



**Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 14th July 2023 (Microsoft Teams)**

Attendees

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Paul Selby	Street Tree Warden (PS)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Catherine Nuttgens	Woodland Trust (CN)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council (CD)
Emily Standbrook-Shaw	Sheffield City Council (ESS)

Apologies

Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Davina Millership	Sheffield City Council (DM)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome and introductions</u>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting and welcomed Emily and Claire, as this was the first meeting of the Partnership that they had attended.	
2.0	<u>Notes and actions from last meeting</u>	
	Partners considered the notes and actions of the meeting held on 16 th June 2023.	
	As KK was not in attendance at the meeting it was noted that he would be asked bring an update regarding comms on tree watering to the August meeting.	KK
	CK confirmed that she was happy with the changes made the to the CIP Matrix and the final version would be shared via the Google Drive.	NRe
	The notes were agreed as a true record. NRe would upload the document to the SSTP website.	NRe

		ACTION WHOM
3.0	<u>Forward Look</u>	
	<p>PS reported that Nether Edge & Sharrow Sustainable Transformation (NESST) had been successful in a grant bid through Aviva, which would provide match funding on a 2:1 basis on money raised during a 6-week crowdfunding period. As such, the total funding amount is currently unknown, however NESST is aiming to raise enough to plant a number of additional trees in the Highfield/Lowfield area. PS flagged that he was talking to a journalist to secure an article in the Yorkshire Post to promote the scheme. The Partnership welcomed the project that PS had outlined and agreed that there was no need for PS to refer back to the partnership around comms.</p> <p>CN updated that there had been some movement of staff within the Woodland Trust. Going forward, they are likely to be represented on the partnership by an External Affairs Officer, once the post is recruited to. CN said that she would keep the Partnership updated.</p> <p>CN gave an update on the Woodland Trust's UK wide Tree Equity Map, which will compare canopy cover against factors including indices of multiple deprivation and flood risk, at local area level. The partnership agreed to bring the Tree Equity Map to a future meeting when this is available. <i>Post meeting note – this item has been added to the forward plan.</i></p>	CN
4.0	<u>Short Updates</u>	
4.1	<p><u>CIP Designs – timescales for consulting the Partnership/additional meetings</u></p> <p>NRe provided the following update from DM:</p> <p><i>Amey was tasked with providing a fully resourced programme showing all relevant activities by 30th June and this programme should show the key delivery of all of the design work by March 2024.</i></p> <p><i>Unfortunately, the programme, which was received slightly later than expected, did not show completion by March 2024 and Amey were tasked again to provide a fully resourced programme including all the activities including consultation with the Partnership and the wider public.</i></p> <p><i>All additional information was provided to Amey including draft process charts and Amey was given further opportunities to meet with SCC officers to discuss the detailed requirements which have been discussed at the Partnership.</i></p> <p>NRe advised that she did not want to set up additional meetings of the Partnership until there was clarity on when the CIP designs would be ready for consultation. This would now be September/October.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NE was keen that Partnership meetings are focussed on forward looking strategy delivery, rather than legacy activity – so welcomed the approach of setting up separate meetings to consider CIP designs.</p> <p>NRe will send out a doodle poll looking at dates in September and October for CIP design consultation meetings.</p>	NRe
4.2	<p><u>Tree Consultations</u></p> <p>NRe advised that due to significant capacity issues within SCC’s Highways Team, the work needed to create the tree consultation template on the new engagement platform – ‘Have your Say Sheffield’ had been delayed. The team were picking this up as a matter of urgency and looking for additional resource to support the work and get the backlog of around 90 outstanding tree consultations on the system. NRe apologised for the delay.</p> <p>CK raised concerns about the capacity of the Partnership to consider 90 consultations. DW confirmed that the outstanding tree consultations would be managed sensibly in batches so that the Partnership don’t have too many responses to consider at any one time.</p> <p>DW/DM to keep the Partnership updated about progress.</p>	DW/DM
4.3	<p><u>Third Party Trees</u></p> <p>NRe informed the Partnership that 5 reports had been received from Ian Murat. NRe would share the reports directly with partners who had confirmed that they would comply with the NDA. From that point, partners would have 5 working days to indicate, via the comms spreadsheet, whether they agree with Ian’s proposal for removal of the tree.</p> <p>NRe also advised that Ian had reached the financial limit on the work he had carried out. A new procurement process would now be required, which would involve seeking quotations from other suitable consultants, because of the value of work which is accruing. This will involve seeking quotations from other suitable consultants.</p> <p>NRe said that SCC hoped to be able to share the CVs of prospective consultants with the Partnership and that agreement would be sought on a suitable cohort to obtain quotations from. DM and DW would keep the Partnership updated.</p>	NRe DW/DM
4.4	<p><u>Councillor Information and Engagement Sessions</u></p> <p>NRe informed the Partnership that 2 sessions had been arranged for Councillors during the w/c 17th July – one remote and one face to face. The format would be a presentation followed by Q&A. NE, CK, CE, NRe and ESS had agreed to attend the sessions to represent the Partnership. The remote session would be recorded and shared with all Councillors.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
