

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

Name Role Response Date	Comments	Action Taken
Cllr Sue Anderson Greenhill Ward 20/10/2014	<p>Thank you for sending the tree strategy consultation document. I am a little concerned with the following lines in the Executive Summary</p> <p>Although the Council will deliver a wide range of services in its management of the tree stock, it will not provide services relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor loss of light or removal to improve sightlines if there is a health and safety issue • Removing to improve Aesthetics/ Health & Safety <p>I would have thought if there were health and safety issues we would provide services, as Health and Safety is an important consideration in other parts of the document.</p>	<p>Text updated Executive Summary and section 5.6</p> <p>Text now states “This is not an exhaustive list and Health and Safety will always be paramount”</p>
Cllr Phillip O’ Dell Wealdstone Ward 27/10/2014	<p>I welcome the publishing of this strategy and the acknowledgement that trees play an important in tackling climate change and improving the environment. The strategy appears to have no targets within it such how trees to be inspected each year? Number of trees to be planted each year this may be a weakness in the strategy. Therefore an Action Plan should be published with the strategy and repeated every five years.</p> <p>I wish to make the following detailed comments :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The monitoring reports should be broken by ward rather just across the 	

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

	<p>borough</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the proposed programme of cyclical maintenance enough? What evidence to support this?• Welcome the commitment to responding within 5 days to reports but how will this be monitored?• I question the individual figures given for Headstone South• I disagree with the priority in Para 5.2 which gives greater priority to Housing than local roads they should be equal or local roads higher• There should be a commitment to increase the number of trees in Wealdstone, Headstone South (subject to numbers being verified) and Edgware Wards as priority above the remaining wards. <p>Overall I welcome the publishing of this strategy and the continued engagement with residents on the contents of the strategy.</p>	<p>As part of the future review of this strategy we will investigate if this detailed monitoring can take place.</p> <p>Cyclical maintenance will be supported by active works as required.</p> <p>Monitoring will take place via the internal tree database</p> <p>Survey already completed. Will be reviewed when work is re-commissioned.</p> <p>Priority allocation – local roads raised to medium priority</p> <p>Text updated – We will target wards with fewer trees where practical – section 6 – Tree Planting</p>
--	---	---

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

<p>Stephen Bolsover 27/11/2014 Chairman, Harrow Nature Conservation Forum</p>	<p>We welcome this document. In particular we welcome the approach that street trees greatly enhance the urban environment and that older forest type trees have greater aesthetic and pollution reduction benefits compared to small short lived ornamental Species. We fully support the statements that pruning and felling of street trees should only occur in circumstances where it is clearly essential or advisable and that Requests for tree removal based on speculative claims about subsidence or property damage will not be acted upon. We do have some comments about specific sections of the document:</p> <p>1. Section 2.1 We suggest expanding point 2 a little. Our suggested text is: Trees are an important component of biodiversity. A tree can directly accommodate many different species of insects, fungi and mosses. Trees are also a major source of pollen for honey bees, in particular Lime trees. In turn the insects provide food for birds, while trees also provide roosts for birds and mammals. Indeed, recent falls in bird population may in part be due to a lack of roosting sites.</p> <p>2. Section 4 Paragraph 3 is confused and inconsistent. There also needs to be reference to the ancient woodland character of some of Stanmore Common, as noted in point 4 below. We suggest that the paragraph be rewritten thus: A tree stock survey was carried out in 2012/2013. The latest figures from Ashley Godfrey Associates show that Harrow Council is responsible for managing over 204,526 trees. There are two sites with significant ancient woodlands in Harrow. Bentley Priory Open Space contains two ancient woodlands: Heriot’s Wood and Lake Wood. Pear Wood, to the NE of the borough, is largely ancient woodland. There are other smaller areas in the borough: Weald Wood which includes a</p>	<p>1.Point 2 – text added “....as well as being a major source of pollen for bees”.</p> <p>2. Section 4 updated to include reference to Stanmore Common, The Spinney and ground flora.</p>

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

	<p>massive ancient beech coppice and ancient hornbeam woodbank and Levels Wood with sessile oak standards and uncommon ground flora, both are parts of the Old Redding Complex. Stanmore Common has significant areas with a wide range of ground level ancient woodland indicator species even though the trees themselves are young, due to felling in the late 19th century. Most of Harrow's woodland areas are recent secondary woodland that has developed in the last 50 years on what were previously open grazed commons or farmland.</p> <p>3. Section 6.1 “Replacement planting” should include reference to the fact that where large trees have been felled there will be space for a large growing tree variety to be replanted since adjacent buildings and pavements will have been built and modified to accommodate the old tree. In these instances all efforts should be made to replace with a similar variety rather than a small short lived ornamental species. Perhaps in addition one should say “The size of tree and design layout is selected to complement the existing landscape character and the history of the site and be appropriate for the function of the site.” We are thinking of roads with tree names such as Long Elms and Elms Road - the aim should be to plant elms as the street trees on these roads, given the historical association with that species.</p> <p>4. Stanmore Common A survey of Stanmore Common in 2010 by John Dobson (available on the HNCf website) revealed that significant areas of the site had a wide range of ground level ancient woodland indicator species even though the trees themselves were all less than 100 years old. This suggests that the areas were ancient woodland and that the</p>	<p>3. Section 6.1 updated – “The size of tree and design layout is selected to complement the existing landscape character and be appropriate for the function and history of the site.</p> <p>4. An Independent survey has already been carried out and the findings form part of the strategy. Text not updated.</p>
--	--	--

