



**Action notes of meeting held on  
Friday 11th August 2023 (Microsoft Teams)**

**Attendees**

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Paul Selby	Community Planting (PS)
Sarah Shorley	Street Tree Warden (SS)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Davina Millership	Sheffield City Council (DM)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council (CD)
Emily Standbrook-Shaw	Sheffield City Council (ESS)

**Apologies**

Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Catherine Nuttgens	Woodland Trust (CN)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Welcome and introductions</u></b>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting and welcomed Sarah Shorley back to the Partnership.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Notes and actions from last meeting</u></b>	
	Partners considered the notes and actions of the meeting held on 16 <sup>th</sup> June 2023.  The notes were agreed as a true record. NRe would upload the document to the SSTP website.	<b>NRe</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>Forward Look</u></b>	
	NRe informed the Partnership that due to annual leave the papers for the Partnership meeting on the 8 <sup>th</sup> September would be circulated slightly later than usual.	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>NRe and ESS have preparations for the Arbourthorne Primary School event on September 5<sup>th</sup> in hand. KK would follow up with Emma Pickering, Amey Engagement Officer, as to whether she would be able to attend the event and let NRe and ESS know.</p> <p>NE announced that he had accepted a new job with the University of Sheffield and would be starting in September.</p>	<b>KK</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b><u>Short Updates</u></b>	
4.1	<p><u>Tree Watering Comms</u></p> <p>KK updated that this was complete, links published on Amey and SCC websites, and through social media. KK agreed that CE would work with the Tree Inspectors to pull together some bullet points as a starting point for a Partnership branded fact sheet.</p>	<b>KK/CE</b>
4.2	<p><u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u></p> <p>CD provided an update – there were still some amendments to be made to the LBAP. Once complete, CD would share the LBAP via the Google Drive – hopefully w/c 14<sup>th</sup> August - for all partners to comment.</p> <p>NE stressed that the LBAP needed to be forward looking.</p> <p>CK asked how often the LBAP is updated. CD agreed to check and confirm the timescales.</p>	<p><b>CD/All</b></p> <p><b>CD</b></p>
4.3	<p><u>CIP Designs</u></p> <p>NRe confirmed that there were 2 dates held in diaries for CIP consultations – 2<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> October. KK would consult with colleagues as to who needs to attend these meetings from Amey.</p> <p>DM was disappointed that she had not yet seen any CIP design drawings. KK confirmed that drawings were currently with Road Safety Audit and should be ready for meetings planned with DM later in August.</p>	<b>KK</b>
4.4	<p><u>Tree Consultations</u></p> <p>CD updated the Partnership on the 90 outstanding tree consultations. The template had been set up on the new consultation platform, and consultations would be added in 3 tranches – aiming to clear the backlog by early November. The first tranche should be live by 18<sup>th</sup> August 2023.</p> <p>The Partnership thanked CD for her hard work on this.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
4.5	<p><u>Third Party Trees</u></p> <p>DM informed the Partnership that of the 5 reports shared via the Google Drive, the proposals were supported for 3.</p> <p>It was agreed that there would be a short meeting immediately after the Partnership meeting to discuss outstanding queries on the remaining 2 reports.</p> <p>NE reminded the Partnership that SCC are the decision maker for these cases and the Partnership is the consultee.</p>	
4.6	<p><u>Arbourthorne School Event</u></p> <p>Update provided under Forward Look – no further update.</p>	
4.7	<p><u>Strategic Planting Palette</u></p> <p>NE gave an update on the Strategic Planting Palette project. Positive conversations were underway with Nicola Dempsey and other University of Sheffield colleagues. NE would share a note on progress via the Google Drive.</p> <p>Initial thoughts on the brief were to structure around 5 areas – replacements; arterial routes and arrival into the city; opportunities for bridging nature reserves; historic/special streets; diversity &amp; resilience. UoS was looking at different options for resourcing the work.</p> <p>NE planned to reconvene the task and finish group, including Tree Inspectors, to work on the brief and asked partners to let him know if they wanted to be involved.</p>	<p><b>NE</b></p> <p><b>NE/All</b></p>
4.8	<p><u>Partnership Manager Role</u></p> <p>NRe reminded partners that she would be leaving the Partnership Manager role in September on a 12-month secondment. After considering options, it had been agreed that Sheffield &amp; Rotherham Wildlife Trust would host and manage a 0.6FTE post dedicated to managing the Partnership, funded by SCC, for this 12-month period.</p> <p>Partners welcomed the proposal, and the increased independence and autonomy this would bring the Partnership.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
4.9	<p><u>Annual Progress Report</u></p> <p>NRe advised that she, CK and ESS had met to discuss the production of the annual progress report and outlined a rough timetable aiming for a first draft to be shared with partners by 15<sup>th</sup> September.</p> <p>A spreadsheet had been shared via the Google Drive for partners to flag any issues for inclusion in the report.</p> <p>NRe thanked CK for the work she is doing on the annual report, which was echoed by others.</p>	
5.0	<p><b><u>Delivering the Partnership’s Priorities and SSTP Terms of Reference</u></b></p>	
	<p>Partners considered the current Terms of Reference, and comments shared via email from NRi. Partners agreed that the ToR were generally fit for purpose but the following minor amendments were required:</p> <p><b>Purpose</b> A reference to the Partnership Charter should be included in the ToR “To work in partnership to” should preface all points in this section</p> <p><b>Structure</b> Core Delivery Group to be renamed ‘Street Tree Partners’ and description altered to better reflect membership.</p> <p>Street Tree Partners renamed as Street Tree Stakeholders.</p> <p>Amend wording re Task and Finish Groups to better reflect how objectives are agreed (CK to suggest).</p> <p>4 Pillars approach to be reflected.</p> <p><b>Leadership</b> Clarify that a Chair will be elected each year, and that the incumbent Chair is eligible to stand.</p> <p><b>Transparency</b> Change wording to reflect that meeting notes are shared via website, and key documents will be shared via ‘Resources’ page of website.</p> <p><b>Securing Resources</b> Change ‘the Partnership will not be an independent body constituted in its own right at this time’ to reflect the commitments made in SCC’s response to the Lowcock report around supporting the Partnership to have a more formal constitution in the future.</p>	<p><b>CK</b></p>

