Gardens” which might be a helpful starting point. AS commented that rather than state a specific species for replant, could we not provide residents with a list of appropriate species on their tree decision notices and ask that they advise us what has been planted when done?</p> <p><b>ACTION: It was agreed that a starting point will be to circulate an email to all members of the working group, asking for nominations of 3 – 4 tree species that reflect the character and are appropriate to a particular area of the Borough. This information can then be collated and considered at the next meeting.</b></p>	<p><b>RTG / RF</b></p>

	<p><b><u>Tree Work Application Information Sheet</u></b></p> <p>This item was raised by MSX who expressed his frustration with the Council's "policy" on reduction and thinning and the fact that he has not had any applications of this nature approved by the BoP. There was general consensus that the Council is much too restrictive and risk adverse in its approach. The general view was that where residents have been allowed to thin / reduce their trees they have a much more positive view of them, even if their original desire was to have the trees removed completely. It was understood that damage can be caused to trees if thinning is not carried out properly but the question was asked "are the instances of bad outcomes happening so frequently as to cause a policy that is so restrictive?"</p> <p>It was also noted by AS that some of the references in the Information Sheet are out of date and that it contradicts BS Guidance with regard to Crown Thinning. Why do we need separate guidance when BS Guidance is in effect? The whole document needs an overhaul.</p> <p>RTG commented that there had been a vast improvement in the level of information provided on application forms as a result of the Information Sheets and this was a positive outcome for all concerned.</p> <p>JF, who was not able to attend the meeting, had emailed in to offer a short objective presentation on Tree Work Applications giving the PINS perspective at the next meeting. It was agreed by all that this would be useful.</p> <p><b>ACTION: MSX to put a note on the Tree Forum asking for comments and feedback on this issue so that we can gauge opinion from a wider audience.</b></p> <p><b>RTG to add Crown Reduction &amp; Thinning as the main agenda item at the next meeting.</b></p> <p><b>JF to present to the Group, from the PINS perspective.</b></p>	<p><b>MSX</b></p> <p><b>RTG</b></p> <p><b>JF</b></p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Supervision Orders and Five Days Notice</u></b></p> <p>There was a general discussion about Supervision Orders and agreement that they can be useful in certain circumstances but should be used sparingly. It was agreed that the use of pictures / diagrams / photographs as part of the application process can more clearly illustrate the requirements negating the need for supervision orders.</p> <p><b>ACTION: RTG to discuss and agree protocols with RF and Tree Team.</b></p> <p>Following discussion at the previous meeting it was agreed that an email notification of tree works can be forwarded to <a href="mailto:planning@poole.gov.uk">planning@poole.gov.uk</a> up to 3 days before the work commences and an email or telephone call will suffice if there is a change to arrangements closer to the date.</p> <p><b>ACTION: SPL to advise Business Support of change to process and procedure relating to Green Cards</b></p>	<p><b>RTG /RF</b></p> <p><b>RTG/RF</b></p> <p><b>SPL / RTG</b></p>

<p>9.</p>	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>Tree Appeal up-held by Inspectorate because Dutch Elm in the general area.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Forward tree decision notice to Planning so that this can be posted on the web-site as a learning / discussion item.</b></p> <p>Best practice – 1. Notes added to Tree-work refusals along the lines of “not acceptable but could do this....” 2. Should be given the opportunity to discuss options following a refusal and prior to submitting an appeal to try and find a way forward. This could reduce appeals dramatically.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Discussion between RTG and Tree Team and feedback to Group next time.</b></p> <p>Feedback received via customers that following call to Customer Service Unit they have been advised “Can only make an application if you own the tree” and “You can’t talk to a tree officer unless you have an application in.”</p> <p><b>ACTION: SPL to speak to CSU and review understanding of tree issues. AS has offered to come in and speak to CS Advisors if it is considered helpful. SPL to progress with CSU</b></p> <p>AS – Council website very slow and not working properly – he was checking for a TPO at Breeze – Durrant Road and the system indicated no TPO but he knows there is one. AO mentioned that upgrades to council website that are coming shortly expected to speed things up.</p> <p><b>ACTION: SPL to pick up with GIS Team.</b></p> <p>WD – Has specific issues regarding an application for pollarding in Oakdale.</p> <p><b>ACTION: WD advised to email RTG with detail and he will then discuss with Tree Officers.</b></p> <p>WD – Asked whether a tree house can be constructed in a Protected Tree. RTG advised that he considered this to be development that would require planning consent.</p>	<p><b>All Group</b></p> <p><b>RTG</b></p> <p><b>SPL / AS</b></p> <p><b>SPL</b></p>
<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting:</u> Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> October 2013 (Venue to be confirmed).</b></p>		