



**Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 16th June 2023 (Microsoft Teams)**

Attendees

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (part of the meeting only) (RE)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Davina Millership	Sheffield City Council (DM)

Item 2 only

Lucy Heyes	Sheffield City Council (LH)
------------	-----------------------------

Notes

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

Apologies

David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Paul Selby	Street Tree Warden (PS)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome and introductions</u>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting and welcomed Lucy Heyes to the meeting.	
2.0	<u>Inquiry report</u>	
	Lucy Heyes gave an overview of the report 'Learning from the past and moving ahead: response to the Sheffield Street Tree Inquiry'. Concerns were raised by CK to ensure that apologies are included to contractors - Amey staff, particularly those on the front line. NRi mentioned that charities put in an awful lot of charitable time during the time of the dispute – including Sheffield Rotherham Wildlife Trust and the Woodland Trust, as well as others.	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>These points were noted by Lucy.</p> <p>Lucy stated that the Core Investment Programme roads that are outstanding are symbolic of the dispute and need to be progressed in a timely fashion. She said that the Partnership is a massive success story and the actions referring to the Partnership within the report seek to build on that success.</p> <p>There are recommendations about membership, attendance at meetings and additional support for the Partnership. Also about continuous improvement and information sharing.</p> <p>In terms of Streets Ahead capacity there are recommendations about this within the report. Also, actions around ensuring that best practice is followed and longer-term actions, in terms of legacy to the contract.</p> <p>In terms of capacity and support for the Partnership, Richard updated that he would be going out shortly to recruit for a permanent Assistant Director of Highways.</p> <p>NRe updated that they had successfully recruited to the role of Business Manager and the new postholder was due to start in post during the first week in July. This is a fixed term 12-month post initially, with the intention that the role could be made permanent in the future if the model works.</p> <p>NRi said that additional resource shouldn't just be for the Council, it should be for all partners. NRe confirmed that the element of the new Business Manager's resource capacity which would be directed towards supporting the Partnership would include working with partners and helping with moving projects forward. The Partnership would have input into prioritisation regarding this additional capacity.</p> <p>NRe asked NRi to be clear what she was asking for when she says that 'additional resource shouldn't just be for the Council'. NRi said that SRWT's involvement in the Partnership was not a funded project and said that if there were funds available for their time, to help pay for their involvement in the Partnership, then this would be welcome.</p> <p>KK gave an update about tree inspectors. He said that the reporting arrangements for the tree inspectors had changed; they now sit under KK and report directly to CE. He said that he had just signed off an order to bring in a new freelance inspector (temporarily).</p> <p>KK said that this extra resource would be an interim measure. Tree inspectors' workload would be reviewed and if there is a shortfall in capacity KK would look to raise a business case so that consideration can be given to providing a more permanent resource if that was required.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NE said that he would also like the Tree Inspectors to get more involved with SSTP meetings, so that should be considered as part of future demand for the tree inspectors' time.</p> <p>CK said that the areas where we lack a tree inspector are the poorest areas and we can't recruit Tree Wardens into those areas for that reason.</p> <p>CK asked if partners were going to be involved in the 'comprehensive review'. She said that the Tree Democrats would also be asking a question about involvement at the S&R meeting on Monday.</p> <p>LH responded that she wanted the report to be clear about information sharing with the Partnership, so that this can be improved. Regarding accountability and governance, LH was keen to avoid setting anything up that 'puts these issues in a vacuum'. This is not tree specific. This is about building a climate of engagement and empowerment led from the top of the organisation and supported by cultures across the organisation. People need the skills to do this, so we also need to build capability.</p> <p>LH said that this report is another steppingstone on the journey, not the end of the conversation.</p> <p>On behalf of the group, NE thanked LH for the detailed report and welcomed the report going to committee.</p> <p>LH said that one of the good things about this issue is that there are lots of partners and people in the community involved who are very passionate about this and will hold the council to account.</p> <p>It was noted that PS, who was absent from the meeting, had sent comments directly to Lucy.</p>	
3.0	<u>Notes of last meeting</u>	
	The notes of the meeting held on 19 th May 2023 were agreed as a true record. NRe would upload the document to the SSTP website.	NRe
4.0	<u>Forward Look</u>	
	<p>It was flagged that a possible subject for discussion at the next SSTP meeting could be how the Partnership prioritises the additional capacity provided by the new Business Manager – this needs to be strategic, not ad hoc.</p> <p>NRi flagged that the Woodland Trust and Kids Plant Trees had been doing some awareness raising work talking about the importance of watering street trees. NE suggested adding details of that on the website.</p>	NRe/NE

