



**Action notes of meeting held on  
Friday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2022  
at Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust, S2 2SF**

**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)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CK)

**Notes**

Amanda Preston	Sheffield City Council (AJP) (in attendance via Teams)
----------------	--------------------------------------------------------

**Apologies**

Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Catherine Nuttgens	The Woodland Trust (CN)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Welcome, introductions &amp; apologies</u></b>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Sign off of previous notes and update on actions</u></b>	
	<p>The notes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022 were agreed as a true record.</p> <p>The following updates arising from the actions were provided:</p> <p>CE updated all that the Local Biodiversity Action Plan was still not ready but he said it was due to be sent to SCC later the same day. DW said that if it was robust enough SCC would share it with partners and provide a date for comments to be received back.</p>	<b>CE/DW</b>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>NRe confirmed that she had circulated an updated version of the 12-Month Partnership Plan and sent out all of the meeting invitations for 2023.</p> <p>Regarding third party trees, DW confirmed that Ian Murat was in the process of being awarded a contract to undertake the work agreed. DW confirmed that within the immediate backlog claims for third party trees there were 6 trees, affecting 7 properties. It was confirmed that the 'example report' would be shared with the Partnership by DW as soon as Ian was under contract.</p> <p>Regarding the Core Investment Programme (CIP), it was noted that there had been a lack of progress. NE asked when the Partnership would be able to look at designs for CIP streets, from Amey's point of view. CE said that it was impossible to say at that time but that design resource was not going to be available for several months.</p> <p>It was noted that the Partnership had requested to see the updated CIP Surfacing Programme spreadsheet and had not yet received this. GC said that she would try to get this to the Partnership before Christmas. This could be shared publicly after that.</p> <p>GC said that because of the delays experienced and the lack of design resource available on Amey's side, it was unlikely that the designs for the remaining CIP streets would now be progressed until after May 2023. It was noted that when the Partnership returns to this, they would need to work hard to ensure that they could agree appropriate ways forward and ensure transparency with the public. NE said that he would have a conversation with GC outside of the room regarding timescales, to be clear about what we can and can't achieve.</p> <p>Regarding the issue of Sheffield Street Tree Partnership as a formal consultee on planning consultations, it had been agreed that this needs further consideration by the Partnership. CK expressed the view that the Partnership should become a formal consultee. GC said that she thinks that Sheffield City Council could have a conflict of interest, resulting from being a statutory planning consultee as the Highway Authority.</p> <p>GC said that as the Local Plan is being developed, the Partnership's input into that is really important; that's what the Partnership should seek to influence. She said that the Partnership should also seek to influence new policy changes coming in relating to biodiversity.</p> <p>NE suggested mulling this over and coming back to it in the new year. He agreed that looking at the Local Plan is key and that this would be scheduled on the agenda for the January Partnership meeting.</p>	<p><b>DW</b></p> <p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>NE/GC</b></p> <p><b>NE/NRe</b></p>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>Short updates</u></b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<p><u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u></p> <p>This had been picked up under item 2 (see notes above).</p> <p>PS raised concerns about the delays with this, as it had been going on for 15 months. The Partnership's frustrations with the significant delay were noted.</p>	
<b>3.2</b>	<p><u>Third Party Trees</u></p> <p>DW confirmed that as soon as Ian Murat was under contract this work would progress. Additional information had been provided under item 2 (see notes above).</p>	
<b>3.3</b>	<p><u>Trees for Streets</u></p> <p>DW updated that the main issue at the moment is driving down the price point for individuals to buy trees. This is one of the challenges that we've been asked by Trees for Streets (TfS) to go away and think about. We are considering whether we can purchase cheaper variants of native trees to bring the price down, potentially moving away from the 'extra heavy' standard. CE also contributed that we shouldn't limit ourselves to native trees only.</p> <p>PS said that the Partnership needs to be properly consulted on the options and it was acknowledged that this needs wider discussion.</p> <p>DW said that Amey need to take the challenge away to work out how they can get the price margins down; this is the immediate action. There are some key links between the TfS work and the wider 'strategic planting palette' piece of work.</p> <p>DW also updated that Cassie Stuart (Sheffield City Council) would be meeting TfS to look at the comms strategy.</p> <p>It was agreed that this needs to come back to the Partnership meeting in January. DW stated that the aim was to launch the scheme in early 2023 before the Pre-Election Rules on Publicity (PERP) period for the May election (<i>note: the PERP period begins 25 working days before polling day</i>). The deadline is driven by getting ahead of the planting season.</p> <p>NE stated that there are considerations over cost, process and species. It was noted that some (and potentially most) local authorities don't allow residents to choose a species.</p> <p>It was agreed that this needs a good amount of discussion time within the Partnership over the next 3 meetings. NRe/NE to schedule.</p>	<p><b>Amey</b></p> <p><b>NRe/NE</b></p>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	It was agreed that NRe, NE & PS would meet before the January meeting to agree the list of outstanding issues that still need to be resolved regarding community planting.	