



**Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 16 September (hybrid meeting, held at SRWT)**

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)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Jillian Fairbrother	Amey (JF)
Richard Ward	Street Tree Action Groups (RW)
Jon Johnson	Street Tree Action Groups (JJ)
Nicky Robson	Sheffield City Council (notes)

Apologies

Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CK)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome</u>	
	Nathan welcomed attendees and asked all to introduce themselves, for the benefit of new attendees.	
2.0	<u>Notes of last meeting</u>	
	The notes of the previous meeting were agreed and would be uploaded to the website.	NRe
3.0	<u>Short updates</u>	
	<u>Sheffield Tree Fayre and ICF Event</u> It was noted that it was a real shame that the tree fair had had to be cancelled, due to protocols following the death of HM The Queen. It will be rescheduled next year - looking at Saturday 20 May 2023 (same venue).	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>The Institute Chartered Foresters event had gone well and was well attended. The partnership's presentations clearly recognised Sheffield's history but were very much focused on looking forward –well balanced.</p> <p>NRe flagged that she would send a follow up email to the Partnership regarding PEFC certification, following Rob Shaw's comments at the ICF event.</p> <p>It was suggested that a follow up conversation should take place with Russell Horsey about Tree Plotter, following a brief discussion at the ICF event. DW noted that Tree Plotter isn't the only game in town.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: suggest that Russell is invited at a later partnership meeting to talk through Tree plotter and its capabilities – to be added to the Forward Planner</i></p> <p><u>Trees for Streets (TfS)</u> DW & NRe briefly went through the presentation that had been shared at the Sheffield City Council (SCC) meeting.</p> <p>They shared the sponsorship and payments platform information – the platform has an attractive and accessible interface for the public. TfS were very clear to say that it's not a one size fits all approach – if we go ahead with this they will work with SCC/the Partnership to make it bespoke for our needs.</p> <p>The other aspect is that TfS has a lot of experience in public facing comms, including using social media campaigns – this looks really good and would be great for us to capitalise on in Sheffield.</p> <p>We can also use this to do crowdfunding campaigns to increase canopy cover in the areas of the city that we want to target; this isn't just about individuals sponsoring a tree outside their own house/in their own neighbourhood.</p> <p>The benefit of this is that we could move much faster on this agenda using this approach than we could on our own (due to our resource constraints as a Partnership).</p> <p>NRi said that she was disappointed that the presentation was taken to SCC and not to the Partnership.</p> <p>NRe explained that the meeting was arranged by councillors, after TfS approached them directly. It wasn't an officer meeting, but NRe & DW were invited by councillors to attend. It wouldn't have been appropriate for the Partnership to be invited to this.</p> <p>NRe and DW both confirmed that it is absolutely the intention to involve the Partnership in this, hence bringing the update to the meeting. As this progresses TfS will be happy to come to present to the Partnership. Meeting to be scheduled on the forward planner.</p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>NRe</p> <p>NRe</p>

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>There were some questions on the detail (including how this would be financed) and answers were provided by NRe & DW.</p> <p>PS stated that there are some key questions remaining about the Nether Edge community planting scheme that need to be addressed before this progresses, but he indicated that he felt that this is overall a positive development.</p> <p>There was a brief discussion about how this could link into educating the public about the value of street trees – including via engagement with schools - in line with the Street Tree Strategy. There is a big opportunity for this and it is on the Partnership’s radar but we need to work out how to resource this in the future. However, having an online presence via the TfS platform would give us something to direct members of the public to, which is a big advantage.</p> <p><u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u> The LBAP is currently back with the Council after Amey made its most recent changes – SCC has a 20-day review period and needs to ensure that this meets our contractual requirements. SCC is currently waiting for a colleague with an ecology specialism to look at the document, but this has caused some delay. It will come back to the Partnership for comments after SCC has reviewed it. NE asked that this is brought to Partnership as soon as possible, as it has been delayed for a considerable period of time.</p>	DW
4.0	<u>Community Tree Planting</u>	
	<p>NE stated that this item is to establish if there are remaining blockers/ challenges for this season.</p> <p>PS said that there were a number of matters outstanding but that the only immediate issue for this season is that the price is still outstanding – PS still hasn’t received this information – and this is really critical.</p> <p>DW said that in the figures he had received from Amey, some items had been priced too highly because of incorrect overheads being added, which made the prices too expensive and which is why the figures had not yet been shared. DW verbally confirmed the following costs:</p> <p>Verge trees - £200.17</p> <p>Paved trees - £421.98</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, David Wain clarified that the prices he'd quoted verbally in the meeting didn't include all aspects of the costs that would be charged to the donors. Therefore the final prices charged to donors for trees planted in winter 2022-23 are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £257.61 (plus the price of the tree itself) for trees planted into grass verges 	

