



## **AGENDA**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
Bristol Tree Forum	21 <sup>st</sup> November 2011	18:00 - 20:00	The Council House
<b>Apologies</b>			

1. Welcome, apologies and explanation of new format (CS)
2. Approval of accuracy of the last minutes
3. Verbal updates on:
  - plaques for trees (JS)
  - Letter to NPs re: Council's approach to tree planting and maintenance (RE)
  - Big tree plant - grant application to Defra (RE)
4. TreeForum - suggested new approach (CS)  
"Plant more and save more trees" "We exist to support the tree champions"  
"Involve more people"
  - discussion, speakers, voting and what you, BTF and BCC can do
5. Matters arising (to follow the "new approach")
  - Tree Planting Design Guide (RE)
  - Veteran Tree Action Plan (RE)
  - TPO Stoke Lodge (SF)
6. New issues
  - "Rapid TPO" and "Pre-emptive TPO" (CS/RE)
  - Other new issues from members or the public

<b>Distribution</b>	
To:	Bristol Tree Forum
CC:	



## MINUTES

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Location</i>
Bristol Tree Forum	21 <sup>st</sup> November 2011	18:00-20:00	Council House
<b>Attendees</b>			
<p><b>RH - Russell Horsey, CS - Clive Stevens - Tree Champion for Bishopston, Redland and Cotham NP (Chair), SF - Stephanie French - Tree Champion for Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury on Trym NP, RE - Richard Ennion - BCC Horticultural Services Manager, BB - Ben Barker - Greater Bedminster Partnership, RB - Richard Bland - Clifton &amp; Hotwells Improvement Society, ML - Michele Lavelle, Landscape Institute, VP - Vassili Papastavrou, Bristol Street Trees, Marcus Grant - MG - University of West of England, Alex van der Nelson - Student UWE, Claire Harbinson, BCC Tree Officer (Planning)</b></p>			
<b>Apologies</b>		<b>CC</b>	
<p><b>Hugh Holden - Bristol Civic Society (Tree Forum Vice Chair), Robin Prytherch</b></p>		<p>Tree Forum Members</p>	

<i>Agenda Item</i>	<i>Discussion Points/ Outcomes &amp; Actions</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>As above.</p> <p><b>Welcome</b></p> <p>Marcus Grant of UWE and Chair of Healthy Living Group will be giving a talk at the Tree Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> February 2012: 'City trees and their importance to public health'.</p> <p>Alex van der Nelson - UWE - Student of Architecture - who, as part of his studies, is exploring a tree-based project.</p> <p>Claire Harbinson - BCC Arboricultural Officer - Claire introduced herself as the new tree officer (supporting Laurence Wood) responsible for TPO's, Conservation Area 211 Notices and development affecting trees. Claire replaces Ben Rose ,but works full time.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Approval of accuracy of the last minutes</b></p> <p>Minutes of meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011 were accepted as a true record with three amendments (item 6 and two in item 9). The revised minutes have been re-published.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Verbal updates</b></p> <p>Plaques for trees (RE)</p> <p>Josie Sadler has researched options for attaching a small plaque to tree guard's, on the basis that it would be sufficiently attractive to business /</p>	

