



**Action notes of meeting held on  
Friday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2023  
Online via Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees**

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Paul Selby	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (PS)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Cassie Stewart	Sheffield City Council (CS)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)

**Notes**

Amanda Preston	Sheffield City Council (AJP)
----------------	------------------------------

**Apologies**

Catherine Nuttgens	The Woodland Trust (CN)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Welcome</u></b>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting and apologies for absence were noted.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Sign off of previous notes and update on actions</u></b>	
	The notes of the meeting held on 9 <sup>th</sup> December 2022 were agreed as a true record.  DW informed all that the Local Biodiversity Action Plan was now back with Amey.	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>Regarding Third Party Trees, DW confirmed that Ian Murat was now under contract. DW agreed to share the example report with the Partnership via the Google Drive, as soon as it was ready.</p> <p>Regarding Trees for Streets, it was noted that getting costs down for community trees was still a live issue. As CE was not in attendance at the meeting it was not possible to receive an update on this.</p> <p>Regarding the Core Investment Programme spreadsheet, the Partnership were updated that the Council had not yet received the updated spreadsheet from Amey. They agreed to share it on the Google Drive asap and get it out publicly after that if the Partnership was happy.</p> <p>Regarding the Street Tree Condition Impact Matrix, DW confirmed that he had received the updated version from Amey and would share this with the Partnership via the Google Drive.</p> <p>It was noted that NE, CK, CE &amp; DW were due to meet the following week to discuss the strategic planting palette work.</p>	<p><b>DW</b></p> <p><b>GC/DW</b></p> <p><b>DW</b></p>
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>Short updates</u></b>	
3.1	<p><b><u>Dunkeld Road</u></b></p> <p>DW gave an update on behalf of CE. He confirmed that Amey were committed to replanting on a 3 for 1 basis, recognising the high quality of the Dawn Redwood trees that are being recommended for removal. Residents would be consulted on whether they want 4 or 8 trees replanted on Dunkeld Road. Any not replanted on Dunkeld Road would be planted in the local area.</p> <p>This is a genuine consultation, however it needs to be very clear about the consequences of the option to retain the trees and the likelihood that this would result in further damage, including to property, within the next 20 years.</p> <p>NE sought confirmation from all that they were in agreement. NE stressed the need for clarity and transparency, to set out the consultation in the way that had been described and were happy for it to be made clear publicly that the Partnership had been consulted. All were in agreement.</p> <p>It was noted that on the wording of the consultation we couldn't say for certain that residential properties would be damaged in the long term but it was true to say that 'there's an increased risk of structural damage to properties if the trees remain'.</p> <p>In terms of the consultation with Dunkeld residents, the wording that was agreed was: 'the Partnership has been consulted and fully supports the approach.'</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	DW and GC to take this forward.	<b>DW/GC</b>
3.2	<p><u>Core Investment Programme – Matrix</u></p> <p>DW said that he had now added the revised Matrix to the Google Drive. GC said that she hoped that the points that PS and CK had raised had now been addressed. She asked if all could have a look at this and confirm that they are happy with it or come back with further comments; we need this bit of the jigsaw puzzle before we start doing the next stage of designs.</p> <p>There was a consensus that the matrix is a really positive tool to provide transparency around decisions. NE said that it was good that changes had been made as a consequence of previous conversations.</p> <p>A deadline for comments of 20<sup>th</sup> January was agreed, so that a final version could be agreed at the next Partnership meeting.</p>	<b>All</b>
3.3	<p><u>SSTP Website</u></p> <p>NRe informed the Partnership that local Sheffield company Ink &amp; Water had been awarded the contract for designing and building the SSTP website. NRe and CK had had the first meeting with them earlier that week.</p> <p>NRe shared the proposed timeline for the different stages of the design and build, which indicated the points at which the Partnership would be consulted. It was noted that this is a very tight timeline. All consultation would be conducted using the Google Drive/comms spreadsheet.</p> <p>It was agreed that NRe and CK would lead on this project, on behalf of the Partnership. NRe also said that they would have to soon start developing the content for the website and agreed that this would also be shared on the Google Drive when available, so that all could comment.</p> <p>NRe asked will there be a contact email address and who will be able to update content?</p> <p>NRe responded that there will be a contact form and if we want to there can be a drop down list to field the query to the right partner. This needs to be explored further. We will set it up so that 2 or 3 people can update website content and that will give us cover if anyone is unavailable for any period of time.</p> <p>CK added that it would be possible for us to have partnership emails linked to the website, if we wished to.</p>	<b>NRe/CK</b>