		ACTION WHOM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £490.51 (plus the price of the tree itself) for trees which require a tree pit digging into tarmac. <p>PS thanked DW for the information and said that the number of additional trees to be planted in this season, via his scheme, would be around 40 trees from community funding, and around 20 from the Nether Edge Village Covid Recovery Funds.</p> <p>There are still outstanding issues that need to be discussed by the Partnership in relation to Community Tree Planting – we made a list of these at the single-issue meeting in June. NRe shared the notes from that meeting. The list of outstanding items for discussion/decision, as noted during that meeting, is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How to progress strategic planting/partnership-led community planting ● The mechanisms for increasing community planting capacity ● How the costs of rejected dug pits will be accounted for this season (assuming that the longer-term solution suggested above will not be ready in time for this season) ● Timelines and key deadlines for future planting seasons ● Allowance of Rosaceae for community planting schemes ● Maintenance arrangements ● Support for potential donors, including a) Update on community briefing note about identifying appropriate locations & b) Hand holding/capacity to do this ● Lead for Gift Aid <p>NRi asked about how rejected dug pits were being dealt with this year. PS confirmed that he is informally creating an ‘insurance pot’ this year in case of rejected dug pits. He felt that this is fine this year but is not sustainable going forward so a longer-term solution still needs to be found.</p> <p>NRe/DW said that they had raised the issue of rejected dug pits directly with Simeon at Trees for Streets, and he said that it wasn’t an issue that came up for them – this is because they have stricter criteria about the suitability of a location. Because SCC/Amey’s have tried to accommodate preferred locations for trees there has been a higher risk of rejected dug pits, but using the criteria suggested by Trees for Streets would mean that this risk is significantly reduced.</p> <p>CK asked if the criteria that TfS use is transparent. NRe responded that yes, it is but it was shared with us on screen during the meeting – it’s information on the public facing part of the TfS website - so we don’t currently have a copy of this, but we can ask TfS to share this with us when they present to the Partnership in the future.</p> <p>PS said that CE is applying stricter criteria for locations this year, so it will be good to see if this means that there are fewer rejected dug pits.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>All agreed that there's a balance to be struck between sensible criteria and ensuring that there are enough locations for tree planting.</p> <p>DW said that the criteria used on the TfS website would be customisable according to our requirements and it was agreed that this could come back to the partnership for discussion if it was felt that the default criteria that TfS use rules out too many locations.</p> <p>There was a brief discussion about utilities and the resulting constraints for tree planting. We need to come back to this in the future. To be added to the forward planner.</p> <p>It was confirmed that all the above bullet points need resolution, but none are urgent for this season. NE/NRe to consider when to schedule for future discussion(s) and update the forward planner accordingly.</p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>NE/NRe</p>
5.0	<u>Street Tree Wardens</u>	
	<p>Jillian Fairbrother summarised where we are currently. The Tree Warden Handbook has been a really important and useful development.</p> <p>All tree wardens have had an induction but not everyone has had training, although it has been offered to all.</p> <p>KK said that there is an issue that Amey are seen as being 'in charge' of the tree wardens... is this a barrier to people getting involved?</p> <p>JF reported that we have lots of volunteers in the areas where there are lots of trees and fewer in other areas. JF is an Area Highways Rep – she and other Area Highways Rep colleagues are aligned to the Council's LACs and they have reached out via LACs and other community groups for more volunteers.</p> <p>PS – we need to get the basics right and if we don't these volunteers will stop being involved. They aren't getting any feedback from Amey when they've reported issues with trees in their patch and that's a problem. There aren't enough Amey Tree Inspectors (down to 2) and managing tree wardens in addition to their day job is too much, so they are struggling to respond to tree wardens and as a result the tree wardens have given up reporting. This is one of the root problems that we have with the scheme.</p> <p>NE – it's fair to recognise that there is a lot to achieve and the resource that we have to achieve it is really stretched. We need to determine if this is going to continue to be managed by Amey. We have between now and the Tree Fayre in May to work this out so we can use that as our opportunity to recruit more tree wardens.</p> <p>NRe - volunteer management is a specialism, it's not easy and it takes a lot of time and resource. We've asked a lot from Amey in this – if there are</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>changes that we need to put in place to make this a more sustainable scheme then we need to consider that.</p> <p>JF – we have tried to make meetings more accessible and have created a calendar of events for the next 12 months so that people have plenty of notice (some face to face, some lunchtime meetings, some evening meetings). The issue about reporting back to tree wardens is really difficult because it needs tree inspector resource, which is limited. JF’s own capacity to dedicate to managing the tree wardens also fluctuates depending on resource and some of this is affected by seasonal demands. The new tree warden handbook should help with the resource issue because it gives a really good guide and explains which tree issues are urgent and which aren’t – and it helps to manage expectations.</p> <p>CK – part of this is an issue of trust. I believe that if I put an email in to Amey, something will happen. So I don’t need a response. It’s only if it’s an emergency that I would want a response to provide assurance that it has been picked up. So there’s this trust gap that we need to fill as well.</p> <p>KK was asked what is the situation with the tree inspector vacancy. KK responded that currently the tree inspectors are on top of their work.</p> <p>NRi commented that the handbook is really good but maybe it needs something additional to be added to make it clear whether tree wardens will hear back, depending on the issue raised, to help manage that expectation and stop people getting disillusioned. NRi agreed to share the Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust Volunteer Handbook as an example (shown in the meeting).</p> <p>CK – one way that this feedback can be picked up is in the tree warden pre-meetings. CE has suggested that he could go through a list of what has been received and what has been actioned so that people receive that update.</p> <p>KK said that this could take the form of a month end report stating ‘this is what has been logged and this is the outcome’, so we are giving feedback but it doesn’t require individual emails to be responded to.</p> <p>NE provided the following summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have got until May to get this right if we want to recruit at the Tree Fayre, which is a great opportunity. - We need to think about what we need to do between now and then to improve the scheme and make it sustainable. - One of the key issues in terms of blockers is resource, and we need to fully identify what that blocker looks like. - It would be good to trial what CE is doing in terms of the new way of feeding back to tree wardens and then evaluate that. - We should also get the handbook on the Google Drive so that the Partnership can give constructive feedback. 	<p>NRi</p>