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Points/ Outcomes &amp; Actions</b>	<b>Actions</b>
	<p>private sponsorship, be temporary, easy to fix, environmentally friendly and low cost. No best option has yet been identified - but options include; wood, aluminium tags and lasered plastic on aluminium (the most sophisticated option @ £24/each). It was agreed that the cost of a plaque should be passed onto those sponsoring the tree. ML suggested a 'competition' to come up with a design / product. MG suggested that UWE's 'Product Design' Group may be interested in the challenge of developing a suitable product - JS to follow this up.</p>	<b>JS</b>
	<p>Letter to NPs re: Council's approach to tree planting and maintenance (RE)</p> <p>It was agreed that a 'bottom up approach' would be more productive ie influencing decision making through representation. RE intends to contact each NP and offer to give a short presentation about trees timed to suit their agenda. A short paper will also be made available, outlining the council's approach to tree management and planting. RE is progressing via liaison with the new 'Neighbourhood Engagement Team' in Environment and Leisure.</p>	<b>RE</b>
	<p>Big Tree Plant (Bristol): grant application to Defra (RE) - partnership of Forest of Avon Trust, BCC and The Woodland Trust.</p> <p>At its meeting in September, Defra deferred a decision on the Big Tree Plant (Bristol) grant application commenting that our unit price at £7.95 / tree (cost to Defra) was too high.</p> <p>RE affirmed the benefit of the Tree Forum taking an active role in developing and supporting the bid.</p> <p>Options discussed included a smaller scale proposal and / or revised bid.</p> <p>There was some discussion reflecting disappointment / frustration in the bids deferred status. Defra have advised that the principle issue is our unit price per tree compared to their benchmark £4 / tree ('1 million trees for £4 million'). The disconnect was readily recognised between the Big Tree Plant's aspiration (planting trees in cities) and the low average funding per tree on offer. ML agreed to raise these general concerns at the Tree and Design Action Group meeting due to take place the following day.</p> <p>Defra have confirmed that they won't formally reconsider our bid until March 2012. The Forest of Avon Trust have now re-submitted, clarifying outputs and asking for a 'sounding' on acceptance of a reduced unit price per tree (down to £6.96/ tree). JC will advise as he received feedback from Defra.</p>	<b>ML</b>        <b>JC</b>

Agenda Item	Discussion Points/ Outcomes & Actions	Actions
<p><b>4</b></p> <p>7.</p>	<p><b>TreeForum - suggested new approach (CS)</b></p> <p>"Plant more and save more trees" "We exist to support the tree champions" "Involve more people"</p> <p>CS gave a short presentation. He noted that the Tree Forum has largely been concerned with the council's direct influence over trees reflecting its land holdings and role in overseeing the statutory planning system. CS argued that the Tree Forum should also focus its attention on the private sector if we are to achieve a 30% citywide tree canopy cover. CS referred to an 'eight point plan' which largely is concerned with progressing a 'more interest and more influence' agenda.</p> <p>Members agreed to widen the scope of the Tree Forum to see more trees planted on private land.</p> <p>There was some discussion as to how the Tree Forum should attract and keep new members and be more effective.</p> <p>Ideas / actions include:</p> <p>a) Tree Forum members undertake visits to eg arboreta to observe and discuss trees in an informal setting;</p> <p>b) Tree Forum continue to use 'technical sub-groups';</p> <p>c) Tree Forum members come out to more council run tree planting events (see <a href="http://www.bristol.gov.uk/treebristol">www.bristol.gov.uk/treebristol</a> for details of events);</p> <p>d) Work through existing organisations and their campaigns such as the Forest of Avon Trust, Amenity Societies, Wildlife Trust, Design Forum, other 'issue groups' such as Healthy City Group (invitation from GM for Tree Champions to attend this group);</p> <p>e) Influence 'Transition cities' groups;</p> <p>f) Seek assistance from the council's Community Development Team to support development of the Tree Forum;</p> <p>f) Review Tree Champion role and membership.</p> <p>Current Tree Champions per Neighbourhood Partnership are:</p> <p><b>Clive Stevens</b> - Bishopston, Redland and Cotham  <b>Stephanie French</b> - Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and W-o-T  <b>Pete Bullard</b> - Ashley, Easton and Lawrence Hill</p>	<p><b>CS</b></p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Matters arising</b></p>	
	<p>Tree Planting Design Guide (RE)</p> <p>A second draft Tree Planting Design Guide was tabled (RE to circulate an electronic version) following feedback from the tree planting design sub group.</p>	<p><b>RE</b></p>