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NRi asked - do SSTP need a position on what we're asking people to do? The consensus seemed to be that the message is if there is a tree outside your house, water it!</p> <p>CK asked if it was possible to share details of the 'free' taps that are dotted around the city with people. KK responded that these taps aren't free and they belong to Amey.</p> <p>It was suggested that SSTP should be putting out their own comms on tree watering – KK said that he would pick this up as an action with Yvonne. It was suggested that he checked with Catherine Nuttgens what the campaign is that we are supporting (info could be accessed through Kids Plant Trees). NRi said that she would share through the Wildlife Trust's comms channels when the comms was available.</p>	KK
5.0	<u>Short Updates</u>	
5.1	<p><u>Additional Partnership meeting in July</u></p> <p>DM flagged that CIP designs were unlikely to be available in time to hit the additional meeting proposed for 17th July. Agreed to discuss further in item 7 (below).</p>	
5.2	<p><u>Feedback from Forestry Commission (Urban FWAC Network) event on 9th June</u></p> <p>NE and CK had represented the Partnership at this event. A presentation was given about the Partnership, followed by a tree walk and discussion about challenges. This was a great opportunity for the Partnership to make contact with a partner organisation. There may be more opportunities to work with the FC as a potential partner in the future.</p> <p>An issue arose about informing and engaging with councillors about the work of the Partnership. NRe suggested that it would be a good idea to put on a series of briefing sessions that councillors could attend. CK and NE said that they would like to be involved with that.</p> <p>CK said that through the meeting on 9th June they had found out that the FC are rewriting the best practice guide on working around trees and were seeking to get more visible input from Highways Engineers. This was due to be consulted on in late summer 2023. NE said that the 'Duty to consult' guidance would also be coming out soon and NE had discussions with the FC about the Partnership being a consultee in relation to this.</p> <p>NE also reported that the FC had advised him that Urban Tree Challenge Funding (UTCF) <i>could</i> be used to match fund Trees for Streets trees. This is contrary to previous understanding of how this funding could be used. This is something to follow up in the future, possibly when the new Business Manager starts in post.</p>	<p>NRe/NE</p> <p>NE/NRe</p>

