



**Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 14th October 2022 (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)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CK)

Notes

Amanda Preston	Sheffield City Council (AJP)
----------------	------------------------------

Additional Attendees

Item 4 only:

Matt Reynolds	Sheffield City Council (MR)
Alexandra Redman	Sheffield City Council (AR)

Item 5 only:

Nicola Dempsey	University of Sheffield (ND)
Ellie Hughes	University of Sheffield (EH)

Apologies

Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Catherine Nuttgens	The Woodland Trust (CN)

		ACTION WHOM
1.	<u>Welcome, introductions & apologies</u>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting.	
2.	<u>Review and sign off previous notes</u>	
	<p>The notes of the meeting held on 16th September 2022 were agreed, subject to the following amendments:</p> <p>On item 4 a post meeting note was added by PS, as follows:</p> <p><i>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 • £490.51 (plus the price of the tree itself) for trees which require a tree pit digging into tarmac. <p>On item 5 the following action was added to the notes:</p> <p><i>NRi agreed to share the Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust Volunteer Handbook as an example (shown in the meeting).</i></p> <p>On item 7 the following action was added to the notes:</p> <p><i>It was agreed that an updated CIP list would be shared with the Partnership.</i></p> <p>NRe to make the above changes and send the notes to be uploaded to the website.</p>	NRe
3.	<u>Communication update</u>	
	<p>A written note had been circulated before this meeting.</p> <p>NRi asked if it could be possible to have a note for future meetings about whether there was any positive/negative/ambivalent feedback. NR to raise with Cassie.</p>	NRe
4.	<u>Connecting Sheffield Scheme on Abbey Lane</u>	
	<p>Matt Reynolds and Alexandra Redman attended the meeting to share with the Partnership information about the proposed Connecting Sheffield scheme on Abbey Lane.</p> <p>Historically there has been a need for better accessibility across Abbey Lane for people accessing the woods on either side of the road and the plan aims to address this. Following feedback from interested parties, the focus is on pedestrian refuge islands, rather than one controlled crossing. Matt</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>confirmed that there was no proposed impact on any trees in the area – the plan is to work around the trees rather than fell any.</p> <p>There is also a proposal to create more formalised parking on Abbey Lane, to discourage people from parking on the kerbside in areas that aren't appropriate. There will be disabled parking bays included in the scheme as well as coach parking. Consideration is also being given to a reduction in the speed limit.</p> <p>Thanks were offered to Matt and Alexandra for sharing the proposal.</p> <p>CE said that he would like to be reassured regarding the working practices of the contractors, to make sure that they don't damage the trees while the construction work is taking place. Matt took this feedback on board.</p> <p>NRi – raised concerns about being able to meet the demand for parking, especially when there is an event on. She also raised issues about light pollution, as this is an important area for bats – we need to protect them against increased light pollution in the area. Matt responded that there may need to be more street lighting around the new refuge islands, but it would be a priority to ensure that the lights point down.</p> <p>NE thanked both Matt and Alexandra for sharing the information and asked that they keep the Partnership informed, especially if there is a new iteration of the proposal.</p>	
5.	<u>Darnall Street Tree consultation outcomes</u>	
	<p>NE welcomed Nicola Dempsey and Ellie Hughes to the Partnership meeting.</p> <p>Ellie talked the partnership through the presentation that she had shared in advance.</p> <div data-bbox="316 1444 368 1503" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Presentation_Hughes.pdf</p> <p>NE thanked Ellie and Nicola and opened up to questions from the Partnership.</p> <p>NRi noted that the sample size was quite small (there were only 27 participants in the survey). She said that it would be nice to see the work repeated with a large number of participants.</p> <p>PS asked what the next stage was for the project.</p> <p>DW explained that 10 trees were gifted to this particular project by Amey in order to help realise the project outcomes. These are to be used in the public highway in Darnall. Ellie is working with Amey on this. He explained</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>that Parks and Countryside are also looking at the possibility of putting some additional trees nearby on non-highways land.</p> <p>CK suggested communicating with the Local Area Committee (LAC). DW confirmed that when the exact locations had been finalised, the LAC and other groups would be updated.</p> <p>Ellie and Nicola thanked DW and CK for their work to support the project.</p>	
6.	<u>Short updates</u>	
	<p>Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP)</p> <p>DW confirmed that SCC had received the LBAP from Amey. However for contractual reasons it is not suitable so this has been sent back to Amey to resolve. Amey has 20 business days to respond.</p> <p>DW confirmed that once SCC are happy that it meets contract requirements it will go to the Partnership for comment, before it gets signed off by SCC.</p>	DW
7.	<u>Blockages to Progress</u>	
