



**Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 10th February 2023
At Sheffield Rotherham Wildlife Trust**

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)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE) (part)


Item 3 only

Laurence Heijbroek (LH)

Apologies

Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Cassie Stewart	Sheffield City Council (CS)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome</u>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting and apologies for absence were noted. It was noted that RE would be attending the meeting, but would be late, due to a clash with a member briefing.	
2.0	<u>Sign off of previous notes and update on actions</u>	
	Nathan shared the notes on screen and ran through them, as these had only been shared the previous evening so not everyone had had the opportunity to see them in advance. There was one correction to accuracy – on the Local Plan Consultation item the wording needed to change from ‘January 20 th ’ to ‘February 20 th ’. With that amendment the notes of the meeting held on 13 th January 2023 were agreed as a true record.	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NRe to make the correction and send the final version for uploading to the website.</p> <p>There were few updates, as most of the issues were either to be picked up in a later part of the meeting or had been paused, due to the recent absence of key colleagues.</p> <p>There was a brief conversation about Trees for Streets (TfS), around the issue of the pavement width of 2 metres. NE referred to the comment that he had added to the comms spreadsheet and his proposal to 'start with a 2m width'. Partnership members were comfortable with this. However there was a collective concern that currently the TfS website doesn't do what we need it to do, as it doesn't stop requests coming through which don't meet the criteria for suitable planting locations. This could create a problem for Amey as it would generate a big resource demand for them to assess sites, many of which are likely to be unsuitable. It was agreed that CE would pick this up with DW to try to resolve.</p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>CE</p>
3.0	Reflective Research	
	<p>Laurence introduced himself. He had previously worked with the Council as a National Management Trainee through the Local Government Association's National Graduate Development Programme. During this time, between October 2020 and June 2021, Laurence supported and participated as an active member of the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership.</p> <p>As part of that work, Laurence undertook a piece of research relating to the SSTP and produced a research study: <i>Strategy Co-production on the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership</i>.</p> <p>This was designed to provide a set of recommendations that would benefit the Partnership, whilst satisfying the criteria of an Institute for Leadership and Management ILM Level 7 Qualification. Laurence said that he hoped that some of the findings would be useful.</p> <p>Laurence explained that he undertook one on one interviews with the ten Partnership members at that time and used that data to come up with some themes, which are reflected in the research report. All the qualitative data in the report is anonymised. There are 6 core themes.</p> <p>NRi suggested that it would be helpful to share the 6 core themes with other partnerships. NRe suggested that we could share the report on the website with the notes of this meeting, if Laurence was comfortable with this. Laurence agreed that he was happy for this to happen. NRe to action.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>SSTP_Reflective Research_020223.pdf</p> </div>	<p>NRe</p>