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

	<p>associated flora, and perhaps some invertebrate and fungal species, have survived the tree felling that occurred in the late 19th century so that as the younger trees develop the areas will regain much of the character of ancient woodland. Text to this effect should be included as a footnote to section 6.3 of Appendix D.</p> <p>5. Relationship with Harrow Nature Conservation Forum The document refers to a partnership with Harrow Nature Conservation Forum for managing areas of woodland and possible involvement in the Tree Warden scheme. However at present operation of the Forum depends on specific grants, for example from the Heritage Lottery Fund, for specific projects, plus Harrow Council Small Grants of ~£4,500 per year which again are mainly directed to specific projects which change year on year, require re-application every year, and may not continue in the future. We suggest that partnership with the Forum be put on a more stable footing with a steady, small grant of £1000 per year for activities related to the tree strategy, guaranteed for at least five years.</p>	<p>5. This refers to operational financial issues so text not updated.</p>
<p>Julian Maw 27/11/2014 Chair Environment</p>	<p>The Association is very aware of the benefits of trees to the Borough has planted several commemorative trees over many years. The Association has reviewed the document and taken sounding of our members and the overall consideration is very supportive of the positive nature of the draft strategy. We have a few comments which are set out below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bearing the positive proposals to augment and enhance the tree stock in 	<p>1. Vision updated - “To protect,</p>

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

	<p>made b. Number of vacant tree pits [targeting zero].</p> <p>We trust our comments are helpful and congratulate the officers on a well presented useful document.</p>	<p>zero by 2019.</p>
<p>David Summers Harrow Agenda 21 1/12/20014</p>	<p>1. Recognising the importance of trees, and at the same time the financial constraints within which the Council are operating, LBH / Officers should be congratulated for preparing a positive tree strategy.</p> <p>2. The Council’s Tree vision on Page 3 “To protect, improve and sustain the tree population of Harrow for the benefit and enjoyment of current and future generations.” should also explicitly vision an expansion of the tree population.</p> <p>3. Executive Summary – Page 4. Bullet point items relating to services LBH will NOT provide: a. “Minor loss of light or removal to improve sightlines if there is a health and safety issue” – is this correct having implied elsewhere that Health & Safety will not be compromised? b. “Removing to improve Aesthetics/ Health & Safety” – unclear – similar to previous item</p> <p>4. Section 6 - Tree planting programme – “The aim is to undertake to annually plant more trees than are removed”. This should not be an aim but a commitment, and reflected in the Executive Summary and in Section 10 as a metric (see item 7 below).</p>	<p>2. Vision updated - “To protect, improve, increase and sustain”</p> <p>3. Text Updated – now states “Minor loss of light or removal to improve sightlines unless there is a health and safety issue.</p> <p>Text Updated – now states “Removing to improve aesthetics”</p> <p>4. Text unchanged. It remains an aim as it is subject to financial constraints.</p>

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

	<p>5. Section 4.4 – Vehicle crossovers - The strong line on tree removal is fully supported.</p> <p>6. Section 5.3 – Page 15 et seq. re tree pruning – if this is the (existing?) strategy, why are there notices for buses to avoid the low branches and at other locations there are no notices but the low branches do hit the double decker buses?</p> <p>7. Section 10 – re Monitoring. a. To complement the number of trees successfully planted, there should be a metric which records the net increase in Harrow’s tree population (which is in LBH control) (see item 2 & 4 above).</p> <p>b Instead of “Number of vacant tree pits planted with replacement trees”, replace with “Number of vacant tree pits” – target is zero by end of each planting year.</p> <p>c. Similarly, an additional metric “Number of tree planting locations, but not yet planted” – this gives an indication of forward activity.</p>	<p>5. Section 4.4 no change needed</p> <p>Section 5.3 This is a new strategy including cyclical maintenance for the first time. London Buses put up their own notices. The LA endeavours to keep the highway unobstructed but some trees will have grown faster during the summer period.</p> <p>Section 10 – addressed – net increase of the tree population now included</p> <p>Point B – addressed – number of vacant pits added as a performance indicator</p> <p>Point C – number of vacant tree</p>
--	--	--

Tree Strategy – Consultation Feedback – Appendix C

	<p>d. I would also like to see a tree diversity metric.</p>	<p>pits added as a performance indicator</p> <p>Not appropriate for this strategy</p>
<p>Community Champions Cannons Park</p> <p>Received 09/12/2014</p>	<p>Many thanks for sending me this document - it is indeed a weighty tome and it has taken me some time to read through it, especially the parts relevant to Canons Park! The aims of the document are admirable, in that the council is striving to protect existing trees and encourage the planting of new trees, especially in parks and open spaces such as Canons Park. I look forward to hearing when work will begin on the clearance of brush and fallen trees and logs in Canons Park's small but important woodland, the Spinney in Canons Park, following discussions and a site visit by Nick Harrison a couple of months ago. The Spinney is a quarter mile long ancient woodland that runs from the top end of Canons Park down to Whitchurch Lane and is a sadly neglected area of the park that needs urgent attention.</p>	<p>Clearance of bush and fallen trees – this item will be attended to.</p>
<p>John Dobson</p> <p>Consultant Ecologist</p> <p>11/01/2015</p>	<p>Acknowledged consultation but unable to comment.</p>	<p>No update needed to text</p>