<b>NRe/NE/ PS</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b><u>Core Investment Programme (CIP)</u></b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<p><u>Agreeing a way forward for Dunkeld Road</u></p> <p>DW shared the hard copy plans showing the location of the trees on Dunkeld Road so that these could be viewed by all to help inform the discussion.</p> <p>Dunkeld Road has 4 dawn redwood trees on it. These are considered to be the wrong species of tree for this street (will grow very large and continue to cause root damage), however they are healthy, Category A trees. Amey had produced a design for the works required on the street showing all 4 dawn redwoods removed. DW talked through the plans and a thorough discussion followed.</p> <p>It was explained that the issue is that the trees will continue to cause ongoing damage to the highway network (and will also, in time, cause damage to nearby residential properties) as they have not finished growing, so there is really no viable way to retain the trees.</p> <p>It was also explained that the trees already fall within the Highways Act regulations because their growth means that there is less than 1 metre of useable footway available.</p> <p>A question was asked about the ash trees on the street and it was confirmed that these are being monitored for ash dieback disease.</p> <p>CE and DW explained that if the dawn redwoods are removed, almost all the engineering solutions required for that street are minor. CE said that Amey would consider replanting on a 3 for 1 basis (i.e. replacing each tree felled with 3 new trees) because the dawn redwoods are valuable Category A trees.</p> <p>CK said that we need to be really open and honest in the consultation to explain the complexity of the issue.</p> <p>NE asked if, in principle, the Partnership were in agreement that the 4 dawn redwood trees needed to be removed. All stated that they were in agreement, but the need for honest and open communication was reemphasised.</p> <p>CE committed that Amey would assess the scope for replanting and report back to the Partnership.</p> <p>NE confirmed that there was total agreement amongst the Partnership that the trees should be removed but said that we need to be transparent</p>	<b>CE</b>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>about why; the consultation needs to be structured in that way – it's all about the messaging.</p> <p>The question was asked whether a YouTube video could be produced to explain this really clearly. The idea of a roadshow was also raised.</p> <p>CE said that he would take away the issue of whether Amey could provide a roadshow for local residents, as part of the consultation for the proposal and would report back. If the roadshow was viable, it would be advertised via a letter drop to inform local residents.</p>	<b>CE</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<p><u>Street Tree Condition Impact Matrix</u></p> <p>By way of introduction it was explained that the Street Tree Condition Impact Matrix is designed to ensure that there is a consistent approach within Amey; the matrix is supposed to be a tool to support a balanced understanding of both tree condition and tree impact to inform decisions. This is used as <i>guidance only to aid a decision</i>.</p> <p>It was noted that a build out within a street is a permanent change to the road layout, so the Council has a responsibility to the community to ensure that these are only suggested in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>PS said that there were some specific concerns about the Matrix that he raised in September that still haven't been addressed.</p> <p>NE confirmed that everyone was in agreement with the principle, but that the devil is in the detail; there are some specific issues which Partnership members need to understand so that they feel able to defend the process. Therefore we need to work out how the specifics are applied.</p> <p>There followed a detailed discussion about the engineer score of 15, which will always result in a recommendation to fell. GC said that she accepted that low level works being required to a boundary wall is a very different scenario to more significant damage. NE said that there is a more nuanced approach needed to recognise that not all scores of 15 should result in an automatic fell. GC &amp; DW agreed to 'play this back' to Amey (Dave Laurence) and report back to the Partnership. However GC confirmed that it wouldn't be possible to bring this back to a specific monetary value.</p> <p>PS requested that the other comments in his email dated 17 September be responded to. CK was asked to provide any additional comments/feedback so that any remaining concerns could be resolved.</p> <p>CK stated that additional consideration also needs to be given at the lower end of the scale; for example it needs to be made explicit that leaving a gap in the kerb is permissible. It was agreed that Dave Laurence needs to define what falls within the remit of 'no work required'.</p>	<b>CK</b>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>NE stated that if the two extremes were addressed then everyone would be in a position to sign off the Matrix.</p> <p>DW and GC agreed to progress this with Dave Laurence, taking into account all the issues raised.</p> <p>It was agreed that this would be brought back to the Partnership in January. And that the aim would be to reshare the revised Matrix in advance of the meeting.</p>	<b>DW/GC</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<p><u>Surfacing Programme Spreadsheet</u></p> <p>The spreadsheet was not available to share and this had been addressed under item 2 (see notes above).</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<p><u><b>Strategic Planting Palette Proposal</b></u></p>	
