



Action notes of meeting held on Friday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2022 (via Zoom)

**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)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CK)

**Also in attendance**

Observing:

Nya Muchina (part)	Sheffield City Council (NM)
Cllr Joe Otten	Sheffield City Council (JO)

Item 1 only:

Chris Fazakerley	Ares (CFa)
Cavan Foo	Sisk (CFo)
Ben Handley	Ares (BH)
Kelly Sowden	Sisk (KS)
Matt Hayman	Sheffield City Council (MH)

**Apologies**

Cassie Stuart	Sheffield City Council (CS)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Amanda Preston	Sheffield City Council (AP)

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Welcome</u></b>	
	NE welcomed everyone to the meeting and facilitated introductions.	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Presentation and discussion Fargate Future High Street Fund</u></b>	
	<p>RE declared an interest as he is the Project Sponsor for the Fargate Future High Street Fund.</p> <p>Chris Fazakerley gave a thorough presentation on the Fargate Future High Street Fund, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project timeline and design evolution</li> <li>• Scheme comparison</li> <li>• Key points of the proposal</li> <li>• Proposed tree species</li> <li>• Working around existing trees</li> <li>• Wider benefits to the city centre</li> </ul> <p>There are currently 28 existing trees within scope of the scheme. The proposal is to remove 14 trees and introduce 21 new trees - a net gain of 7.</p> <p>14 existing trees are being proposed to be retained within the scheme.</p> <p>Where there are trees that are being proposed for removal, this is for the following principal reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate refuse service and emergency vehicle access along a single dedicated track</li> <li>• To reveal and activate the space outside “Event Central”</li> <li>• To improve the visual and physical connectivity around Castle Square</li> </ul> <p>The CAVAT values of existing trees and costs associated with new trees were shared.</p> <p>Some of the new trees that are being proposed are from the SSTP suggested species list within the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership Strategy, but not all.</p> <p>Benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in sustainable urban drainage</li> <li>• Increase in biodiversity - over 80 different species of plants will be installed</li> <li>• Creation of new jobs</li> </ul> <p>Comments/questions and answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS - the new trees being put in are generally much smaller - not large canopy trees even at full growth; potential that the value of the new trees going in doesn't reflect the CAVAT value of the trees being proposed for removal - we aren't comparing like for like in the calculations</li> </ul>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BH - yes, the trees proposed are smaller and this is due to the streetscape that the scheme is trying to create - this will require smaller trees; this is part of achieving the vision</li> <li>• CE - not particularly worried about the trees that are being proposed for removal - they aren't great specimens and some can be prone to failure. Re the proposal for the one new Black Pine tree - these are also prone to failure - concerned that this will fail</li> <li>• CFa - could look at a different species instead if there are concerns about the tree failing</li> <li>• CE - suggest a conversation with the tree inspector for that area to discuss this further, subject to timescales (it would need to happen in the next few weeks)</li> <li>• NRi - disappointed at the number of mature trees proposed for removal and that these are going to be replaced with smaller landscape species; overall not as many native species. Would have wanted to see more trees replacing those being removed and more in line with the suggested species in the Strategy. Agree with PS about the value of the new trees going in.