



Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 22nd July 2022 (via Zoom)
Community Tree Planting

Attendees

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE) (part of the meeting)
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) – (Chair – 1 st part of the meeting)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Nya Muchina	Sheffield City Council (NM) (observing)
Cassie Stewart	Sheffield City Council (CS) (part of the meeting)
Amanda Preston	Sheffield City Council (AJP) (notes only)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Catherine Nuttgens	The Woodland Trust (CN)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CK)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)

Apologies

Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
--------------	-----------------------------

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome</u>	
	NE experienced technical issues joining the meeting so NRe chaired the start of the meeting. All were welcomed to the meeting.	
2.0	<u>Notes of last meeting</u>	
	The notes of the meeting held on 24 th June 2022 were agreed, subject to a small change on page 4, to remove the wording ‘the compromise is the all or nothing’. NRe to make the change and then send the notes to be uploaded online.	NRe
3.0	<u>Communication update</u>	
	CS informed all that further to previous meetings, she had met with Communications representatives from the partner organisations and they had all agreed that a Comms representative would be present at each future	

		ACTION WHOM																						
	<p>SSTP meeting (on a rotating basis). They would have a pre meeting prior to each meeting to share information/agree approach.</p> <p>Updates as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Planting for Liz – confirmed 1st August 2022 CS agreed to attend for photos/video of new Chair. This would be linked to the Annual Report – we just need to wait for the designed version of the report to be ready from Anna Pethen. NRe had commissioned Anna and agreed timescales. • Tree Fayre event and arrangements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pop up banner – CS sorting ○ Tree Game – Amey sorting • NRe asked re the Partnership Charter, what are we planning to do with it when the designed version is ready? Agreed that this is not of media interest and is more internally facing but that this should be available on the website with the suite of Partnership docs. • NRe flagged that work on the SSTP website is paused as this cannot currently be prioritised in light of other more urgent work for the Partnership. NRe will inform the Partnership when capacity is available to progress this activity. 																							
4.0	<u>September Tree Fayre event</u>																							
	<p>NRe updated all as follows:</p> <p>Timeslots – 2 slots remaining to fill. CK volunteered and NRi stated that she could be flexible to fit in with other people’s availability. NE gave his apologies – he would not be able to attend the event due to a family commitment that day.</p> <p>Street Tree Wardens talk – SS and CK will deliver this.</p> <p>Materials</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="336 1525 1329 1921"> <tr> <td>Street Tree Strategy</td> <td>All sorted; we have copies available (NRe)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual Report</td> <td>Printed copies will be available (NRe)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QR codes</td> <td>NRe to sort</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Question sheets</td> <td>NRi to send template to NRe</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Info about tree wardens</td> <td>Who leading?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pin badges/other</td> <td>SS to sort</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tree bark game</td> <td>CE to sort</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pop up banner</td> <td>CS to sort</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Business cards</td> <td>CS to sort</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Container trees</td> <td>CE/KK to sort</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High vis vests</td> <td>CE/KK to sort</td> </tr> </table> <p>If the donations page is set up by this time, we could also include a QR code to link to this at the event.</p>	Street Tree Strategy	All sorted; we have copies available (NRe)	Annual Report	Printed copies will be available (NRe)	QR codes	NRe to sort	Question sheets	NRi to send template to NRe	Info about tree wardens	Who leading?	Pin badges/other	SS to sort	Tree bark game	CE to sort	Pop up banner	CS to sort	Business cards	CS to sort	Container trees	CE/KK to sort	High vis vests	CE/KK to sort	
Street Tree Strategy	All sorted; we have copies available (NRe)																							
Annual Report	Printed copies will be available (NRe)																							
QR codes	NRe to sort																							
Question sheets	NRi to send template to NRe																							
Info about tree wardens	Who leading?																							
Pin badges/other	SS to sort																							
Tree bark game	CE to sort																							
Pop up banner	CS to sort																							
Business cards	CS to sort																							
Container trees	CE/KK to sort																							
High vis vests	CE/KK to sort																							