4.5	<p><u>Waste & Streetscene Committee Leads to attend September Partnership Meeting.</u></p> <p>NRe advised that the Chair, Deputy Chair and Lead Spokesperson of the Waste & Streetscene Committee had asked to attend a Partnership meeting, to introduce themselves to partners. NE has invited them to attend the first 15 minutes only of the September meeting.</p>	
4.6	<p><u>Arbourthorne School Event – 5th September</u></p> <p>NRe advised that she had spoken with Angela Hiley from Arbourthorne Community Primary School re having a stall at their Horticultural Show to promote the work of the Partnership – notes shared via the Google Drive.</p> <p>NRe proposed working with Amey’s Education Officer to adapt the materials used at the Tree Fayre to create resources for a younger audience.</p> <p>NRe advised that she and ESS would attend the event on behalf of the Partnership, and asked partners to let her know if they were interested in attending.</p> <p>NRe advised that the work undertaken to plan for this event could form the basis for an engagement programme with schools, that the Partnership may wish to pursue in the Autumn.</p> <p>Partners agreed to support the event, and NRi raised the importance of having a more strategic conversation about what the Partnership is trying to achieve through its engagement work, and how events such as this might fit into that. Partners agreed to schedule an item on this for a future agenda. <i>Post meeting note – this item has been added to the forward plan.</i></p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>NRe/ESS /All</p>
4.7	<p><u>Meeting with SYMCA re Partnership and Funding Opportunities</u></p> <p>NE updated the Partnership on a meeting that he and NRe had attended with Richard Sulley, Net Zero Project Director and Colette Harvey, Ownership Hub – Local Coordinator at South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA). There were many synergies between the strategic planting ambitions of the Partnership, and SYMCA’s target of planting 1.4 million trees. SYMCA also have an interest in circular economies and creating green jobs. NE would continue the dialogue with SYMCA and look for opportunities to facilitate additional street tree planting.</p> <p>CN said that she had previously raised some concerns with Oliver Coppard regarding the scale of additional tree planting that he was proposing. CN offered to help in these conversations as required.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
4.8	<p><u>Strategic Planting Palette</u></p> <p>NE reported that the University of Sheffield was keen to be involved in the Strategic Planting Palette. NE was keen to progress this work and involve the Tree Inspectors in the work to create a brief.</p> <p>NE will reconvene the Strategic Planting Palette Task Group.</p>	NE
5.0	<u>Priorities for additional SCC resource for the Partnership</u>	
	<p>NRe introduced the newly appointed Business Manager, Emily Standbrook-Shaw (ESS), who would be providing around 15 hours of support a week to the Partnership. The Partnership's priorities will determine how this additional support is used.</p> <p>NE proposed that the Partnership should adopt a twin track approach to its work – dealing with CIP streets outside of the scheduled Partnership meetings, enabling the Partnership to prioritise strategy delivery. NE outlined a proposal focussing the Partnership around 4 pillars – Community Planting; Street Tree Wardens; Monitoring, Data & Reporting; Engagement. NE would share the detail of this proposal, and his view of priorities within this, via the Google Drive. All partners to comment and reflect on priorities to direct resources where needed.</p> <p>NRi highlighted that we don't currently share tree mapping with the public, and that this should be a priority. The Partnership discussed various options – including Andy Greenwood's tree map and Treeplotter but recognised that a wider conversation is needed to consider options around systems and funding. The Partnership agreed that DW, CE, CK, CN, NRi and Andy Greenwood (AG) would convene a sub-group to do this, and report back to a future meeting of the Partnership.</p>	<p>NE/All</p> <p>DW/CE/ CK/CN/ NRi/AG</p>
6.0	<u>Follow up from the Tree Fayre</u>	
	<p>NRe asked the Partnership to reflect on the success of the Tree Fayre that had been held in the Botanical Gardens in May. NRe reported that she felt the event, although resource intensive, had been worthwhile. There could be benefits to holding future events in different parts of the city where there is less awareness of the benefits of street trees – this could be picked up through the Partnership's engagement work.</p> <p>NE and CN felt that incorporating an employment element into future events would add value – including green jobs (a priority for SYMCA), and women in arboriculture.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed that we should continue to be involved in future Tree Fayre events, building on the experience and learning from this year.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
7.0	<u>Membership and Terms of Reference</u>	