</li> <li>• CK - agree with Carl's suggestion to introduce the project team to the tree inspector for the area. Can we understand more about biodiversity?</li> <li>• CFa - 85 new species of plants going in will improve the biodiversity</li> <li>• SS - disappointing to see smaller trees going in; larger trees would cool the environment in warmer summers. Also disappointed that not more trees have been selected from the species suggested in the Strategy.</li> </ul> <p>The team were thanked for the presentation. NE summed up that the main concerns were about species selection and also the issue about the long-term life of the new trees.</p> <p>BH said that the comments were really helpful and reiterated the team's willingness to meet with the tree inspector for the area, if this could be arranged quite quickly. He said that the team would do some more work to reflect on the species choice and size of the trees.</p> <p>GC thanked the team for the presentation and for working to retain more trees within the scheme. She flagged that there are some issues about underground waste containers, which mean that there are practical issues to consider about the space requirements for waste, which introduce some restraints.</p> <p>NE summary - overall the design looks great but feel that there is a little bit more work to do.</p> <p>NRi asked if there was any consultation due. MH said that there was already extensive consultation on the public realm in 2019; the scheme hasn't changed significantly since that consultation was carried out. He also explained that the timescales require that the scheme is completed by the end of March 2024.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	The project team left the meeting.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>Review and sign off of previous notes</u></b>	
	<p>The notes of the previous meeting had accidentally not been sent out in advance of the meeting. It was agreed that these would be shared and agreed after the meeting, via email.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NE to share the notes of the previous meeting</li> </ul>	<b>NE</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b><u>Partnership Away Day Follow Up</u></b>	
	<p>Nathan thanked everyone for the time that they had given attending the away day.</p> <p><b>4.1 SESSION 1: Partnership Charter</b></p> <p>The wording of the Partnership Charter was agreed with one small amendment that everyone agreed on. This was about consensus of decisions - the new wording agreed was: 'Discussion and dialogue; reaching decisions collectively and promoting and supporting them, presenting a united front'</p> <p><b>4.2 SESSION 2: Consultation</b></p> <p>It was confirmed that, following the additional meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> June, DW is looking now at the consultation wording but this isn't ready yet.</p> <p>PS said that he was happy with where we have got to with build outs consultation process.</p> <p>GC said that the key action was for DW to craft the consultations. The work that the facilitators did was great but we need to have another look at how we present what was agreed by the Partnership - so that the decisions are clear.</p> <p>NRe offered to turn the outputs from the meeting into some clear notes.</p> <p>CK expressed the view that this was going to be quite complicated and difficult to get right because in some cases up to 7 trees are part of the same scheme.</p> <p>GC - do we do the Appendix 5 tree assessment for the trees for this process? We need to show what the true value is of the trees that we would have to remove if the build out proposals were rejected. We don't have anything to hide - the build outs designs have been proposed to save the trees.</p>	<b>NRe</b>





