



**Action notes of the additional meeting held on  
Monday 20<sup>th</sup> February 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)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)

**Apologies**

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

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Fargate Future High Streets Fund scheme</u></b>	
	<p>NRe updated the Partnership regarding the Fargate Future High Streets Fund (FHSF) scheme, following the email that she had sent at the weekend. She informed the Partnership that she would be arranging an urgent meeting that week involving herself, RE, the FHSF project team, any partnership members who wish to attend and the STAG co-chairs.</p> <p>She asked who from the Partnership wanted to be consulted on the time and day of the meeting before this was finalised. CK and SS said that they wished to attend and would prioritise the meeting. CE asked that Andy Greenwood (Amey City Centre Tree Inspector) also be invited to the meeting. NRe agreed to liaise with CK, SS and AG regarding the timing of the meeting, but would invite all of the Partnership to the meeting so that those who were able to attend could do so if they wished.</p> <p>NRi suggested that when the Partnership has its new website, we could put our responses to consultations on the website so everyone can see what the Partnership has said.</p> <p>RE reiterated the apology that had already been offered by the council regarding the error that had been made with the comms relating to Fargate</p>	<b>NRe</b>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	FHSF. NE said that the apologies and the quick response in taking the incorrect tweets down was appreciated and thanked RE for that.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Dunkeld Road</u></b>	
	<p>CK raised concerns about the wording used in the Dunkeld Road consultation relating to the potential size of the dawn redwood trees. The wording used was incorrect and doesn't relate specifically to the dawn redwood species; the trees that grow to 100 metres are a different species.</p> <p>GC responded that she is frustrated about the mistake; the council genuinely didn't intend to get this wrong.</p> <p>PS said that everyone was in agreement that the trees need to be removed because they are too big. And the Council has bent over backwards to actually plant more replacement trees than what is currently there, which is great. It's actually quite a good thing that we're testing out the process on this but we need to learn the lessons for the other CIP roads. He said that he didn't think that any long-term damage had been done on this for Dunkeld Road; it's just a genuine mistake and we can move on because of that.</p> <p>CK requested that the text on the online consultation be changed so that the information is more accurate. It was noted and understood that the printed information could not now be changed.</p> <p>It was agreed that CK would send GC the revised text that she would like the existing wording to be replaced with. NE said that it was clearly the Council's consultation but asked for GC to take a view on whether she was happy to use the revised text that CK would supply and either make the changes or explain why she would not be making the changes.</p>	<b>CK/GC</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>Future consultations regarding Core Investment Programme (CIP) streets</u></b>	
	<p>The purpose of this item was to agree a clear way forward regarding the future involvement of the Partnership in consultations regarding CIP streets. NE said that we need to agree what we are consulted on and what we are not consulted on. He felt that on CIP streets the council/Amey should take the time to consult the Partnership. NE said that it is accepted that any inaccuracies have been mistakes, however involving the Partnership early should help to avoid this for future important consultations on CIP streets.</p> <p>RE said that from his point of view we should be coming to the Partnership early on in the process on this - sometimes we'll disagree and other times we'll find a compromise; either way we'll be grateful for the input. Going forward let's use the Partnership in the way that it's been set up.</p> <p>GC said that Amey lead on consultation, therefore we need to get Cassie and Yvonne involved in the conversation. GC also elaborated on some of her concerns about getting the approach right in the future – especially with</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>some of the very challenging roads. She reflected that there's a real risk that whatever we try to do with comms, we won't get it right.</p> <p>NE said that he thinks that that's where the Partnership ultimately can come in to help the council work through those comms.</p> <p>GC said that the issue may be that the council might not be presenting the Partnership's view; it will be tricky to get the right balance going forward.</p> <p>NE said that there were two parts to this and this is about what it means to be partner. One element is about being consulted over the works that are proposed - to express a view, which the council can then choose to accept or not, and that's entirely up to the council. The second element is that when comms are being prepared the Partnership can assist in trying to put those comms out in a way that will be most widely and best received. And recognising that in that process, by sharing with the Partnership, we are effectively working in partnership.</p> <p>CK added that all partners are perfectly capable of assisting in putting together a document that they don't personally agree with.</p> <p>NE said that he would also stress that if anybody does decide to express a personal view in the public arena, he would take them to task, because this is a partnership.</p> <p>PS said that he understood GC's nervousness. However when it comes to the CIP roads, 'we know them inside out'. PS said that he and CK could actually help significantly if information is fully shared and partners are trusted.</p> <p>NE said that he would take this away and develop a protocol to bring back to the Partnership to outline when the Partnership should be involved with consultations. NE committed to involve RE, GC and Amey in this.</p>	<b>NE</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b><u>Core Investment Programme (CIP) spreadsheet</u></b>	