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NE – where you’ve got to is seeking to address the issue about how we consult members of the public on engineering works in a way that they understand.</p> <p>NRi – maybe it needs testing out with members of the public to see if they understand it to test the theory that it is crystal clear!</p> <p>DW – we have worked examples for Silver Hill Road and Spring Hill Road that we can share.</p> <p>NRi – what happens if the public respond ‘no’ to the consultation question?</p> <p>DW – if that happened we would consult on individual tree felling, working to Appendix 5.</p> <p>Agreed that it would have to be clear in the consultation that this would be the consequence of a ‘no’ vote.</p> <p>NE asked DW to share the presentation and the worked examples for comment. He said that this is a giant leap forward from where we were and all thanked DW for all the work that had gone into this; people need to have the chance to look at this after the meeting and see the worked examples and comment but the initial feeling is very positive.</p> <p>NRi raised the issue that it is preferable for papers to be distributed in advance, rather than tabled at the meeting, especially if we’re being asked to make a decision. This is something that NRe and NE will pick up – we also need to be clear on the agenda, if possible, whether items are for discussion or decision.</p>	<p>DW</p> <p>NE/NRe</p>
7.0	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
	<p><u>Issue with published matrix</u></p> <p>DW explained that there is currently an error in the top right-hand corner of the Street Tree Condition-Impact Matrix which is published in the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership Strategy (see slide number 4 in the presentation pack). It currently says that a dead tree should be retained, which is incorrect. DW proposed to change this to say ‘remove and replace’. This was agreed by all.</p> <p><u>Moving online meetings to Teams (instead of Zoom)</u></p> <p>NE would prefer for all meetings that aren’t face to face to be held on Teams or another platform, but not Zoom (as NE has technical issues with Zoom). It was agreed by all that future online meetings would be held on Teams.</p> <p><u>December Meeting</u></p> <p>NE suggested that the December meeting could be face to face, followed by drinks as a sort of social, so therefore suggested that the meeting is in the</p>	<p>DW</p> <p>NRe</p>

