



**Action notes of meeting held on  
Friday 19<sup>th</sup> May 2023 (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)                       |
| Amanda Preston    | Sheffield City Council (AJP) (notes only)         |
| Nicky Rivers      | Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)        |
| Sarah Shorley     | The Woodland Trust (SS)                           |
| Kieron King       | Amey (KK)   |
| Carl Ellison      | Amey (CE)   |
| Davina Millership | Sheffield City Council (DM)                       |

**Item 2 only**

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Cllr Tom Hunt    | Leader of Sheffield City Council (TH)        |
| Cllr Fran Belbin | Deputy Leader of Sheffield City Council (FB) |

**Notes**

|                |                             |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Amanda Preston | Sheffield City Council (AP) |
|----------------|-----------------------------|

**Apologies**

|            |                             |
|------------|-----------------------------|
| David Wain | Sheffield City Council (DW) |
|------------|-----------------------------|

|            |   | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b> |
|------------|---|------------------------|
| <b>1.0</b> | <b><u>Welcome and introductions</u></b>   |                        |
|            | NE thanked all for attending the meeting and welcomed the newly appointed Leader and Deputy Leader of Sheffield City Council to the meeting.  |                        |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b><u>Introduction to the new Council Leadership</u></b>  |                        |
|            | Cllr Tom Hunt thanked the Partnership for the opportunity to meet them all and thanked them for the work of the Partnership. He said that it was the second day in their new roles and that he and Cllr Fran Belbin were really pleased to join the meeting. TH said that they recognise the importance of the work of the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership; the Lowcock report laid out |                        |

|  |   | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b> |
|--|---|------------------------|
|  | <p>the full truth of what has gone before and has set up the next steps on the path to reconciliation and the Partnership is an integral part of that.</p> <p>He confirmed that the Strategy &amp; Resources Committee would receive a report in June setting out the full recommendations and that he was due to be briefed the following week on this. The paper would be clear on the council's intentions – there will be actions, with clear monitoring. He said that this is a top priority and that the implementations will need to happen as soon as possible.</p> <p>He said that the important role that the Partnership has to play is recognised both within the council and externally and that the council leadership would provide whatever assistance and support they could.</p> <p>Cllr Fran Belbin said that she was expecting to be leading on governance and the response to the Lowcock report. She said that partnership working is crucial, and that Sheffield Street Tree Partnership is held up as an example of good practice that the council should be following. She said that she was looking forward to getting to know partners better.</p> <p>TH and FB were thanked for taking the time to attend the meeting. NE said that he would welcome cross party conversations about how the Lowcock recommendations can be taken forward and how the Partnership can play a key role in that. TH responded that the council need to bring about the culture change that is required to respond to the report; round table conversations will be important. He said that the council would ill serve the people of Sheffield if this is turned into a political issue and that cross party working on this is therefore important.</p> <p>NE said that transparency and trust are values that the Partnership holds dear and that the Partnership looked forward to working with the new leadership.</p> <p>TH and FB left the meeting.</p> <p>NRe informed all that she had been working with Lucy Heyes on the Strategy and Resources report, for the sections that relate to the work of the Partnership and confirmed that a draft had been shared with NE for his comment.</p> <p>NRe stated that the recommendations relating to the Partnership are mainly about ensuring that more resources are available to help support the work of the Partnership.</p> |                        |

|            |  | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b>  |
|------------|--|---|
| <b>3.0</b> | <b><u>Notes of previous meetings and update on actions</u></b>   |   |
|            | <p>The notes of the meetings held on 10<sup>th</sup> March and 24<sup>th</sup> March were agreed as a true record, subject to the following changes relating to the meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> March:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A correction regarding the names of two streets referred to; and</li> <li>2) A change to the wording regarding barriers at Aldfield Way.</li> </ol> <p>NRe to upload the approved notes to the Partnership website.</p> <p>Regarding Urban Tree Challenge Fund (UTCF)/Subsidising Community Tree planting, Nathan updated that he would progress the letter to the mayor, in consultation with NRe in DW's absence.</p> <p>NRe updated that she hadn't yet arranged the meeting regarding UTCF, but that this would be progressed when time allows.</p> <p>There was a brief discussion about the schedule of planned works and a request for this to be shared with partners before work commences. KK said that he was happy to issue an update regularly about any planned works on the highways and would arrange for this to take place.</p> <p>PS said that if any key decisions are made regarding Core Investment Programme roads then the Partnership needs to know, as they are so contentious; early notice would therefore be helpful so that PS and CK can continue to work with the community and help to manage any issues that could arise. KK responded that Amey were happy to share the information as they don't want people to be suspicious of them; they want to be open and transparent.</p> | <p><b>NRe</b></p> <p><b>NE</b></p> <p><b>NRe</b></p> <p><b>KK</b></p> |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b><u>Forward Look</u></b>   |   |
|            | <p>This item was included so that Partnership members can update the group regarding any significant activities taking place between then and the following meeting.</p> <p>NRe reported that interviews were due to be held on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> May for the Business Manager post, which will report to NRe. Part of this role will be to provide additional capacity to support the work of the Partnership.</p> <p>The question was raised regarding whether the Partnership needs to be prepared for responding to the S&amp;R paper. NRe informed the Partnership that Cassie Steward, Communications Officer, has now left Sheffield City Council and that her replacement was being recruited to soon. In the meantime NRe said that other partners may be asked to offer comms support for the Partnership until Cassie's replacement is in place. KK said that Yvonne Wilkinson at Amey could support with comms if needed. NRi offered for the Wildlife Trust to lead on the comms relating to the new SSTP website. NRe thanked KK and NRi.</p>  |   |

