



**Action notes of meeting held on  
Friday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2022 (via Zoom)**

**Attendees**

Liz Ballard (Chair)	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (LB)
Christine King	Chair, Street Tree Action Groups Steering Group/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Paul Selby	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (PS)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Nicola Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Bethany Allsop	Sheffield City Council (BA)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Nathan Edwards	Urban Wilderness (NE)

Also in attendance:

Huda Ahmed (Item 6 only) Sheffield City Council (HA)

**Apologies**

Mick Crofts	Sheffield City Council (MC)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Catherine Nuttgens	Sheffield City Council (CN)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Cassie Stuart	Sheffield City Council (CS)

		<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
	LB thanked everyone for attending the meeting.  LB introduced Nathan Edwards who would be shadowing the meeting and would be taking over as the new Chair of Sheffield Street Tree Partnership from March 2022.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Notes of the last meeting</b>	
	LB flagged that the notes that were being considered were those that had been sent out via email to the Partnership by NRe that morning (these had superseded the ones sent by LB the previous day).  The Partnership agreed that the notes of the meeting on Friday 28 <sup>th</sup> January 2022 were a true record. These would be uploaded to the SRWT website.	

		<b>ACTION</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Actions/updates &amp; decisions – Friday 28th January 2022</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b><u>Update on Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP)</u></b>	
	<p>CE updated the group that the LBAP was still not ready but that there had been progress on this. Kieron Scruton (KS) at Amey was due to meet with a compliance manager next week to take this forward.</p> <p>LB will schedule a slot at the next partnership meeting for KS to provide an update on the LBAP.</p>	<b>LB</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b><u>5 Year Tree Strategy &amp; contract change</u></b>	
	<p>LB explained that there would not be an update on this today as DW had sent his apologies.</p> <p>PS said that the old tree management plan is still in use and asked for a date on when the new plan will be ready. GC said that Sheffield City Council (SCC) had already agreed with Amey that the Sheffield Street Tree Strategy (SSTS) supersedes the 5-year plan. GC said that in terms of the annual submission, SCC had said to Amey that the Appendix 5 process referred to in the SSTS needs to be followed relating to recommendations to fell. This includes using the street tree condition-impact matrix.</p> <p>It was noted that Amey colleagues had experienced delays with this work due to the significant volume of reactive work caused by the recent storms; Amey were still dealing with the fall out from that and this would continue into the following week.</p>	
<b>3.3</b>	<b><u>Status of buildouts documents</u></b>	
	<p>The Partnership shared their views on the <i>Parameters for Buildout and Engineering Works Consultation Process</i> document which is on the SCC website. CK and PS expressed concern that they had not been involved before the document was uploaded and were unsatisfied with the document remaining online. CK said that the document talks about being a partnership document in the first sentence, but the partnership hadn't discussed it.</p> <p>RE confirmed that the document would remain on the website but asked if there could be a discussion about this now during the meeting so that he could understand what needs to change within the document.</p> <p>GC stated that the document doesn't say that it's a partnership document, it says that it has been developed in relation to Appendix 5 within the SSTS. GC stated that the document is additional engagement with residents that elected members had asked for.</p> <p>LB stated that there wasn't time during the meeting to discuss the document in detail and instead asked GC to put the document on the</p>	<b>GC</b>

		<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>Google Drive so that PS and CK (and any other partnership member who wished to) could add their comments to it.</p> <p>LB said that there would be a separate item about this at a future meeting, but that there needs to be communications between members of the partnership about this via the Google Drive initially.</p>	<b>LB</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b><u>Comms Protocol &amp; Comms Forward Plan</u></b>	
	The partnership confirmed that they were happy with the Comms Protocol and Comms Forward Plan, which had been shared on the Google Drive. No issues.	
<b>3.5</b>	<b><u>Monitoring report</u></b>	
	NR updated the group that the monitoring report is in hand however there had not been as much progress achieved on this as had originally been hoped for by this point, due capacity challenges. NR offered to share the monitoring report progress doc on screen during the meeting but it was agreed that due to a lack of time it should instead be shared on the Google Drive. NRe said that she would create a new folder on the Google Drive for this.	<b>NRe</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b><u>Tree wardens update</u></b>	
	CE, SS and CK were due to meet to discuss Tree Wardens but had rescheduled for early March. CK informed the group that there had been several comments regarding Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) from Tree Wardens via WhatsApp. One had noted that 7 trees had been felled as TPOs had been removed in one area.	
<b>3.7</b>	<b><u>Third party compensation</u></b>	
	<p>PS, CK, GC and SS had met to discuss the subsidence issue. SS reported that she is working with professional contacts in London on how they are attempting to address this issue at Islington Council and would report back with any updates/information.</p> <p>LB asked that partnership members take notes during any future meetings with external stakeholders and add them to Google Drive so that the whole partnership can keep track on any updates.</p>	<p><b>SS</b></p> <p><b>All/Any</b></p>
<b>4.0</b>	<b><u>Communications</u></b>	
	<p>NRe updated the group that the PEFC press release was in hand and thanked the partnership for their comments and quotes. It was agreed that the PR would be sent out in the next 7-10 days by CS.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the PR that was to be prepared welcoming Nathan as the new Chair of SSTEP. The preferred timing for this was mid-end April, however it was noted that this would be during the Pre-Election Rules on Publicity (PERP) period. The rules prevent the Council from issuing any publicity that could be seen to support or promote individual</p>	<b>CS</b>

