



**Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 8th September 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)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Davina Millership	Sheffield City Council (DM)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Emily Standbrook-Shaw	Sheffield City Council (ESS)
Cllr Joe Otten	Chair, Waste & Streetscene Policy Committee (JO)
Cllr Mark Jones	Deputy Chair, Waste & Streetscene Policy Committee (MJ)
Cllr Alexi Dimond	Group Spokesperson, Waste & Streetscene Policy Committee (AD)
Apologies	
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Catherine Nuttgens	Woodland Trust (CN)
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council (CD)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome and introductions</u>	

		ACTION WHOM
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting and welcomed Councillors from the Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee to the meeting.	
2.0	<u>Introductions from lead members of the Waste & Street Scene Policy Committee</u>	
	<p>Lead Members from the Council’s Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee attended the meeting to discuss how stronger engagement between Councillors and the Partnership could be supported.</p> <p>JO explained that the W&SS Policy Committee had political responsibility for Highway Trees within the Council, and introduced the Lead Members from the Committee. JO expressed his support for, and appreciation of the Partnership and its work, and its role in progressing the street tree agenda post dispute. He was keen to hear from the Partnership as to whether it has the support it needs from Sheffield City Council to do the job it has been asked to do.</p> <p>NE explained the Partnership’s new structure, establishing 4 task and finish groups, or pillars, focussed on the priority areas of Community Planting, Street Tree Wardens, Public Engagement, Data & Evaluation; to accelerate progress in delivering the strategy. There was a role for Councillor support here in using their networks and contacts to get more people involved in these pillars, and ‘opening doors’ for the Partnership to have conversations with people they can’t currently access – for example utility companies.</p> <p>NRi welcomed the offer of support, and asked Councillors to help share Partnership news via networks, eg the advert for the Partnership Manager role that was being advertised. Engaging the Partnership early in Council housing/transport/development schemes would be welcome – enabling the Partnership to positively influence from the outset – rather than last minute consultation.</p> <p>JO noted the importance of making links with the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Committee on this point, and committed to asking Council Officers to ensure this link is made. RE commented that he was in regular contact with colleagues in the Planning Department which provided opportunities for increasing planting and progressing the strategy.</p> <p>CK asked Councillors to be champions for street trees, challenging negative perceptions and myths where they encounter them. NE noted that the Partnership need to equip Councillors with the information they need to champion the natural capital benefits of street trees.</p> <p>PS commented on the positive progress the Partnership has made, and that everyone is working hard within available resources – capacity remained a</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>challenge, for Amey and the Council, and any additional resource would be welcome.</p> <p>AD thanked the Partnership for their work, and was keen to be involved in championing the work of the Partnership and supporting Councillors to understand the nature and climate emergencies. He was keen to see more promotion of the Trees for Streets scheme. AD flagged the Gleadless Valley Regeneration scheme, and offered to link the Partnership into that via NRi.</p> <p>NRi noted that it would be useful for Councillors to help the Partnership tap into Local Area Committees.</p> <p>MJ asked whether the Partnership would welcome a more ‘hands on’ approach from Councillors in the work of the Partnership. Partners were agreed that the Partnership should remain apolitical, but would welcome Councillors supporting and championing the Partnership’s aims.</p> <p>Partners agreed that JO, MJ and AD be invited to observe the rest of the meeting.</p>	