4.0	<u>Local Plan Consultation</u>	
	It was noted that the Local Plan consultation period began on 9 <sup>th</sup> January and would run until 20 <sup>th</sup> February 2023. NRe drew people’s attention to the document in the agenda pack which explained that there would be an	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>engagement event for environmental groups, which the Partnership would be invited to. Information about how the consultation response would need to be structured had also been provided.</p> <p>NRi shared and ran through the presentation that she had prepared. NRi agreed to set out the key points in the comms spreadsheet and share the relevant links there so that people could add their own comments.</p> <p>The question was asked - can we comment as a Partnership? It was noted that this question could be asked in the consultation session.</p> <p>NRi was thanked for the presentation.</p> <p>PS expressed the view that the current document doesn't seem to be very ambitious.</p> <p>NE felt that references to street trees should be strengthened. Allocated sites don't mention street tree planting; they should require an allocation of street trees and also there's no reference to the protection of existing street trees (i.e. new developments should be mindful and respectful of existing tree stock). The policy needs to give planning the armoury to protect street trees and make sure that developers are mindful of street trees.</p> <p>NRe agreed to email everyone the date for the consultation meeting, once this was known. It was agreed that the final consultation response from the Partnership would be agreed at the February meeting. NRe to add to the agenda.</p>	<p><b>NRi/All</b></p> <p><b>NRe</b></p> <p><b>NRe</b></p>
<b>5.0</b>	<b><u>Trees for Streets/Community Planting</u></b>	
	<p><u>Community Planting - outstanding issues</u></p> <p>NE updated the Partnership regarding the productive meeting that had taken place between NE, PS and NRe in December. The list of outstanding issues has been worked through and narrowed down. NRe shared and ran through the document outlining the outstanding issues.</p> <p>There was an extensive discussion about engagement with neighbours regarding community tree planting.</p> <p>GC shared an email from a councillor regarding a tree outside a property on Machon Bank, where residents said that they had not been consulted, illustrating the challenges that the Council and Amey have to deal with when we get this wrong.</p> <p>After discussion it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a resident wishes to plant a tree outside their own home then no consultation with neighbours is required</li> </ul>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is a community planting scheme where several trees are to be planted on the same street then the whole street would be consulted*</li> <li>• If a resident cant plant a tree outside of their home but wishes to plant a tree outside someone else’s home nearby then they would need to seek consent from that resident. The Council/Amey would also letter drop the property to ensure that there were no problems.</li> </ul> <p>*DW pointed out that there is specific support for whole street schemes from Trees for Streets and we will have an account manager who will help with this.</p> <p>It was agreed that the way that these rules/processes are described on the Trees for Streets website is important as we don’t want to put people off contributing to tree planting.</p> <p>There was a consensus that if a resident does not want a community tree to be planted in front of their house then we would not plant in that location, regardless of the reason; we can’t impose things on people that they don’t want and we need to model best practice community engagement.</p> <p>DW/GC to take the above agreed points forward in their ongoing conversations with TfS.</p> <p><u>Trees for Streets</u></p> <p>DW explained that in all other 20 local authorities working with Trees for Streets (TfS) the questions asked on the website are the same. DW agreed to share the link with everyone; all to provide feedback.</p> <p>NE said that it sounded like everyone was on board with this but that we need to give everyone the opportunity to look at the questions.</p> <p>NRi asked if we could have the SSTP logo on the website rather than the Council one. This could be looked into.</p> <p>DW flagged that an extraordinary meeting of the Partnership may be needed in order to meet the timescales for the TfS launch. NRe and DW to discuss outside of the meeting and liaise with the Partnership as appropriate regarding this.</p>	<p><b>DW/GC</b></p> <p><b>DW/All</b></p> <p><b>DW</b></p> <p><b>NRe/DW</b></p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>	
	<p>It was noted that <i>Current replant species list &amp; Decision re replant species for recent consultations</i> would be rolled forward to the next agenda due to time constraints.</p> <p>It was agreed that a discussion regarding the parameters for when we consult on road build outs would be put on the agenda for the March Partnership meeting.</p>	<p><b>NRe</b></p> <p><b>NRe</b></p>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>Gill informed the Partnership that the Council were making changes to the performance requirements of the Amey contract, to reflect the commitment to the Street Tree Partnership Strategy. Gill said that she would inform the Partnership once the decision was published.</p> <p>NRi asked if anyone could give her a contact at Amey for support with toad crossings. DW said that he would try to help if NRi could email him the details.</p>	<p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>NRi/DW</b></p>