|            |   | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b>                               |
|------------|---|--|
| <b>5.0</b> | <b><u>Awayday follow up</u></b>   |  |
|            | <p>NE thanked all for participating in the recent away day, which was a really good day. It was noted that NRe had shared the link to the away day notes and that a follow up paper had been included with the agenda.</p> <p>The following items were discussed.</p> <p><u>Communications Spreadsheet</u></p> <p>It was agreed that going forward all partners would access issues raised via the comms spreadsheet and if they do not want to contribute, they will add 'no comment'. This way the Chair will be able to see easily who has viewed the documents.</p> <p><u>Consultation with the Partnership</u></p> <p>It was agreed that going forward a minimum of 5 working days would be required to consult the Partnership on any issue. If there are exceptional issues where a decision needs to be made sooner than the minimum timescales would allow, this would be agreed with Nathan on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p><u>Running short of time in meetings</u></p> <p>The Chair's response was noted. NE said that it was vital that the Partnership gets through the Core Investment Programme (CIP) designs as soon as possible and asked GC for an update.</p> <p>GC apologised for not getting any designs to the meeting; this was due to problems with the quality of the designs. This issue was due to be discussed later in the agenda.</p> <p>DM said that she had met with the design team and would be having fortnightly meetings with them to ensure that the designs are on track and ready for consultation with the Partnership.</p> <p>CK requested to ask the designers to check that all the trees are plotted on designed streets! DM would pick this up.</p> <p>DM said that she would be resetting priorities with the team and had asked the design team to present the drawings in good time before Partnership meetings so that the Partnership would have enough time to consider them.</p> <p>Additionally it was noted that the design team would be attending the meetings where CIP designs are discussed so that they can answer any questions. NE said that this was a positive move and would result in a constructive way forward – he thanked GC and DM for progressing this.</p> | <p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p> |

|            |  | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b>                              |
|------------|--|---|
|            | <p><u>Agenda papers</u></p> <p>It was agreed that, as had recently been the convention, going forward agendas would be sent out to the Partnership with a minimum of 2 clear working days before each meeting. In practice this would usually mean that for a meeting taking place on a Friday, the agenda would be shared with the Partnership not later than close of play on the Tuesday before.</p> <p><u>Membership</u></p> <p>NE reminded all to consider additional members for this group of who would be valuable for the group. A list would be drawn up for a further discussion at the next meeting.</p> <p>All members of the Partnership were to reflect on the names of people who could be added to the list to contact for support with specific issues. A document had been created on the Google Drive to capture this. NE asked for this to be actioned before the next meeting.</p> <p>The Chair would give consideration as to what further action needs to be taken to progress this and would bring any proposals back to the Partnership.</p> <p>It was noted that SS was arranging a meeting between Partnership members and Birmingham Tree People, so that the Partnership can learn about other approaches/best practice.</p> | <p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>NE</b></p> <p><b>SS</b></p> |
| <b>6.0</b> | <b><u>Short Updates</u></b>  |   |
| 6.1        | <p><u>Trees for Streets (TfS) launch</u></p> <p>It was noted that the press release had recently been sent out to the press regarding TfS. To promote the TfS scheme NRe would be bringing a pop-up banner and promotional leaflets to the Tree Fayre on Saturday. It was noted that the information contained in the Sheffield Star article was incorrect, but that this had not been taken from the press release.</p>   |   |
| 6.2        | <p><u>Website launch</u></p> <p>It was confirmed that the new website was now live! A press release was being prepared. QR codes had been prepared to be shared at the Tree Fayre on Saturday.</p>   |   |
| <b>7.0</b> | <b><u>Sheffield Street Trees Partnership – Sheffield Tree Fayre on 20<sup>th</sup> May</u></b>   |   |
|            | NRe briefly talked through the plan for the event. A note regarding this had been shared in advance. NE thanked all for pulling this together and said that he looked forward to the event.  |   |