	<p>NE advised that it was an appropriate point in the Partnership’s development to consider the Terms of Reference, and whether they need to be updated to better reflect how the Partnership is working now, and its increasing focus on strategy delivery.</p> <p>NE asked all partners to reflect and comment on the ToR – which NRe would share via the Google Drive – to inform a discussion at the August meeting.</p> <p>NE observed that the Partnership had limited time to get through its agenda. He proposed a model where the Partnership holds an overview and co-ordinating role, with Task and Finish groups being established around the four pillars of Community Planting; Street Tree Wardens; Monitoring, Data & Reporting; Engagement. These T&F groups would recruit an additional tier of membership (adhering to the Partnership Charter) to bring additional capacity into partnership activity and drive progress. The T&F groups would report into the Partnership, which would remain the key forum for decision making and delivering the strategy; as well as overarching activity such as influencing city policies and strategies.</p> <p>NE proposed that membership be restructured to reflect this approach, with PS to become the Community Planting lead and Sarah Shorley to be invited back to the Partnership as a Street Tree Warden lead. CK would become the Monitoring, Data & Analysis lead, with further thought to be given to the lead for Engagement – recognising that while neither the Woodland Trust nor SRWT have capacity to lead in this area it would be good if they could be involved.</p> <p>There was broad support from all partners to this approach, and it was agreed that NE would invite Sarah Shorley back to the Partnership, and that NRe would update the membership pages of the website to reflect these changes.</p>	<p>NRe/All</p> <p>NE/NRe</p>
8.0	<u>SSTP Progress Report 2023</u>	
	<p>NRe explained that the Partnership is committed to producing an annual progress report on the work of the Partnership and delivery of the strategy. The first of these had been published in 2022, and this year’s is due to be published by the end of the Calendar year.</p> <p>NRe said that she and ESS were happy to start planning and drafting the progress report, and asked whether any other partners would like to be involved in the process.</p> <p>CK had been involved in the annual progress report for 2022 and was happy to do so again this year. NE was willing to be involved as needed.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	NRe, ESS, CK and NE would meet to discuss allocation of tasks.	NRe/ESS /CK/NE
9.0	<u>Measuring Canopy Cover</u>	
	<p>CE introduced a paper setting out proposals from Treeconomics on measuring canopy cover, as per the action in Outcome 5 of the Strategy. This was the result of a series of meetings between CK, CE and Treeconomics. CE highlighted some challenges with the proposals – the inclusion of third party trees that extend over highways, and the exclusion of highways trees that extend over third party land in the calculations, and questioned the cost/benefit of this approach, given the negligible change in canopy cover per year.</p> <p>Partners expressed varying views over the need to measure canopy cover annually, and the best approach to do this.</p> <p>DW and CK both felt that the annual change in canopy cover was too small for it to be beneficial to measure this frequently. PS felt strongly that measuring canopy cover annually was essential. Even if it shows limited change – the Partnership needs to be able to react to that to deliver the aims of the strategy.</p> <p>CN reported that a lot of work had been carried out recently on canopy cover in relation to Tree Equity. The Woodland Trust, Google, and DEFRA all have data on this – although not exclusively on street trees. Further exploration of this may prove helpful.</p> <p>NRi pointed out that the action in the Outcome 5 is to measure canopy cover annually. If this is no longer appropriate in the view of the Partnership, the strategy would need to be changed.</p> <p>NE summarised that the Partnership needed to be clear about frequency of reporting, what is being reported on, and whether there is already mapping in existence that could be used.</p> <p>NE asked partners to give their views in relation to the frequency of reporting. DW was of the view that as the tree network only changes by 1-1.5% a year, annual calculations were not necessary, and a more appropriate timeframe would be every 5 years, with a caveat around major events. CE felt that it did not need to be annually but that a calculation did need to happen soon given that the last calculation was in 2019. PS was of the view that an annual calculation was essential. CK felt that a 5-year timeframe was appropriate, which would mean that the next calculation would be due in 2024, which would give time to explore options. CN and NRi were of the view that more needed to be done to review what data and systems are out there now to measure canopy cover, given recent developments.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	NE concluded that the Partnership needed to be better informed about what is available already in terms of tree data, whether we can extrapolate the data specifically for street trees, and how data availability might affect reporting frequency. This needs to be understood before the Partnership can determine if it should go ahead with the offer from Treeconomics. The Partnership agreed that CE, CK & CN would meet to discuss this and bring an update back to the next Partnership meeting.	CE/CK/ CN
10.0	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
10.1	<p><u>Process for agreeing the Partnership's formal consultation responses in relation to CIP design</u></p> <p>NRe advised that the schedule for consulting on CIP designs would hopefully soon be available. DM was keen to have a curated response from the Partnership on the designs and NRe asked the Partnership for views on the best way to do this.</p> <p>Options included NRe/ESS drafting responses based on Partnership discussions and bringing back to partners for sign off; and the response coming from the Chair on behalf of the Partnership.</p> <p>NE was of the view that the Partnership may need to trial various options dependent on the nature of the discussions, and that this should be revisited. Item to be added to the next Partnership meeting.</p>	NE/NRe
10.2	<p><u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u></p> <p>CK asked for an update on the LBAP. DW/DM to provide an update at the next Partnership meeting.</p>	DW/DM
10.3	<p><u>Natural England Funding</u></p> <p>NRi sought the Partnership's views on a possible funding bid to Natural England for community tree planting, that had been shared with partners via email. The timescales for the bid were tight, and NRi had conversations lined up with Natural England.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed that NRi should determine whether or not to pursue the bid, and they would support her decision either way.</p>	NRi