	<p>NE raised concerns with the Partnership regarding blockages to progress.</p> <p>We all know that we have an important job to do to deliver the actions in the Strategy, for Sheffield and its residents. We had a really good away day and made great strides. However since the away day some things need calling out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is still mistrust and we cannot meaningfully move on while this continues. We need to deal with that. Predominantly that is due to communication – either a lack of communication or ineffectual communication. We need to think carefully about how we communicate with each other in the future. 2. These meetings cannot become a talking shop otherwise we will not make progress. 3. We need to be clear about the purpose of the Partnership – role and remit. Sometimes we are a decision maker and sometimes a consultee and we need to be clear when we are one and when we are the other. 4. We need to agree who here are our members, who has voting rights, who is here in an advisory capacity and who are we representing. That’s also true of anyone who comes to the meeting as an observer so that we are clear about who is contributing to the discussion. We also need to grow our membership – we need to hear other voices to maximise the effectiveness of the Partnership. <p>NE suggested that we start by reconsidering comms. We have created a new agenda template – that’s the first thing we’ve done to bring clarity. NE explained that NRe and he had also worked hard on how we deal with</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>comms outside of the meeting. It's not working at the moment with email exchanges, so there is a suggestion about how to improve this.</p> <p>NE also suggested that there are fewer items on the agenda for future meetings, so that we make better progress.</p> <p>NE raised some specific Partnership issues that we need to work through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cost benefit analysis - NE confirmed that the Council is not executing a full cost benefit analysis. NE said that we don't have time to pursue the full cost benefit analysis route for immediate matters so let's focus on what DW has proposed and work through it. A cost to benefit analysis is still however required and this should not be overlooked for future decision making. ● Community Tree Planting - NE said that progress has been made but it's not a model that works for the whole city. Trees for Streets may be the answer and we need to make a decision before deadlines arise relating to the next planting season. ● Tree Wardens, NE suggested that the scheme is not sustainable in its current form. We need to properly resource this and work through the issues before we recruit more wardens and work hard to ensure that we don't lose the ones we already have. NE was clear that this is not all on Amey; this is for the whole Partnership. ● Replant species – NE said that we collectively disagree about this, including about cherries. NE felt that the tree inspectors need to be empowered to make the call, but they need to be given the tools to do this. We will therefore pursue the idea of the species palette for neighbourhood areas. ● Third party trees – this issue needs dealing with and one case is urgent. A 3rd party advisor to the partnership was suggested. NE stated that on this issue the partnership is a consultee not decision maker. ● Street safety – because of delays to resurfacing the Council is being petitioned by residents in some cases. Some of these streets sit within the Core Investment Programme (CIP) and these need to be dealt with one by one – we must work together to move past this. <p>NE finished by reiterating that we need to work together to deal with trust issues through good communication; let's move on and get this done.</p> <p>RE said that he felt that the Partnership had wobbled recently and that we need to get back on track; we have to stay focussed. He agreed with all that NE had said.</p> <p>CK said that re CIP trees, it's really important to sort these out. She said that there is a perception that people are being punished by the Council and Amey. We need to get on with the CIP Programme and move forward. CK said that it is appropriate for people to observe at Partnership meetings, but we need to be clear that this is their role.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	All to reflect on the conversation and recommit to working together to take the Partnership forward.	All
8.	<u>Partnership Charter and Members</u>	
	<p>NRe shared and ran through the Charter, which was now available in the designed format.</p> <p>There was a brief discussion about who should sign the Charter.</p> <p>RE said that at the Away Day everyone had agreed the behaviours and values, he therefore felt that everyone should sign the Charter. Voting rights at meetings is separate to this.</p> <p>PS agreed.</p> <p>Regarding membership, NE said that we need to reflect on the Terms of Reference. He asked for people's thoughts regarding increased membership.</p> <p>DW suggested that as biodiversity is going to become increasingly important on the Council's agenda, that it would be beneficial to get someone on the Partnership who specialises in planning and biodiversity net gain (BNG). CK agreed that a planner should be on the membership. It was noted that NRi is well versed in BNG so the gap might be more on the planning side.</p> <p>PS said that we need to ensure that the focus is on street trees and not things that are outside our remit.</p> <p>GC agreed that there will be and have been lots of discussions on biodiversity and we need to see who will be the main lead on this for the Council and bring them onto the Group.</p> <p>NE asked if Amey had a view.</p> <p>KK said that there is a need for people to be brought in for different conversations. But we have issues that we need to resolve before we expand our remit. CIP springs to mind; we have made progress but need to get it over the line. Amey want to stay involved and see themselves as a key stakeholder in this.</p> <p>NE stated that we also don't have a 'tree person' on the Partnership. Something for people to think about.</p> <p>NE said that he would reflect on membership and speak to NRe about how we take this forward and would update at the next meeting.</p> <p>NRi offered to give an intro to BNG at a future meeting so that we can think about our role as a Partnership. NRe/NE to note for the forward plan.</p>	<p>NE</p> <p>NE/NRe</p>