		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>be any issues around Charity Commission rules. There will be a small charge for that platform and a small cost to manage this, so SRWT would probably need to take a small proportion of the gift aid donations to cover those costs.</p> <p>There was an acknowledgement that we need to make sure that this wouldn't interrupt the process that has been agreed within SCC and signed off by Legal.</p> <p>GC confirmed that she would need to get this checked out by Legal/Finance and asked NRi to send her an email outlining the key points so that she could have that conversation with them. We also need to iron out whether the money is going to the Council initially and then being sent to Amey or whether it can go directly from SRWT to Amey.</p> <p>PS said that he had been told last year that the money had to go via SCC in order for it not to attract VAT. CE confirmed that this was also his understanding.</p> <p>What is the cost of a rejected dug pit? CE said that he had started to look into this and would get back to the Partnership with an estimated cost.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remaining issues regarding the donations fund to be followed up outside of the meeting by NRi and GC</li> <li>• CE to provide estimated costs for rejected dug pits</li> </ul>	<p><b>NRi/GC</b></p> <p><b>CE</b></p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b><u>Surfacing Programme</u></b>	
	<p>GC apologised for not sharing the document before the meeting. GC shared the document on screen showing the 308 trees where work was paused (78 roads in total). She said that she would share the final document with the Partnership in the next few days (it's with Amey at the moment for checking) and this will provide the Partnership with a full update.</p> <p>There are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 42 roads completed; status 'Closed'</li> <li>• 15 roads programmed for 22/23 (with no road layout changes proposed); status 'Programmed'</li> <li>• 12 roads programmed for 23/24; status 'To be programmed'</li> <li>• 9 programmed for 22/23 with proposed changes to the road layout; status 'Road layout changes'</li> </ul> <p>The latter 9 are the focus for the Partnership now and Gill filtered the spreadsheet so that these could be seen and briefly talked through these roads.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>PS thanked Gill for updating the document and noted that there has been a lot of positive progress since last October.</p> <p>The discussion moved on to the specific issue of Sheldon Road. GC explained that there had been a petition received by the Council from local residents, reflecting their concerns about the state of the footpaths, which are causing accessibility issues, especially for those with mobility issues and people with pushchairs.</p> <p>The residents want SCC to get the programme done quickly so that the footpaths are fully accessible. This is a big challenge as there are a lot of mature trees on Sheldon Road and they are very close to front gardens so it's very difficult to get the widths that are needed on the pavements to class as an accessible footpath.</p> <p>Build outs are part of the potential solution but this will have a big impact on parking and it's already quite a densely parked area. There are challenges for Amey to come up with a design to accommodate keeping the trees, having the correct width footpath and maintaining the road - it's a very busy road, a key link road in the area. Local residents are understandably quite concerned about not having safe footpaths.</p> <p>PS - Sheldon Road was always going to be one of the most complex roads to save all the trees - accept that it is unlikely that all the trees will be able to be saved. PS said that he was here to support if there is evidence of why the trees need to go; he wanted to help not hinder.</p> <p>NE asked how we proceed. GC said that the immediate issue is for the Council to respond to residents, but the Partnership is key to that. The problem is that the Council don't have a complete plan from Amey about the solution that they propose for this road, because of the complexities.</p> <p>There is a site meeting next Friday morning to look at options - Amey will be on that visit, as will Cllr Otten and possibly also local ward members - we can convey the issue that we are experiencing with coming up with a solution for that area to residents.</p> <p>There is potential that we need some more yellow lines if we want to do build outs or widen the pavement and that comes with a 9-month timescale; so it's not a quick fix. The challenge to Amey is - is there anything that we can do quicker than that to improve the condition of the footway. GC said that SCC would share with the Partnership the response to the petitioners, so that they are aware of what's going out.</p> <p>NE asked if it would it be appropriate/helpful for SSTP members to attend the site visit. JO said that it would be useful for the Partnership to be represented at the meeting but they need to note that the residents are coming at this from an accessibility perspective, rather than a tree perspective. So as long as that is borne in mind, the attendance of one partnership member would be welcome.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>The site meeting was due to take place on Friday 1<sup>st</sup> July at 9.30am meeting.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GC to circulate the final spreadsheet to the Partnership when it's ready</li> <li>• One representative of the Partnership to attend the Sheldon Road site meeting on Friday 1<sup>st</sup> July, if this can be arranged</li> <li>• SCC to respond to the petitioners and will share the correspondence with the partnership</li> </ul>	<p><b>GC Tbc GC/RE</b></p>
<b>7.0</b>	<b><u>September Tree Celebration</u></b>	