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Points/ Outcomes &amp; Actions</b>	<b>Actions</b>
	<p>RE confirmed that options to replace 'like for like' are addressed in the guidance and that achieving a pre-determined 'diversity in the population' was not the primary object.</p> <p>Further comments were invited (deadline by 3<sup>rd</sup> January).</p>	<b>All</b>
	<p>Veteran Tree Action Plan (RE)</p> <p>A second draft Veteran Tree Action Plan was discussed and is available on the Tree Forum web page for comment following feedback from the veteran tree action plan sub group, see <a href="http://www.bristol.gov.uk/page/bristol-tree-forum">http://www.bristol.gov.uk/page/bristol-tree-forum</a> (listed under meeting '21<sup>st</sup> November 2011')</p> <p>Questions / observations:</p> <p>a) Will those involved in the original HAP in 2000 be consulted? Answer: Yes</p> <p>b) What will be BCC response to the action plan reflecting its approach to 'high value trees' Answer: there is an action for BCC to review its approach.</p> <p>c) The Bristol Biodiversity Partnership will need to accept the plan and build it into the existing suite of action plans.</p> <p>d) VP asked how the location of veteran and ancient trees in our area would be known and requested that a list of veteran and ancient trees be included as part of the plan in order that their locations became better known."</p> <p>Further comments were invited (deadline 3<sup>rd</sup> January).</p>	<b>RE</b>       <b>All</b> <b>RE</b>
	<p>TPO Stoke Lodge (SF)</p> <p>SF welcomed, on behalf of the NP, the making of a TPO for those trees included in the Cotham School lease. However, the NP are likely to request that the scope of the TPO be extended to include all trees within the grounds of Stoke Lodge (ie those trees excluded from the TPO on the basis that they were not included in the lease).</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>New issues</b>	
8.	<p>"Rapid TPO" (CH)</p> <p>Following the loss of privately owned trees on Canford Lane, in part reflecting the time taken to serve a TPO, a review has been completed of the process to make and serve a TPO. CH presented her interim findings which identified opportunities to speed up the process by removing steps (but would require a policy change) and means to provide a back up system if key council officers were not available. It was noted and accepted that the option to provide full weekend cover by having officers on call was desirable but un- affordable. RE is to brief the relevant Executive Member to facilitate any required change in policy.</p>	<b>RE</b>
	<p>Pre-emptive TPO" (CS)</p> <p>There was some discussion as to the merits of identifying trees of high amenity value and making a TPO to reflect this. RE advised that without</p>	

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Points/ Outcomes &amp; Actions</b>	<b>Actions</b>
	<p>the element of risk it would not be appropriate to use TPO legislation for this purpose.</p> <p>It was suggested that noteworthy trees in any one area (Neighbourhood Partnership?) could be identified and made available to tree officers / inform the Planning Group Network.</p> <p>RH suggested that the list of trees should be kept short. RE suggested that the definitions given in the Veteran Tree Action Plan could help help identify categories of higher value trees.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Other issues</b>	
	<p>SF expressed continuing concern that consent has been granted to allow the removal of trees subject to TPO. RE to review the example given by SF, but affirmed that the TPO status itself did not preclude consent being granted subject to the reasons given in the application and general policy. Further, RE confirmed that the scope of TPO legislation is essentially concerned with amenity and not other tree benefits such as that resulting from a particular canopy cover in any one locality.</p>	<b>RE</b>
	<p>What is the status of NE3 and any replacement policy - DM 6 / 7?</p> <p>RE advised that he was not aware of when and how the council would re-consult on Development Management policies 6 and 7 as these relate to the provision of new trees and the protection of existing trees. RE to investigate.</p> <p>RE affirmed that NE3 applies until formally replaced. The Bristol Replacement Tree Standard is in operation as it supports NE3.</p>	<b>RE</b>
	<p>VP noted that the site notice erected at Redland Green which gave information about the proposed felling of an Acer, indicated that the tree would be replaced; but on enquiry this appears not to be noted on the council's database. RE to investigate.</p>	<b>RE</b>
	<p>CS raised concerns about the further loss of trees on a development site at Fallonden Way, on the basis that this was done without further consultation. RE to investigate.</p>	<b>RE</b>
	<p>The council's approach to orchards was discussed. The council supports the planting of fruit trees and looks to incorporate such in tree planting schemes based on demand / good design. RH advised that this issue has been raised at the Parks Forum when he requested a more coordinated approach.</p>	
	<p>RE referred to proposed changes to the statutory fee arrangements including the option to allow local authorities to charge (if they choose) for TPO applications. The government consultation closed early in 2011, but any replacement legislation is yet to be issued. No doubt this will be a debating point as replacement arrangements become clear.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>7<sup>th</sup> February 2012 6-8 at the Council House.</p>	

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Points/ Outcomes &amp; Actions</b>	<b>Actions</b>
	Note: the meeting will start with a talk by Marcus Grant: 'city trees and their importance to public health'.	