	<p>NE asked if everyone had had the opportunity to look at the CIP spreadsheet that had been shared by Gill.</p> <p>CK raised a specific issue about barriers remaining on Oldfield Way, which GC said that she would pick up.</p> <p>All agreed that the spreadsheet was now accurate, but PS suggested a final proof check to remove any spelling errors. GC would pick this up.</p> <p>NRi asked if there could be some comms that go with it to explain the context, as the public might not understand this. GC said that she would talk to Cassie about how to provide this.</p>	<p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>GC</b></p>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>NE said that he thought that the spreadsheet was really clear. Obviously there are various small things that people have picked up on, but from his point of view he said it was really helpful to see everything in one place.</p> <p>The CIP spreadsheet was agreed.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b><u>Trees for Streets</u></b>	
	<p>GC said that due to DW's ongoing absence there had been some delays with progress on the Trees for Streets (TfS) scheme.</p> <p>NE asked if there were any questions remaining for any partners regarding TfS that would prevent the scheme from being launched. He said that the costing point was the only thing from his perspective.</p> <p>It was confirmed that there had been views shared on the Partnership's comms spreadsheet regarding concerns about the two metre minimum width for the pavement, specifically that this width requirement would preclude a lot of locations. But all partnership members were happy to go with this requirement for now and evaluate later whether this was proving to be a significant barrier to additional planting.</p> <p>It was also flagged that there had been an issue raised at the SSTP meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> February about the website not preventing requests coming though which don't meet the criteria for suitable planting locations. This could create a problem for Amey and CE had taken an action to pick this up with DW to try to resolve.</p> <p>NRe said that she thought clarity was needed regarding what sign off the Partnership wants and expects regarding the launch of the TfS scheme.</p> <p>NE confirmed that all were happy to use the criteria for planting new street trees that Trees for Streets had recommended. NE also outlined what had been agreed at the meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> February regarding pursuing possible funding avenues to bring down the cost to individuals of tree planting. It was clear though that ultimately none of those funding sources would be likely to be lined up ahead of the current planned launch of the scheme.</p> <p>GC said that the soft launch of the scheme was planned for 6<sup>th</sup> March. She asked what information the Partnership wanted to see to enable this to go ahead in the timescales outlined. GC confirmed that the policy was fully signed off at committee last week, so this was fully delegated to officers to agree with the Partnership. She accepted the concerns about the pricing point but asked for the Partnership's support to move forward with the scheme in the timescales outlined. It was confirmed that the timescales for the launch of the scheme had been driven by planting season timescales.</p> <p>CE said that realistically there was no prospect of reducing the price point by the time of the launch, however that's not to say that people are going to be put off by the prices. Yes, there is a disparity between our price point and</p>	<b>CE / DW</b>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>what other local authorities charge, but there are people who are still interested in tree planting at this price point.</p> <p>PS said that he thought that the interest would probably be quite low at the current price point, without subsidy.</p> <p>In terms of communicating with people about the price and how that might reduce for future planting seasons, CE said that we should be clear that the price will be reviewed every year.</p> <p>NE said that it may well be that we launch the scheme and after six months no one signed up - at that point we would have a very clear message, that there's not been an uptake because people can't afford it.</p> <p>There was a question about whether crowdfunding would be an option on the Sheffield TfS site right from the beginning of the scheme.</p> <p>GC said that it was her understanding and intention that there would be a crowdfunding option available on the website from the outset.</p> <p>CE said that he needed to speak to Simeon at TfS anyway, so he would raise the point about crowdfunding with him, to check.</p> <p>NRi asked if the Partnership could see the comms in good time before this went out, so that all had the opportunity to comment. CS would be asked to liaise with the Partnership regarding the comms in good time for people to comment.</p> <p>PS said that the soft launch provided an opportunity for the Partnership to have a good look at the website, note any mistakes/issues, if there were any, and share feedback ready for the full launch.</p> <p>NRe asked for clarification about what 'soft launch' meant and GC confirmed that this would mean that the site was live and accessible to the public, however we will not have told the public about it yet. GC explained that the full launch was scheduled for 20<sup>th</sup> March – so this gives us between 6<sup>th</sup> March and 20<sup>th</sup> March to get any issues resolved and fully agree all comms with the Partnership within that window.</p> <p>NE asked if everyone was happy to endorse the TfS scheme and to proceed with the soft launch on 6<sup>th</sup> March. All confirmed their agreement to proceed.</p>	<p><b>CE</b></p> <p><b>CS</b></p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b><u>Third Party Claims</u></b>	
	<p>GC confirmed that unfortunately in DW's absence this item had not progressed. GC confirmed that Ian Muratt had been due to send the council a template and she had hoped to be able to share this with the Partnership by now. She said that she didn't yet have this but would share it with the Partnership as soon as possible via the Google Drive.</p>	<b>GC</b>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	NE thanked GC and confirmed that what we want to see at this point is just the template, so that we know what level of information we're due to be able to see when Ian completes his work.	