	<p>NRe gave an update - the tree celebration event will be on Saturday 10<sup>th</sup> September, 10am-4pm. Catherine Nuttgens in Parks and Countryside is organising it. We have asked for a stall for the Partnership - we can use this as a base to reach out and talk to people.</p> <p>There will also be talks throughout the day on a range of issues about trees - the talks and the stalls will be based in the Dorothy Fox Centre. Nikki has asked for a slot for the Partnership to talk about street tree wardens and try to recruit some new people to be involved.</p> <p>We need to agree how to approach it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stall needs to be manned throughout the day - probably 2 people on at any one time.</li> <li>• Do we want to produce materials? If so, what?</li> <li>• Who will do the street tree warden talk?</li> <li>• Can people commit their time, not just to attending on the day but also to spending some time in advance for planning etc.?</li> </ul> <p>NRi said that she would do a couple of hours. In terms of materials - something user friendly... maybe a list of who is on the partnership and a one-page summary of what we've achieved. NRi suggested that we could have on hand a copy of the Strategy for people to look at and signpost them to where they can find it online. She also suggested that in the talk it may be a good idea to have a few minutes at the beginning about the Partnership and then the bulk of it about the street tree wardens. NRi recommended that we use a question sheet, which is something that SRWT use so that if people have a question that can't be answered by the people on the stall it can be taken away and a response can be provided later. NRi said that SRWT will have a separate stall at the event, which she will be involved with.</p> <p>SS said that the street tree wardens would really like to get involved in this. She said that at the away day we talked about a partnership branded vest - can this be produced and ready in time? SS said that she would man the stand for a couple of hours but will be at the event all day. Continuing to engage with tree wardens about their involvement is a good idea.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>GC said that she would attend and asked if we could let her know when we want her to be there. Needs to be forward facing. We need to sort out that broader tree wardens thing - like producing a slimmed down job description etc. Could we ask people to nominate an area near them where a new tree could be (so we can have a reserves list) - esp. in verges - that's a call to action.</p> <p>RE mentioned the new temporary role that was being created at SCC to pull together a volunteering strategy for people volunteering to improve their local environment and street scene.</p> <p>PS said that he couldn't guarantee being available on the day but that he was happy to contribute in the lead up. If we have a donations route sorted by then could we have a raffle and whoever the winner is gets to nominate a location for a street tree?</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All to email NRe with any further ideas for the event</li> <li>• SS to speak to Jillian Fairbrother (Amey) about liaising with street tree wardens in relation to them getting involved in the event</li> <li>• Branded high vis vests to be produced - action for Amey?</li> </ul>	<p><b>All SS KK/CE?</b></p>
<b>8.0</b>	<b><u>Short Updates</u></b>	
	<p>It was noted that there were no updates at present for the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Biodiversity Action Plan</li> <li>• 3rd party claims</li> <li>• 5-year Tree Strategy &amp; contract change</li> </ul> <p>NRe provided a short update about the Progress Report - thanks for the helpful and constructive comments. Small tweaks/suggestions have been picked up already and Nikki has responded to people's comments via the Google Drive. NRe said that NRi made a wider point about the structure of the document, to make it clearer, which will also be picked up.</p> <p>NRe asked if people would want the final document to be designed up by Anna Pethen in the same style as the Strategy. Everyone was supportive of this.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NRe and CK to meet to progress the report and will share an update/final version in due course</li> <li>• NRe to contact Anna Pethen re designing the final version</li> </ul>	<p><b>NRe/CK NRe</b></p>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>9.0</b>	<b><u>Communications / Website</u></b>	
	<p>NRe said that there isn't much of a comms update at the moment. Cassie's main priority is the comms introducing Nathan, which will include a short video but she needs to get some time with Nathan and he has understandably been very busy recently with other Partnership activities, so hasn't been able to prioritise this.</p> <p>There is a comms forward plan on the Google Drive, which Cassie is keeping up to date; if people want to add suggestions for communications work the best thing to do is to contact Cassie.</p> <p>NRi asked regarding the video introducing Nathan, if we wanted to include a short video clip of Liz Ballard, as the outgoing Chair of the Partnership. NE said that he hadn't thought about this but that he would have a chat with Cassie and would contact Liz directly about this.</p> <p>NRe updated that the SSTP website is progressing, but progress is quite slow, but the Partnership will be kept informed as it moves forward.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NE to speak to Cassie regarding the introduction video, including about NRi's question/suggestion and to make contact with Liz about this.</li> </ul>	<b>NE</b>
<b>10.0</b>	<b><u>Tree Planting for Liz</u></b>	
	<p>We need to reschedule the tree planting ceremony for Liz – the tree is already in the ground but no official 'tree planting' ceremony has taken place.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NRi to speak to Liz to establish her availability for the tree planting ceremony</li> </ul>	<b>NRi</b>
<b>11.0</b>	<b><u>AOB</u></b>	
	<p>NRi asked about the Institute of Chartered Foresters (ICF) meeting that was in the diary on 14<sup>th</sup> September. NRe said that this was going ahead - she would send an update by email and suggested that this as added as an item for the next SSTP meeting.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NRe to send an email update about the ICF event</li> <li>• NRe/NE to note this as an item for the next meeting</li> </ul>	<b>NRe NRe/NE</b>