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>Laurence talked through the recommendations contained within the report and took questions and comments as he went through. The recommendations were as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider bringing in external, independent voices to temporarily support and advise on the establishment of the strategy delivery pathways. 2. Confirm and reignite political buy-in, if necessary, through drawing the responsible Councillors closer into the strategy delivery process. 3. Review action plan awareness and accessibility to ensure stakeholders are fully aware of both responsibilities to maintain it, and accountabilities to actions within it. 4. Seek to strengthen the Partnership's connection with SCC Parks & Countryside to integrate delivery with the Trees & Woodland Strategy, to which it contributes, and develop a more holistic approach to managing, maintaining, and enhancing the urban forest. 5. Create space to collectively listen and learn from the experiences and views of new members of the Partnership strategy delivery group. 6. Develop an induction guide that captures and communicates the Partnership's way of working, group culture, and expectations around participation. 7. Bring members together in person at independent spaces. 8. Renew conversations around resource to ensure that public servant action plan management and internal engagement responsibilities are adequately supported. 9. Invite the SCC Highways Team onto the Partnership Core Delivery Group. 10. Ensure Tree Officers are given a platform for expression and opportunity to co-develop and co-own actions throughout the strategy delivery process. 11. Engage with the Disability Community and include an accessibility perspective throughout the delivery phase. 12. Seek to create open delivery mechanisms that offer a range of levels of invitation that empower stakeholder support networks and citizens to become active agents and part of the solutions to the challenges street trees face. 13. Take new opportunities to adopt a hands-on approach to engagement that elevates voices and galvanises participation of diverse communities across all parts of the city. 14. Renew membership to bring new ideas, skills, and perspectives to increase the energy, impetus, and positive tension and drive the project forward. 15. Create space to collectively debate and explore some of the approaching longer-term strategy commitments to bring clarity, identify actions, and add accountability. 	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>It was noted that some of the recommendations had been superseded by activity that had taken place since the research was carried out.</p> <p>Regarding recommendation 3, PS said that he felt that there was more structure and organisation within the Partnership and said that the internal communications spreadsheet was working well as a way of facilitating clear communication between the Partnership.</p> <p>In relation to recommendation 5 a comment was made that CE had brought a range of new insights into the Partnership since joining the Partnership, at the point of turning the strategy into practical reality and that the Partnership had found that very helpful. LH noted that his research found that a culture of being frank and direct had been really helpful in having constructive conversations within the Partnership.</p> <p>Regarding recommendation 10 it was noted that this was a work in progress. Carl expressed the view that it would be helpful if one of the tree inspectors was a member of the Partnership group or more closely involved. It was noted that the subject of membership is one that the Partnership had already agreed required further discussion and this would be scheduled on the agenda at the next away day.</p> <p>LH was thanked for his presentation. There was a consensus that the work was excellent and very well considered. LH invited partnership members to keep in touch and to contact him if they had any further questions.</p> <p>There was a suggestion that a short version of the report, e.g. an Executive Summary, would be helpful in terms of disseminating the research further and LH said that he would consider this.</p>	
4.0	<u>Short updates</u>	
4.1	<p><u>Dunkeld Road</u></p> <p>CE and NRe shared the consultation materials that had been produced for Dunkeld Road and explained that these had been signed off, were being shared for information and were due to be printed that afternoon.</p> <p>NRe explained that it had been challenging to find a simple way of explaining what's a very complex issue. And consequently there had been many iterations of the document to try and make it as easy to understand as possible. NRe talked through and explained the document.</p> <p>NRe explained that there isn't much difference between options 1a, b & c – the difference was the number of trees to be planted on Dunkeld vs. the number of trees to be planted in the nearby area.</p> <p>There was some concern raised about the wording 'causing minimal damage to nearby surfaces and property'. NRe explained how difficult it had</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>been to meet the print deadlines and that it had been challenging because the work had been led by CS and GC originally but NRe had picked it up at the last minute due to their annual leave. NRe said that if there was anything that the Partnership feels is desperately wrong with the materials then she would stop it going to print, but otherwise it was going to print that day.</p> <p>Some disappointment was expressed about the Partnership not having the opportunity to be involved before the point of sign off. NRe said that she had been clear that this was being brought as an update, for information; while it might be ideal to consult/involve the Partnership in things like this, we have to accept that there isn't always the time and the resource to do that. We need to set realistic expectations about when the Partnership will be consulted and when it will be informed.</p> <p>PS made the point that the Partnership would like to help the Council/Amey; if the Partnership were involved in developing this consultation document it would help the Council, as some of this wording could rile residents.</p> <p>A question was asked about the process for how the decision will be made once people have responded to the consultation. NRe said that she did not know; GC would be asked to respond on that point.</p> <p>A question was asked about how SCC would inform residents of the outcome, after the consultation. Some members of the Partnership felt very strongly that residents should be informed of the outcome of the consultation before any action is taken. DW/GC would be asked to respond.</p> <p>NE said that we need to resolve the point regarding when the Partnership is consulted and when it is informed.</p>	<p>GC</p> <p>GC/DW</p>
4.2	<p><u>Strategic planting palette</u></p> <p>NE brought all up to speed that a meeting had taken place between CE, CK and NE (in DW's absence) to start the work towards creating the brief. A follow up meeting would be arranged, to include the University of Sheffield and the Amey tree inspectors. This issue would then be brought back to the Partnership, following the meeting.</p>	NE
4.3	<p><u>CIP surfacing programme spreadsheet</u></p> <p>The spreadsheet had been shared with the partnership prior to the meeting.</p> <p>PS said that he had points to raise regarding accuracy. He agreed to add comments into an additional column on the spreadsheet and would then email CE and NRe to say that he had done that so that the issues could be addressed.</p> <p>NRe noted that the spreadsheet was not to be shared publicly for the time being, until PS's concerns had been addressed. NRe to inform GC and CS.</p>	<p>PS/NRe/ CE</p> <p>NRe</p>