3.0	<u>Notes and actions from last meeting</u>	
3.1	Partners considered the notes and actions of the meeting held on 11 th August 2023.	
3.2	<p>The Partnership agreed the notes with one clarification at 8.1 – the figure quoted was for labour – the cost of the tree would be additional. This would be made clear before the notes were uploaded to the website.</p> <p>Partners updated on actions from the last meeting:</p> <p>Tree Watering Bullet Points (4.1) – CE would chase with Amey Comms Officers and bring back.</p> <p>Strategic Planting Palette (4.7) – NE would pick this up under that away day item, but asked Partners to get in touch if they wanted to be involved in the work.</p> <p>NE informed the Partnership that he would be meeting with NRi to discuss approaches for dealing with Biodiversity through the ‘pillars’. NRi asked CK for views – CK thought it would be useful to have a pillar that goes wider than trees eg – underplanting with hedges, glyphosate, differing policies of housing, parks, highways. RE agreed that there could be a role for the Partnership in bringing these issues together. RE would talk to colleagues about possible options and approaches.</p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>CE</p> <p>All</p> <p>NE/NRi/ RE</p>
4.0	<u>Forward Look</u>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NRi noted that the Local Plan had been approved by Council. The Partnership should consider the changes that had been made, and whether any further representations needed to be made to the Planning Inspectorate. ESS would check consultation timescales.</p> <p>NRi asked when Biodiversity Net Gain would be on the agenda. The Partnership agreed to tie it to the LBAP timescale. NE/ESS to factor in to future agenda planning.</p> <p>NE updated the Partnership that his new working pattern requires the Partnership meetings to move from a Friday to a Monday or Tuesday. ESS to check partner preferences and availability and co-ordinate.</p>	<p>ESS</p> <p>NE/ESS</p> <p>ESS</p>
5.0	<u>Short Updates</u>	
5.1	<p><u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u></p> <p>DW gave an update. A revised version of the LBAP, with detailed comments from SCC had been sent to Amey to action, however the deadline for Amey to respond had now passed. CE apologised for the delay, and committed to chasing the relevant teams within Amey.</p> <p>Partners expressed deep frustration that this process has taken so long and that opportunities for the Partnership to shape the LBAP had been missed.</p> <p>DW reiterated that the draft LBAP would be shared with the Partnership as soon as it was of an appropriate quality.</p> <p>NE urged SCC and Amey to use the expertise of the Partnership to help pull the document together, not just as a consultee at the end of the process.</p> <p>It was agreed that CE would update the document with SCC's changes and return to SCC so it could be shared with Partners. DW and CE would agree the timescales for this and inform the Partnership.</p>	CE/DW
5.2	<p><u>CIP Designs</u></p> <p>DM updated that Amey had put together a design programme that her team had commented on. She had some concerns about the sequencing and timescales, and had asked for prioritisation of roads that are in a particularly poor state, but Amey were reluctant to change the programme. DM expressed concern over whether the designs would be delivered by the deadline of March 2024, but Amey had given assurance that they would.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>DM confirmed that there would be no designs involving fells for the Partnership meeting planned on the 2nd October, so this meeting would be cancelled; and it was not yet clear whether the meeting planned for the 23rd October would be needed – as the designs may not involve fells.</p> <p>CE agreed to chase KK for an update from the Design Team as to when Partnership meetings should be scheduled to consider the designs. ESS to action resulting meeting organisation/cancellation.</p> <p>RE said that he was in regular contact with Amey and would continue to make clear that meeting the March deadline is non-negotiable, and would discuss options for increasing the design resource available.</p> <p>NE formally noted that the Partnership was disappointed and shared concerns that this was not moving forward at pace and in the spirit of partnership and urgency that is needed,</p>	CE/ESS
5.3	<p><u>Tree Consultations</u></p> <p>DW confirmed that the first tranche of outstanding tree consultations was live on the website. The team would continue to add the outstanding consultations in batches, and additional capacity had been brought in to manage this, and the Trees for Streets scheme.</p> <p>CK raised issues re the change of questions relating to the consultee's location, and clarity on closing date of the consultation. CK and DW to pick up outside of the meeting.</p> <p>ESS and CD to schedule meetings to consider the consultation results, giving partners adequate notice.</p> <p>PS noted that the delay in the process would impact on healthy canopy cover, and our ambitions for well maintained trees.</p>	CK/DW ESS/CD