		<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>candidates standing for election, any group of candidates or political party. NRe said that she would seek advice from CS about this.</p> <p>PS updated the group that he did not want a PR to be sent out to mark the planting of the Community Tree Planting pilot trees. He asked that some comms is instead done on this in the summer. NRe to update the Comms Forward Planner accordingly.</p>	<p><b>NRe</b></p> <p><b>NRe</b></p>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Action Plan refresh</b>	
	<p>BA shared a draft for a new, updated version of the SSTP Action Plan. BA agreed to add the Action Plan to the Google Drive so that partnership members could comment on it. BA requested owners of each area to add the latest updates and amend the document as necessary.</p> <p>NE asked about the level of detail held within the Action Plan. NRe responded that this was tricky as the approach needs to strike a balance between level of detail and readability/usefulness. NRe and BA offered to meet with NE to discuss further if that would be helpful.</p> <p>LB asked if the key theme areas agreed in the previous SSTP meeting could be added to the 'recurring themes' tab within the Action Plan. BA to update.</p>	<p><b>BA</b></p> <p><b>NRe/NE/BA</b></p> <p><b>BA</b></p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	
<b>6.1</b>	<p><b><u>Outcome 6 (&amp;4) - Community planting</u></b>  Huda Ahmed (Local Area Committee manager for the East LAC) had joined the meeting for this item and introduced herself.</p> <p>Catherine Nuttgens, SCC Community Forestry Manager, had also been due to attend the meeting but unfortunately had to send apologies at the last minute.</p> <p>LB shared her draft Community Planting Scheme document and talked through this. LB made changes to the document live during the meeting, in response to the points raised.</p> <p>HA updated the group that she had met with DW who gave a presentation to the East LAC about the opportunity for additional street tree planting. HA reported that the East LAC does have some interest in getting involved with additional tree planting within the Darnall area but flagged that this would not be able to be funded by the LAC and instead, if this idea progressed, they would try to seek sponsorship from local businesses.</p> <p>HA also flagged that the first priority for residents within the East LAC area in terms of environmental issues was around issues like fly tipping and waste, and that dealing with these priority issues would take precedence over additional tree planting.</p>	

		<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>HA said that if work on additional tree planting progressed there would also be areas in Manor and Arbourthorne that would benefit from this. HA said that she was happy to participate in a working group to progress this.</p> <p>DW had previously suggested utilising the work of UOS students, who had produced images depicting how additional street tree planting could transform local areas. CK said that she would contact DW to discuss whether the students could produce images specific to the Darnall area and would discuss how the images could be altered to reflect land ownership and other issues preventing more aspirational planting.</p> <p>SS reported that she had spoken to CN about additional street tree planting and CN had identified some quick wins around Greenhill Parkway. SS said that she would speak to the Woodland Trust about other potential funding streams. LB/NRi said that they would explore setting up a restricted fund to call out for/start receiving donations.</p> <p>PS updated the partnership about progress made on the community tree planting pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>VAT</b> - this issue about is now resolved</li> <li>• <b>Liability</b> - this issue is also resolved as long as the money for the trees is donated (it was noted that SCC can't confer liability or benefit on the donor)</li> <li>• <b>Community engagement/consultation</b> - PS stated that in future this should be carried out by SCC and not by the community group (but this should be supported by the community group). This could be badged with SS and Partnership branding.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that PS, GC and DW would finalise the consultation process and update the draft agreement on Google Drive.</p> <p>PS said that he didn't want to finalise the document until the trees were planted but that the document could come back to SSTP for sign off after this point. PS, DW and GC to work together to ensure that the right version is put on the Google Drive.</p> <p>It was agreed that a working group would be set up to take forward the idea of the Darnall pilot project for additional tree planting. This would involve HA, SS, CK, CN, DW &amp; LB. NRe to contact Amanda Preston to get this set up.</p>	<p><b>CK</b></p> <p><b>SS</b></p> <p><b>LB/NRi</b></p> <p><b>PS/GC/DW</b></p> <p><b>NRe</b></p>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Future meetings</b>	
	<p><i>Friday 25<sup>th</sup> March 10.00-12.00</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership meeting</li> </ul>	