		ACTION WHOM
5.3	<p><u>Press release for SSTP website</u></p> <p>NRi to follow up with James Hargreaves, as SRWT was leading on this comms work.</p>	NRi
5.4	<p><u>Recruitment for Sheffield City Council new comms officer to support Streets Ahead</u></p> <p>DM updated that this was still in progress.</p>	
6.0	<u>Follow up from Tree Fayre</u>	
	<p>Due to a lack of time it was agreed that the main discussion relating to this item would be deferred to the following meeting.</p> <p>Only one (time sensitive) item was discussed – NRe flagged that the Partnership had been invited to attend a Horticultural Show at a local primary school in early September. NRe asked if there was interest/availability from Partnership members to get involved with this.</p> <p>It was agreed that more information was needed but in principle there was a wish to support this request. KK said that Amey had an Education Officer who could get involved with this if we are clear what our messages are/what we're trying to convey. NE said that he would like to be involved but could not be certain at this point that he could commit to the date. NRe to follow up the request to get more information.</p> <p>NE said that in terms of future engagement activity it would be really good if the Partnership could work with Amey's Education Officer to create some information that could be shared with schools. KK was open to this.</p>	<p>NRe/NE</p> <p>NRe</p>
7.0	<u>Update on Core Investment Programme (CIP)</u>	
	<p>There was a discussion about how to manage CIP designs coming through the Partnership. The suggestion was made that additional agenda time is created for the designs involving tree fells, but that where no fells are proposed these would be dealt with via the comms spreadsheet. All were in agreement with this suggestion.</p> <p>CK stated that the roads should be addressed in the order of what state they are in; worst first so that implementation on the worst streets can be planned in earlier.</p> <p>It was noted that Amey were looking at the level of resourcing for this.</p> <p>NE said that there was a need to be clear what the ask will be of the Partnership in terms of timescales. KK responded that there would not be any designs ready in time for the meeting on 17th July.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>CK requested using the time slot on 17th July to discuss outstanding tree consultations. This was agreed. The meeting would be held remotely for an hour, at 10.00am. NE advised that he would attend. NRi may attend. KK/CE/CK would lead the meeting. NRe agreed to send the meeting invite.</p> <p>It was agreed that NRe would send out another doodle poll to all to put some dates on hold in diaries to discuss CIP designs (likely looking at dates in August, September and October).</p> <p>DM said that the Council would want a formal response from the Partnership in relation to each CIP street design, in their role as consultee. NE also made clear that the Partnership is keen to feed into the wording for the public consultations. This was noted by DM.</p> <p>DM went through some other elements of the process for consulting with the Partnership to ensure that her understanding was clear. She agreed to share her presentation about this process with the Partnership, via the comms spreadsheet.</p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>NRe</p> <p>DM</p>
8.0	<u>CIP Matrix</u>	
	<p>DM ran through the revised CIP Matrix, which had been shared with the Partnership in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>There was one small issue that CK raised regarding the wording relating to Flexipave. It was agreed that DM and CK would meet to tweak the wording.</p> <p>All agreed that they were happy to sign off the version of the CIP Matrix that had been shared, subject to CK's issue being resolved. It was noted that, although PS was not at the meeting, he had confirmed separately that he was happy to sign off the revised matrix.</p>	CK/DM
9.0	<u>Update on Third Party Tree reports</u>	
	<p>NRe updated all on the approach that SCC were proposing to take, which was the subject of a recent email that NRe had sent to the Partnership. NRe flagged that since the email had been sent, Amey had raised concerns about this approach.</p> <p>KK clarified that Amey aren't comfortable with SCC's proposal. NE responded that the Partnership can't be consulted effectively without seeing the information that the Council is proposing to share.</p> <p>NRe stated that this issue could not be resolved during the meeting and that Amey and SCC would need to take this issue outside of the meeting to resolve.</p>	DM/RE/ KK

		ACTION WHOM
10.0	<u>Partnership Terms of reference</u>	
	Due to a lack of time it was agreed that this item would be deferred to the following meeting.	NRe/NE
11.0	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
11.1	<p><u>Tree Consultations</u></p> <p>CK flagged that tree consultations had been moved from citizen space and that she didn't know any more about where new consultations would be held. Additionally the consultation map isn't being updated. She was concerned that no consultations were going out, whilst one of the tree inspectors had advised that there was now a backlog of trees that needed to be consulted on for felling; if there are further delays Amey may not be able to process them and additionally the Partnership may not have capacity to process them.</p> <p>NRe explained that the Council had stopped using Citizen's Space at the end of March 2023 and had moved to a new consultation and engagement platform called Have Your Say Sheffield. She did not know why new tree consultations had not been created since the system had changed but this could be related to capacity issues within the Highways Team. DM to take this away to resolve and bring back an update.</p>	DM
11.2	<p><u>August meeting</u></p> <p>NE asked for an indication of which partners would be able to attend the meeting in August. It seemed that around half of the Partnership would be able to attend if the meeting went ahead. NE said that he would take this away from the meeting and consider whether to go ahead with the meeting and would update the Partnership as soon as possible.</p>	NE