5.4	<p><u>Third Party Trees</u></p> <p>NE informed the Partnership that a sub-group had been held after the August meeting to discuss third party trees:</p> <p><u>Totley Brook Road</u></p> <p>Partners agreed to go ahead with the fell, as the landowner wouldn't accept the repair. Partners welcomed Amey's agreement to replace this tree on a 3 for 1 basis, given the high quality of the tree in question. NE acknowledged that this would not set a precedent for future replacements.</p> <p><u>Wisewood Road</u></p> <p>Partners had asked whether the property owner would be willing to accept underpinning of the property to avoid the fell. DW updated that it would be a</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>decision for the insurer, and this was being chased, although it was thought unlikely that the insurer would agree to underpinning. DW would inform Partners via the subsidence tab on the Google Drive comms spreadsheet once a response had been received.</p> <p>DM gave an update on the procurement process to appoint an independent arboriculture consultant. The procurement process would close in early October, with the Panel likely to meet in mid-October.</p>	DW
5.5	<p><u>Assistant Director of Highways</u></p> <p>RE informed the Partnership that the post had been recruited to, but was not yet in a position to give details. DM would remain in post until March to allow for handover.</p>	
5.6	<p><u>Delivering the Partnerships Priorities - 4 Pillars Approach</u></p> <p>NE informed the Partnership that he would be making contact with each of the pillar leads and deputies to discuss getting the pillars up and running. NE to action.</p>	NE
5.7	<p><u>Arbourthorne School Event</u></p> <p>NRe provided an update on the event that the SSTP had attended on the 5th September. The event had been a good learning experience, and had highlighted the need for the Partnership to consider where to put its resources in terms of engagement. The event had resulted in productive conversations with NRe, ESS and Emma Pickering, Amey's Education Officer, around the possibility of developing a school assembly programme.</p> <p>ESS would produce a note on the learning from the event to be picked up through the Engagement Pillar.</p>	ESS
5.8	<p><u>Partnership Manager Role</u></p> <p>NRi informed the Partnership that the advert for the Partnership Manager role was now live on the Wildlife Trust's website, and dates were in the diary for shortlisting and interviewing. Any questions should be directed to NRi.</p>	
6.0	<p><u>Canopy Cover</u></p> <p>CE updated the Partnership on discussions held with CK and Tree Inspectors to develop a method for measuring canopy cover. It was proposed to measure canopy cover as a percentage of an area, rather than as a percentage of the road network as this would be simpler, and we already hold the data through existing tree maps.</p> <p>CE noted that whilst there were limitations to all methods, the proposed approach would be accurate, easy to understand, calculate and replicate.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>CK informed the Partnership that further work needed to be done to include community planted trees, and how to address dead and dying trees in the data.</p> <p>CK agreed to share the methodology via the Google Drive once finalised, so that the process can be replicated. NRi observed that there might be wider industry interest in the approach.</p> <p>CE confirmed that the calculation would take place around September every year, as trees planted in year have been plotted, the annual ash die back survey is complete, and next year's planting not yet begun.</p> <p>NE asked whether trees on housing land could be included in the calculation. CK confirmed that she is in discussion with the Housing Tree Officer on this. NE and RE would pick up the issue of trees on housing land in a separate conversation.</p> <p>NRi suggested that data was needed on trees planted in community areas and on new developments, and that a conversation around the NPPF and BNG would be useful on a future agenda.</p> <p>NE summarised that there was support for the proposal, and thanked all involved for their work on it.</p>	<p>CK</p> <p>NE/RE</p>
7.0	<u>Annual Progress Report/October Away Day</u>	
	<p>NRe talked through the Annual Progress Report to identify any areas that would benefit from discussion time at the October awayday. The first draft of the Annual Progress Report would be shared with Partners in due course for comment – ESS to action.</p> <p>NE informed the Partnership that University of Sheffield colleagues would be able to attend the awayday for a discussion on the Strategic Planting Palette. Tree inspectors would also be invited.</p> <p>NRi suggested that an awayday session should look at prioritising the actions in the strategy to inform the Partnership's forward plan.</p> <p>NE suggested a session on engagement, looking at how the Partnership can best influence and engage. External expertise could be brought in for the discussion.</p> <p>NE and ESS would pick up the agenda planning for the awayday.</p>	<p>ESS</p> <p>NE/ESS</p>
8.0	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
8.1	<u>Aviva Fundraising for Community Planting</u>	

		ACTION WHOM
	NE congratulated PS for the amount raised through the Aviva Crowdfund. PS said that a minimum of 23 trees would be planted as a result, and thanked CE and team for their work in assessing locations for planting.	
8.2	<p><u>Thanks and Goodbye to Nikki Rees, Partnership Manager</u></p> <p>On behalf of the Partnership, NE thanked NRe for all of her hard work and contributions to the Partnership's work, and wished her all the best in her new role. The Partnership had agreed with Amey that a tree would be planted in a location of NRe's choosing – NRe and CE to pick up.</p>	NRe/CE