|            |  | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b>  |
|------------|--|---|
| <b>8.0</b> | <b><u>Process for managing consultation with the Partnership regarding Core Investment Programme (CIP)</u></b>   |   |
|            | <p>DM shared a presentation on screen relating to processes for consultation and decision-making regarding street trees.</p> <p>Regarding slide 2 'Emergency- Immediate Removal' PS said that the current process was that only a couple of people in STAG would be notified, not the whole Partnership. DM said that she would correct this.</p> <p>Regarding slide 3, it was stated that 'Immediate' and Urgent' are effectively the same category. DM to update.</p> <p>A conversation followed about some of the background issues.</p> <p>DM stated that she wanted to produce a flowchart that makes it really clear what the processes are – the presentation is just a starting point.</p> <p>Regarding timescales for Partnership members to view the CIP designs, it was agreed that 5 working days ahead of meetings should be the minimum. More time would be welcome/preferable; 2 weeks would be ideal. DM to work with Amey to start programming on the basis of these assumptions.</p> <p>NE stated that the designs would be far less contentious when no tree removals are proposed; the Partnership would be much more concerned about streets where there are proposals for tree removals.</p> <p>PS said that he appreciated DM trying to get clarity on this so that the process is clear.</p> <p>NRi asked if it would be possible to have a public facing version of the process available on the website when the Partnership is happy with the content. Everyone agreed that this was a good idea. DM to follow this up (with the support of comms colleagues) when this is further progressed.</p> <p>DM said that she would refine and create a new version of the presentation and would circulate on the comms spreadsheet when this was available.</p> <p>Gill shared the revised Matrix on screen. She said that she had tried to give better parameters around this, i.e. giving clear examples for each element of the criteria. Re 'car parking demand', there was a challenge around this so a clearer definition had been attempted. GC said that she was sorry that the Matrix wasn't shared in advance of the meeting. This was partly about having time since Davina's arrival to help bring her up to speed on key issues, including this one.</p> <p>GC agreed to share the Matrix on the shared drive asap after the meeting. It would then be up to NE in terms of how he wants to take it forward; if it needs further discussion this would need to be added to a future agenda.</p> | <p><b>DM</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p> <p><b>GC</b></p> |

|             |  | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b> |
|-------------|--|------------------------|
|             | <p>There was a discussion about the possibility of putting some additional face to face meetings in the diary, specifically to discuss CIP designs.</p> <p>NRi said that she may not be able to prioritise these meetings.</p> <p>NRe, NE and DM to discuss how to take this forward.</p>  | <b>NRe/DM/<br/>NE</b>  |
| <b>9.0</b>  | <b><u>Third Party Trees</u></b>  |                        |
|             | <p>A discussion took place regarding the SCC proposal that had been shared in advance of the meeting relating to the way forward for third party trees reports.</p> <p>Having consulted with Arboriculture Consultant Ian Murat, who in turn had discussed the matter with Dr Kieron J. Doick, Head of the Urban Forest Research Group and author of CAVAT, it was suggested that CAVAT is the correct tool to be using when considering subsidence cases, as it was designed precisely for providing a financial valuation of a tree to be pitched against built infrastructure (in this case homes subject to subsidence).</p> <p>SCC proposed to proceed with using CAVAT when providing reports regarding third party trees.</p> <p>It was noted that CAVAT does not provide for proper cost benefit analysis. However, after a discussion, the Partnership accepted that there was a need for a pragmatic way forward and SCC's proposal was agreed.</p> <p>It was noted that where the financial margins were very tight then the Partnership would reserve the right to request additional cost benefit analysis for third party trees on a case-by-case basis.</p> |                        |
| <b>10.0</b> | <b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>   |                        |
| 10.1        | <p><u>Request from Forestry Commission</u></p> <p>It was noted that there had been a request from the Forestry Commission's FWAC (Forestry and Woodlands Advisory Committee) for SSTP to give a presentation and lead a site visit to look at street trees on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>NRi said that she would not be able to attend. CK said that she was available and would like to be involved.</p> <p>NE was following this up and would get in touch with relevant individuals outside of the meeting.</p>   | <b>NE</b>              |

|      |   | <b>ACTION<br/>WHOM</b>            |
|------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 10.2 | <p><u>Funding for volunteer training</u></p> <p>KK said that he leads for Amey on social value schemes and education. He had identified some funding that was available for training for volunteers and that this could include Street Tree Wardens. KK asked if the Partnership would like KK to follow this up on behalf of the Partnership. All agreed that this would be very welcome and KK agreed to look into this further and report back.</p> <p>NRi said that one of the areas of training need for Street Tree Wardens was around biodiversity. She said that the Wildlife Trust could deliver the training if there was funding available to pay for this.</p> <p>SS mentioned the urban forest accelerator scheme in Birmingham and said that it would be good to touch base with KK about this.</p> | <p><b>KK</b></p> <p><b>SS</b></p> |
| 10.3 | <p><u>Changes to membership of the Partnership</u></p> <p>SS informed all that this would be her last meeting, as she would shortly be leaving the Woodland Trust.</p> <p>It was noted that GC was also leaving soon to take up her new role for Barnsley Council, so it was both Gill and Sarah's last meeting.</p> <p>On behalf of everyone, NE thanked both Gill and Sarah for all their work and support for the Partnership.</p>   |                                   |
| 10.4 | <p>GC updated all on DW and on behalf of the Partnership NE asked that well wishes be passed on to him.</p>   |                                   |