		ACTION WHOM
	NE thanked NRe for getting the Partnership Charter sorted. This will be signed by all at the next face to face meeting.	NRe
9.	<u>Partnership ways of working and communication between meetings</u>	
	<p>NR shared and talked through the communication table that she and NE had prepared.</p> <p>NRi said that this was great and asked if we could add a column to say which area of the Strategy this links to and a column for any final comments from the issue raiser.</p> <p>Separate tabs/tables were suggested for the following areas:</p> <p>CIP Third party trees Consultations Miscellaneous</p> <p>PS asked for a clarification - will the Partnership get an email to confirm that there is a new item added to the table. NE and NRe confirmed that, yes, there would be.</p> <p>A suggestion was made that if we're putting tabs into the doc, can we add a tab for info only. There could be a box for people to tick to raise a flag if they have an issue but no opportunity to leave comments.</p> <p>KK raised the issue that Amey were unable to access the Google Drive due to technical problems with Amey's IT set up. It was agreed that it wouldn't be possible to move to this new way of working unless Amey were able to access the documents.</p> <p>The new way of working was agreed but it was agreed that we need to sort out Amey's technical issues before we can move to this approach.</p>	KK/CE/ NRe
10.	<u>Revised Core Investment Programme (CIP) list & update on approach to build outs</u>	
	<p>DW provided the following verbal update. There are only 17 streets left in CIP and the status of these is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ryle Road - progressing to build, no consultation required ● Edgedale Road - progressing to build, no consultation required ● Kenwood Park Road - progressing to build, no consultation required ● Kenwood Road - progressing to build, no consultation required ● Banner Cross Road - one recent felling consultation leading to removal of Sycamore, action sat with Amey to work out distance between build outs and then run it through the decision flow agreed at the Away Day to confirm whether consultation is required 	

