



ARBORICULTURAL WORKING GROUP
Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy
 Wednesday 4th July 2012
 2 – 4pm The Study, Upton House

ATTENDEES:

Borough of Poole:

RTG – Richard Genge (*chair*)
 ST – Stephen Thorne
 SPL – Sue Ludwig (*minutes*)
 RF – Russ Fisher
 AD – Andy Dearing
 AL – Andy Luddington
 AO – Andy Osbourne

Arboricultural Consultants:

MS – Martin Saxon, KJF – Karl Forkasiewicz, DC – Dave Cashman, MHi - Mark Hinsley, AS – Andrew Scott, SC – Steve Cox, JF – Jonathan Fulcher, MHu – Mark Hunter, WD - Wayne Doe.

APOLOGIES:

SLE – Shelley Edwards (*minutes*)

SJ – Steve Jones (*Arborcare*)

1. Introductions: Attendees and who they represent

Richard Genge – Planning and Regeneration Manager
 Stephen Thorne - Head of Planning and Regeneration Services
 Sue Ludwig - Business Manager, Planning and Regeneration Services
 Russ Fisher – Senior Arb Officer, Planning and Regeneration Services
 Andy Dearing – Enforcement Manager, Planning and Regeneration Services
 Andy Luddington – Arboricultural Officer, Planning and Regeneration Services
 Andy Osbourne – Tree Officer (Public Trees)

Martin Saxon – Apex Tree Surgeons
 Karl Forkasiewicz – KJF Consulting
 Dave Cashman - Barrell Tree Consultancy
 Jonathan Fulcher – Alderwood Consulting Ltd
 Mark Hinsley – Mark Hinsley Arboricultural Consultants
 Andrew Scott – Scott Tree Services
 Steve Cox – Tree Call Consulting
 Mark Hunter – Hunters Treework
 Wayne Doe – W.T.Doe Tree Surgeon Ltd

ST introduced the group; and explained the success of the other working groups which are working well and the reasons for setting up the group. ST explained that minutes are taken from the meetings and uploaded onto the website. The group agreed to the Wednesday afternoon meetings and that they would be quarterly.

ST explained that the group is a representation of the discipline and therefore the group acts as a conduit for other arbs to feed into the meeting agendas.

ST put forward RTG to chair the meetings which the group agreed to.

	<p><u>Terms of Reference put forward:</u></p> <p><i>“To work together, in the best interests of Poole to ensure that the community and the Borough of Poole, achieve the best quality sustainable development outcomes in an open and transparent way.”</i></p> <p>ST invited the group to give their thoughts?</p> <p>RTG – Changes in Policy and procedures – drafted and agreed with group.</p> <p>DC – Pleased to be part of the group and feel that it is a positive step – the degree of consistency can only be of benefit. Transparency and feedback.</p> <p>JF – Maintaining and refreshing connections. Keep up to date with Poole’s requirements. Welcomes chance to influence policy. It is works then encourage it to be taken up by other LPA’s. Maintaining professionalism and professional standards.</p> <p>MHi – Curious to see what happens and what comes out of it.</p> <p>AO – Maintain standards across the council.</p> <p>MS – Raising standards and understanding the issues. Inconsistency</p> <p>KFJ – Curious and interested to see what the outcomes are and to have a better working relationship.</p> <p>MHu – Registration at Poole needs to be looking at the procedures. Inconsistencies and agreement of technical terms.</p> <p>SC – Increased dialogue with LPA. Keen to see Poole improved and the way arb is carried out in the Borough.</p> <p>WD – Turnaround times for apps; dedicated tree admin team to speak to in the office. Not able to build up personal relationship. Process made easier so that everyone is singing off the same hymn sheet.</p> <p>AS – Discrepancy between how TPO’s are managed in Poole and other authorities. Level of trust between arbs and tree team.</p> <p>AL – Welcome the opportunity to work more closely and build relationships.</p> <p>RF – Has wanted this type of group for a long time to build relationships and the understanding of constraints that we are under. Iron out issues and generate stronger links and build better relationships.</p> <p>It was raised that TPO’s are not easy to find on the website. It was commented that the website is slow and has lots of glitches. The area orders need updating and there is a lot of ‘rubbish’ info – RTG explains.</p> <p>Woodland orders.</p>
2.	<p><u>Crown cleaning and clarification</u></p> <p>MS - Raised the issue of Crown cleaning and consistency with other Councils. RF explained the current standard the changes and clarified the reasons why Poole ask for more detail. Standards changed 12 months ago and time was given for all to get used to the changes. Poole can no longer accept Tree Work Applications that do not specify detail of works to be undertaken. Regulations state that any application must have a clear and precise description of the works to be undertaken.</p> <p>Action: In future Crown cleaning as a descriptor of an Arb operation will not be used and that details should be in accordance with the Regulations/Standard and be specific. ST also made the point that with a protected tree unless we know what the works it is difficult to monitor as to what is authorised and what is not and therefore what is a breach in the context of enforcement.</p>
3.	<p><u>2012 Regulations</u></p> <p>A general discussion took place regarding the new regulations and the implications for</p>