		ACTION WHOM
	It was agreed that once any corrections had been made, and PS was happy that his concerns had been addressed, this should be shared publicly.	
5.0	<u>Local Plan Consultation</u>	
	<p>NE updated the Partnership about the consultation engagement meeting that some partnership members had attended on 31st January.</p> <p>It was noted the Partnership had until 20th February to submit their consultation response. NRi shared on screen the draft consultation response and this was discussed in detail.</p> <p>NRi made notes on screen to make sure that everyone's comments were captured.</p> <p>NE raised that he had contacted Sheffield City Council's (SCC) Planning Service to raise the issue about biodiversity net gain and the opportunity to use this to create a mechanism to plant more street trees. This is being followed up with a meeting in February between NE, NRi, NRe, CK and SCC's Planning and Ecology Teams.</p> <p>It was agreed that NRi would continue working on the consultation response document and would send it out to everyone for further comment. The deadline for comments would be Wednesday 15th February. NE would then submit the consultation response on behalf of the Partnership.</p>	<p>NRi</p> <p>NE</p>
6.0	<u>Decision of the Director of Street Scene and Regulation to vary the Highways Maintenance Contract</u>	
	<p>NE explained that comments had been added to the comms spreadsheet in relation to this. RE said that he was disappointed with what had happened; we did drop the ball and accept that this has caused problems. Let's learn from that and move on; we need to keep a positive trajectory going forward to support what the Partnership is trying to achieve.</p> <p>PS said that there had been a series of own goals, mostly created through a lack of resource; partners need to do their very best in the future not to rush things and do more to communicate better and in advance.</p> <p>RE suggested to add a 'Forward Look' as a standing item on future Partnership meeting agendas to consider what's happening between now and the next Partnership meeting. All agreed that this would be a good idea. NRe to action.</p> <p>NRe and NE to also consider whether we want to have an item on the next away day specifically focussing on communication.</p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>NRe/NE</p>

		ACTION WHOM
7.0	<u>Outstanding consultations</u>	
	<p>There was a discussion about the outstanding consultation decisions that had been shared on the comms spreadsheet. CE had had to leave the meeting early and was not present for this discussion.</p> <p>Psalter Lane opposite 190a – it was agreed to ask SCC/Amey if the replant could be elm instead of birch. DW/CE to consider and report back.</p> <p>Hangingwater Road near bridge – it was agreed to ask SCC/Amey to reflect on the tree size and either justify Cornus mas as the replant species or come back with a different suggestion.</p> <p>Pizza Express Ecclesall Road – it was agreed that this would not be possible to resolve during the meeting and that a future item should be scheduled to discuss this.</p> <p>Derek Dooley Way – the Partnership agreed with proposal for Turkish Hazel. NRe to inform DW/CE that this work could proceed.</p>	<p>DW/CE</p> <p>DW/CE</p> <p>NRe/NE</p> <p>NRe</p>
8.0	<u>Urban Tree Challenge Fund/Subsidising community tree planting</u>	
	<p>The view was asserted that the Partnership needs to resolve the price point regarding community trees before the Trees for Streets scheme is launched.</p> <p>It was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DW and NE would draft a letter to the Mayor of South Yorkshire seeking funding to subsidise community tree planting. This would be shared on the google drive for people’s comments and would be sent in Nathan’s name. • SS would look into whether there was funding available through the Woodland Trust. <p>In principle it was also agreed that PS would make an application to the Urban Tree Challenge Fund on behalf of Nether Edge and Sharrow Sustainable Transformation (NESST). It was noted that the application would require the support of SCC as the landowner. PS to progress and bring back to the Partnership for further discussion, as appropriate.</p> <p>It was also noted that SCC would look into opportunities to pursue funding via the Urban Tree Challenge Fund and/or the Local Authority Treescapes Fund, in conjunction with Parks and Countryside, as appropriate.</p>	<p>NE/DW</p> <p>SS</p> <p>PS</p> <p>DW/NRe</p>

		ACTION WHOM
9.0	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
	It was agreed that the additional meeting of the Partnership would be held on Monday 20 th February at 1.30pm. NRe to action.	NRe
	It was agreed that NE, CK and RE would meet with Jon and Rich from STAG to discuss opportunities for STAG's further involvement with the Partnership.	NE/CK/ RE