		ACTION WHOM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dunkeld Road – a 2 phase approach needed - firstly we need to come to a consensus on how to approach the Dawn Redwoods (i.e. felling or retention) and then progress to design once that information is known ● Hunter House Road - looking to come to consultation ● Silver Hill Road - looking to come to consultation ● Milton Road - looking to come to consultation ● Thornsett Road - looking to come to consultation ● Cliffefield Road - looking at 23/24 programme ● Kenbourne Road - looking at 23/24 programme ● Spring Hill Road - looking at 23/24 programme ● Woodstock Road - looking at 23/24 programme ● Sheldon Road - looking at 23/24 programme ● Ladysmith Avenue - looking at 23/24 programme ● Edgebrook Road - looking at 23/24 programme <p>PS – stated that this is a helpful update but we asked for this to be written down so that it is clear.</p> <p>GC responded that DW has been working furiously with Amey to progress this. She apologised that it hadn't been sent in written but committed to make this available.</p> <p>DW said that SCC is determined to get these streets sorted.</p> <p>KK said that he appreciated DW's input in relation to this because he is moving this on.</p> <p>NRi asked about communications and asked if this could have a timeline both for the partnership and the public. SCC to advise in due course.</p> <p>It was agreed that time to work through the issues on individual streets would be scheduled onto future agendas.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GC/DW</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NE/NRe</p>
11.	<u>Third party trees</u>	
	<p>DW said that he had shared more information and had received positive feedback about this.</p> <p>NE and DW both were in agreement that the way forward to resolve the issues regarding third party trees was for an independent professional to be engaged who would have access to all of the information, including confidential information, and would give their view about whether the SCC/Amey proposal was sound. It was felt that this would resolve the impasse.</p> <p>NE said that the liability for these issues sits with Amey and the Council. In this the Partnership is a consultee, not a decision maker. But as consultee</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>the Partnership needs to be assured that the Council is behaving reasonably.</p> <p>DW raised one urgent issue re a subsidence claim relating to Wadsley Park Crescent. He explained that there is a significant risk of legal action being taken if this issue isn't resolved in the next few days.</p> <p>PS stated that he agreed that the Council is the decision maker on this.</p> <p>CK said that this is about due diligence and understanding that everything has been done correctly. She said that she agreed with the proposal for the independent professional to be engaged.</p> <p>KK said that he understood why people were suggesting an independent professional getting involved. He stated that Amey's commercial team will need to understand their remit and how that will work.</p> <p>All agreed that there should not be a hold up to the decision relating to Wadsley Park Crescent – all agreed that SCC/AMEY should proceed.</p> <p>NE said that he would ask for comments regarding who the independent professional would be. It was confirmed that all were happy to go ahead with the suggested approach.</p>	NE
12.	<u>Any other business</u>	
	<p>Consultation outcome Beverleys Road</p> <p>DW raised the above consultation outcome. He explained that there was 100% agreement regarding felling and replant location. However there was one response raising an issue about the size of the replant species. The Partnership agreed that the original proposal should go ahead.</p> <p>SSTP Progress Report</p> <p>NRe updated, for information, that there had been a couple of minor errors spotted in the Progress Report. These had now been corrected in the online version. One of the errors ('Work towards an independent certification of street trees' instead of 'Work towards an independent accreditation of street trees') also needs to be corrected in the next refresh of the Strategy. NRe has noted this.</p> <p>Update on date of December meeting</p> <p>NRe advised that she couldn't update on this as not everyone had responded. NRe would discuss with NE and advise asap if there will be a change of date for this.</p>	NRe NRe/NE

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>Tree Archive update</p> <p>NRe flagged the written update that had been provided.</p> <p>Tree Warden Handbook</p> <p>CK flagged that CE, Jillian Fairbrother and CK had discussed the Tree Warden Handbook and wanted to advise that there is a new deadline for comments – close of play Friday 21st October. This is to enable meeting design and print deadlines, so that copies of the handbook can be shared with wardens during a face-to-face meeting in December. All to share any comments by the revised deadline.</p>	<p>All</p>