	both consultants and the authority. It was accepted and agreed that a TPO served but not confirmed by 1/10/12 will not be valid.
4.	<p><u>Clarification of 5 day notice</u></p> <p>Note passed to all of the group to agree interpretation of when the five day period starts and therefore ends. Agreed that the wording should match the regulations and that the date of receipt was day zero. Advice to be uploaded on the web. This common understanding will ensure there is the minimum of confusion and time wasted. Action: RF to amend and liaise arrange for advice to be uploaded onto the web. In addition AS considered that in the context of the new regulations the informative note on Treework documentation regarding deadwood needs clarifying and expanding Action – RF to liaise with RG and implement.</p>
5.	<p><u>Application Standards</u></p> <p>Housekeeping: RF Species/Plan/Map WD – Portal states “scaled plan” photos will help, scaled plans are not required by BoP. Note: Email acknowledgments - consensus for email acknowledgement.</p>
6.	<p><u>Enforcement and Prosecution – Tree Replacement Notice’s</u></p> <p>ST advised 19 outstanding. ST commented further that after obtaining legal advice twice, the difficulty is that there is no avenue in law to enforce the landowner to implement the TRN. The only solution is for the authority to undertake and pay for the works with a charge upon the land. This could mean a number of years before the council could reclaim the expenditure. In these times of fiscal restraint and cuts this clearly presents a difficulty for the council. It’s not up to contractor but the property owner and where there is no instruction to do it this can be difficult for the agent/contractor. Agreed that Poole should try and ensure TRN’s are complied with and that in the first instance the authority should try and persuade the landowner to comply. If this does not work ST will have to prioritise what can be achieved and afforded.</p> <p>The discussion then moved onto Poole having a clear Green Infrastructure Policy and how this feeds into a Tree Canopy strategy that ensures that in the future we have a similar if not better canopy than today – ST to discuss with NJ</p> <p>Question – Could the BoP employ a Landscape Architect instead of replacement arb? ST commented that the landscape post was deleted as part of the 15% savings measures in April 2011 and the Arb team have been reduced by 25% already and are struggling.</p>
7.	<p><u>Working Relationships</u></p> <p>A general discussion took place around this item. It was generally felt that the professional relationship was good and that there was an opportunity to discuss views with an acknowledgement that agreement would not always occur. Where disagreement did occur there was always the avenue of appeal. KF commented that a lot of the group had at some point in their working lives worked for the BoP and this skewed relationships in favour of some more than others. It was acknowledged that two members of the group had been employed by BoP as senior arboricultural officers but the majority of the group considered this was not an issue. ST also commented that working relationships could always improve and in some ways this was the whole point of the WG being formed.</p>
8.	<p><u>Next Meeting:</u> Wednesday 3rd October 2012 – Room 134, Civic Centre. 2 - 4pm</p>