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>ESS would lead on drafting a revised Terms of Reference and share with the Partnership for comments in October, aiming for sign-off at the Partnership away-day on October 6<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>For full transparency of the new ToR, pending a revision to the Strategy, a press release would be drafted and published on the Partnership website to flag that the ToR have been revised. It would provide a link to a copy of the updated ToR which would be published within the resources section of the website. ESS to action.</p> <p>NE talked the Partnership through his '4 pillars' proposal that had been shared via the Google Drive. He stated that the pillars should work through consensus in the same way that the Partnership does. Pillar groups should determine the scope for their own area and bring to the Partnership for agreement. The aim was to recruit new people to the pillars to add capacity and make progress against the strategy's outcomes.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed the 'Pillars' approach. CK asked whether an additional pillar beyond street trees, around biodiversity and natural capital should be added. PS was mindful that the current remit of the Partnership is street trees only. NE agreed to take this away for consideration.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed that the areas of focus set out in the circulated document were a good starting point on which each pillar could build. Each group would meet to determine scope and how it would operate. There would be a regular slot added to the agenda of each Partnership meeting for each pillar to feed back.</p> <p>Partners were asked to reflect on which groups they felt able to support. It need not only be one group but could be many, subject to individual's time and resource. It was recognised that DW, CE and Tree Inspectors would have a role across several pillars, and that this approach must not overburden them.</p> <p>The Engagement Pillar was not yet allocated a lead. NE would lead this, with a view to the new Partnership Manager taking a lead once in post. ESS would support, and link into engagement expertise within SCC. Emma Pickering, Engagement Officer from Amey, should be invited to this pillar, as well as representation from SCC Community Forestry team.</p>	<p><b>ESS</b></p> <p><b>ESS</b></p> <p><b>NE</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>NE/ESS</b></p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b><u>Feedback from Councillor Engagement Sessions</u></b>	
	<p>NE updated the Partnership on the Councillor briefing sessions that had been held in July. There had been one in person session, and one online session. Both had been reasonably well attended, and worthwhile sessions.</p> <p>The issues raised had been shared on a document via the Google Drive.</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>The sessions highlighted different approaches to tree management on highways vs housing land, and limited budgets for tree maintenance on housing land. Consideration needed to be given to the implications of community planting proposals on housing land.</p> <p>RE advised that he is leading some work on transforming the street scene which would address some of these issues. He would share a briefing note with the Partnership.</p>	<b>RE</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b><u>Process for Partnership consultation responses</u></b>	
	<p>The Partnership discussed the most appropriate approach for developing Partnership responses to the CIP design consultations.</p> <p>NE proposed that partners submit responses via the comms spreadsheet, and he would formulate a partnership response based on those responses – with ESS supporting as required.</p> <p>It was agreed that this approach would be trialled for the first few designs and reviewed as appropriate.</p>	
<b>8.0</b>	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>	
8.1	<p><u>Cost to Community Groups of replacing a failed sapling</u></p> <p>PS advised that in the early years of the Partnership, there had been an agreement that if a sapling planted by a community group failed in its first 3 years, Amey would not charge for labour, just the cost of the replacement tree - although this was not recorded in any formal meeting notes.</p> <p>CE had flagged that this was not a viable approach, as Amey were operating at a loss. PS agreed that it was not fair for Amey to pick up these costs and all partners agreed that Amey providing the service on a cost neutral basis (currently £178.40 – subject to inflationary uplift) was appropriate. It was noted that the cost for the replacement tree would be additional to the £178.40 labour cost.</p> <p>PS asked that if any partners come across any other areas where practice is different to what was previously agreed by the Partnership, they should bring this to the Partnership's attention for discussion and recording formally in meeting notes for full transparency.</p>	
8.2	<p><u>Tree Archive Update</u></p> <p>A question had been asked during the Councillor briefing sessions, about whether the Tree Archive was being kept up to date with positive developments since 2018. NRe had followed this up with Pete Evans,</p>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>Archives and Heritage Manager, who had confirmed that the archive was still live and could be added to.</p> <p>Partners agreed that the Annual Progress Reports should be added to the archive, and that Pete Evans should be invited to the November Partnership meeting to give an update and discuss whether meeting notes should also be added.</p>	<b>ESS</b>
8.3	<p><u>SCC Staffing Update</u></p> <p>RE reported that DM's interim position had been extended until March 2024. SCC was out for recruitment to new Assistant Director of Highways and should be appointed by September.</p> <p>Once the new Assistant Director of Highways is in post, DM will lead on progressing the actions set out in the Council's response to the Lowcock inquiry until the end of her contract.</p>	
8.4	<p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Party Tree – Independent Consultant Contract</u></p> <p>DM updated that the procurement process to appoint an independent arboriculture consultant to advise on 3<sup>rd</sup> party trees would start soon. She asked for partners to volunteer to be on the procurement panel to assess the quality of the bids. 2 volunteers were requested, in case one was unable to participate on the basis of having a conflict of interest. NE &amp; CK volunteered.</p>	<b>DM/NE/ CK</b>