	<p>Attention was drawn to the briefing note that had been circulated with the agenda. The Partnership had previously discussed at a high level the idea of creating a ‘strategic planting palette’ for individual areas and key streets across the city. The intended output of this work is a bespoke species list for each area/key street. The trees recommended will be both in keeping with the character of the area/street and will also ensure that species are selected for their climate resilience, biodiversity benefits and aesthetic appeal etc. Consideration of tree size/stature suitable for their location would also be a factor.</p> <p>Areas and key streets are to be defined and a species list selected based on best practice and current research. The current TDAG list of species will be reappraised in this context and the planting of cherry species will also be re-considered. The intended output seeks to empower the current tree inspectors to make replant selections and to help the SSTP and other decision makers to agree strategic/community planting projects.</p> <p>An initial approach had been made to the University of Sheffield (UoS) to ask whether they would be interested in working with the Partnership to develop the strategic planting palette and UoS had agreed that they would like to pursue this.</p> <p>The Partnership was asked to consider whether:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This was a sensible way of helping to move forward the Partnership’s thinking regarding a strategic palette?; and</li> <li>2. Whether it would be helpful to form a Task Group with the purpose of developing the brief with the University of Sheffield for this piece of work?</li> </ol> <p>It was envisaged that the brief would then be discussed and signed off by the Partnership, allowing works to start in spring 2023.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>The detailed proposal outlined in the briefing note was as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree that a Strategic Palette is to be progressed and convene a working group (no more than 4 – 5 people) to develop a brief (defining objective, process and output)</li> <li>2. Working group to define brief alongside UoS</li> <li>3. The Partnership to sign off brief (stage 1)</li> <li>4. UoS to undertake evaluation and report findings</li> <li>5. UoS to complete research into climate resilient street tree planting and present findings</li> <li>6. Urban Wilderness to act in a mentoring capacity for UoS PhD students to ensure process on track and students are supported</li> <li>7. The Partnership to discuss and agree to stage 2 – development of the palette, how it is to be used and when it is to be reviewed</li> <li>8. UoS/the Partnership to develop draft palette and report to the Partnership for discussion</li> <li>9. Amendments to be made and then publish for consultation.</li> <li>10. Review consultation responses and make amendments as required.</li> <li>11. Stage 3 - Review the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership Strategy in light of palette and amend as necessary</li> <li>12. Publish both documents</li> </ol> <p>NE asked if anyone had any questions or any reasons why the project shouldn't proceed.</p> <p>PS asked if the palette would be per street or geographical area. The answer was both; all strategic and arterial streets would be dealt with specifically and then whole areas would also be considered. Consideration would be given to whether the trees contribute to the character of the area or not and climate resilience/biodiversity would also be taken into account.</p> <p>NRi said that she would want to make sure that air pollution and ecosystem benefits were also factored in (this is slightly different to future proofing for a changing climate); this needs to be about all the benefits that trees provide.</p> <p>The response provided is that we want the student(s) to start with everything on the table.</p> <p>It was noted that in terms of geographical areas, the first job would be for the student(s) to decide areas. NE confirmed that a small working group would be created to design a brief – it was agreed that CK, DW, NE, CE would form this group.</p> <p>A brief would be formulated and brought back to the Partnership, after which the University could commence the work. The output could be something that the Partnership discussed at the first away day in 2023.</p>	<p><b>CK/DW/ NE/CE</b></p>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b><u>Current replant species list</u></b>	
	Due to time constraints it was agreed that this item would be discussed at a future meeting. CE agreed to add the current approved species list onto the Partnership Google Drive.	<b>CE</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b><u>Decision re replant species for recent consultations</u></b>	
	Due to time constraints it was agreed that this item would be discussed at a future meeting.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>	
<b>7.1</b>	<u>Website</u>  NR informed all that, following a Request for Quote process, she had received 3 bids from potential suppliers to design and build a bespoke website for the Partnership. The successful bidder was due to be awarded the contract by the end of the following week. The work for the website is due to be completed by 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2023 and the Partnership will be engaged and consulted as the project develops. NRe asked if anyone from the Partnership wanted to be directly involved with the process of agreeing the brief with the supplier and getting the project underway. CK asked to be involved and NRe committed to get in touch with her to set this up.	<b>NRe</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<u>Independent Street Tree Inquiry</u>  NE informed the Partnership that he had taken part in a public hearing for the Independent Inquiry into the Street Trees Dispute the previous day.	
<b>7.3</b>	<u>Future High Street Fund</u>  DW informed all that the Future High Street Fund no longer includes High Street; only Fargate is now in scope. Therefore fewer trees will be removed as part of this project.	
<b>7.4</b>	<u>Works on Fountain Square Garden</u>  DW referred to the information that had been shared on the Google Drive relating to the works on Fountain Square Garden to enable to installation of the Covid Memorial. All agreed that they did not have any objections to raise in relation to this work.	
<b>7.5</b>	<u>Removal of Tree at Russel St/Gibraltar Street</u>  DW referred to the information that had been shared on the Google Drive relating to the removal of one tree at Russel Street/Gibraltar Street, as part of the Transforming Cities Fund Housing Zone North work. All agreed that they did not have any objections to raise in relation to this work.	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>7.6</b>	<p><u>Letter in the Sheffield Telegraph</u></p> <p>NRi raised an unscheduled item of other business relating to a letter that had been published in the Sheffield Telegraph that day and asked if a reply could be drafted. CE agreed look into this with Amey's Communications Team and Cassie Stuart (Sheffield City Council), if required.</p>	<b>CE</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<p><u>Signing of the Partnership Charter</u></p> <p>All members of the Partnership who were in attendance signed the Partnership Charter. It was noted that those members of the Partnership who were not in attendance would need to sign this at a future face to face meeting.</p>	<b>NRe</b>