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NRi asked about the Risk Assessment. NRe stated that there was a RA for the overall event. CN informed all that she was doing the RA for the event and would share as appropriate when available.</p> <p>GC – rather than a RA we may need a “Safe System of Work”. NRe to explore.</p> <p>CS flagged re street tree warden recruitment that the info available on the webpages needs to be clearer – to be followed up by NRi and CS. Noted that we are also asking STWs to see if they want to attend the event.</p>	Various (see left)
5.0	<u>Street Tree Wardens</u>	
	<p>Partnership discussed how the Street Tree Warden scheme could be relaunched and what we want our offer to be, ahead of the recruitment drive at the September Tree Fair.</p> <p>SS shared the questions that she had prepared on the Street Tree Wardens. These were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we as a partnership take on more responsibility/ownership for street tree wardens? What does this look like so that wardens feel more embedded in the partnership? • What is our aim for the wardens? For example, feeling ownership for, knowing and caring for street trees in their area, educated and ‘bought into’ the street tree strategy, who can highlight and diagnose issues; or something more simple? For example, hundred(s) of people across city who can fill out a simple form? Can we have wardens with varying levels of skills and confidence? • What further or additional training is needed for wardens, what gaps can be filled and how? What exactly are we asking them to do? • Celebration and recruitment into roles to fill geographical gaps – how can we use known and wider events to promote and recruit wardens? How can we ‘sell’ the role? (e.g. helping to tackle climate change – what will spark interest?) • Do we need to consider branding further? • How can be realistic about how we resource the wardens scheme, whilst making sure communications are frequent and engaging? <p>SS stated that we need a clear idea of our offer by 10th September.</p> <p>NE asked the Partnership Group how we take on the role, training, branding, resourcing the scheme etc.</p> <p>NRi suggested understanding more about geographic coverage, with a map showing where we have Street Tree Wardens and identifying where the gaps are. CE informed all that Amey were working on this.</p> <p>PS – we need to get the basics right before we pursue wider ambitions.</p> <p>It was raised as a concern that Tree Wardens sometimes feel that they are being ignored when they report issues. KK stated that the inbox is being monitored and emails are being dealt with but they don’t get responded to because of capacity issues. We need to manage expectations of STWs –</p>	CE

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>they need to understand what to expect when they report things (in terms of whether/when they will receive a response).</p> <p>It was noted that CK, SS & CE would meet with Jillian Fairbrother at Amey the following week and would report back.</p> <p>It was agreed that SS would add the questions to the Google Drive for all to look at and respond to.</p>	<p>CK/CE/ SS</p> <p>SS</p>
6.0	<u>Build Outs Consultation</u>	
	<p>The Partnership Group referred to the email DW had sent out and comments in response.</p> <p>DW confirmed that he had built and tested the “base” consultation for build outs. This was based on the process that the Partnership had agreed at the away day and follow up session (notes embedded):</p> <div data-bbox="311 891 368 954" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>SSTP Away Day Follow Up Session - C</p> <p>He had subsequently created one test-case survey (Woodstock Road) using that as a template.</p> <p>NE – the Partnership Group are comfortable with Appendix 5; it’s the issue of ‘all or nothing’ options that is problematic.</p> <p>All agreed that there needs to be an approach where some of the trees could stay and some could go, rather than it being all or nothing which is too blunt and could result in unintended outcomes.</p> <p>A concern was raised that the consultation language is currently too negative – it needs to be more neutral (it was felt as though the consultation was only highlighting the negatives of the build outs proposals). DW agreed to look at this again.</p> <p>GC suggested that SCC could change the consultation approach to make the matrix assessment available – where we would need to change the road layout in order for the tree to be retained (i.e. build outs), we explain what the condition of the tree is and we ask whether residents want to save the tree or not. GC was clear that this is only about consulting on trees where we’re looking to build out; the default is that the tree stays.</p> <p>This was felt to be a sensible way forward. NE asked GC/DW to set this out clearly in an email for everyone. GC agreed to do this and said that DW would adapt the Woodstock consultation accordingly.</p>	<p>DW</p> <p>GC/DW</p>

		ACTION WHOM
7.0	<u>Surfacing Programme</u>	
	<p>Cliffefield Road</p> <p>DW informed all that the consultation had closed but that he didn't yet have the results broken down by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local residents on the street • Sheffields • out of city responses <p>There was a discussion about the need for a site visit to discuss proposals, following which KK offered to attend a site visit to meet with a small number of people in a managed way. It was agreed that this would be a good way forward.</p> <p>Sheldon Road</p> <p>GC updated that Amey had been asked to provide Matrix Scores and CAVAT valuations before any next steps are decided, to ensure compliance with Appendix 5.</p>	KK
8.0	Institute of Chartered Foresters (ICF) meeting 14th Wednesday September	
	Due to time restraints, it was agreed that NRe would deal with this item via email.	NRe
9.0	<u>Actions from last meeting</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community tree planting - donations fund – noted that GC was progressing this with Finance colleagues and would discuss further with NRi offline to take forward. • Progress Report – the Partnership agreed to sign this off. Noted that there would be a small change re Acer pseudoplatanus. NRe and CK to pick up. 	GC CK/NRe
10.0	Any Other Business	
	For information - NRe reported that both herself and DW had been invited to attend a meeting in August with Cllr J Otten and the group Trees for Streets.	
11.0	Dates of future meetings:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August meeting CANCELLED • Wednesday 7th September 10.00-11.00 - Additional meeting • Friday 16th September 10.00-12.00 - next usual SSTP meeting 	