



**Action notes of meeting held on
Tuesday 5th December 2023 (Microsoft Teams)**

Attendees	
Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Camilla Rootes	Partnership Manager, SSTP
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Paul Selby	Community Planting (PS)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Caroline Campbell	The Woodland Trust (CC)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Davina Millership	Sheffield City Council (DM)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Emily Standbrook-Shaw	Sheffield City Council (ESS)
Nicola Dempsey	University of Sheffield (ND)
Apologies	
Sarah Shorley	Street Tree Warden (SS)
Catherine Nuttgens	Woodland Trust (CN)
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council (CD)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome and introductions</u>	
	<p>NE welcomed and thanked all for attending the meeting. NE introduced the new Partnership Manager, Camilla (Milla) Rootes who would be spending time with all Partners over the coming weeks.</p> <p>NE also welcomed Caroline Campbell (CC) to the Partnership, representing the Woodland Trust in place of Catherine Nuttgens, who would be leaving the Trust in mid January.</p>	
2.0	<u>Notes and actions from last meeting</u>	
2.1	<p>Partners considered the notes and actions of the meeting held on 7th November 2023.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed the notes of the meeting. ESS to upload onto website.</p>	ESS
2.2	<p>Partners updated on actions from the last meeting:</p> <p>SSTP Relationship with Housing – NE to pick up with RE.</p> <p>Tree Inspectors - conversation due to take place between Amey and SCC re funding of additional capacity.</p>	NE/RE
3.0	<u>Forward Look</u>	
3.1	<p>ESS informed the Partnership that SCC's Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee had requested an update on the Council's progress in implementing the recommendations in the response to the Lowcock Inquiry at its December meeting. This would include details of the Council's support for SSTP, drawing largely on the content of the Annual Report, and an update on progress on the Core Investment Programme designs. Partners asked for the draft CIP information to be shared via the GoogleDrive for comment in advance of publication, and for the full report to be added to the SSTP website once published.</p>	ESS
3.2	<p>The Woodland Trust's Tree Equity project would be launched on Thursday 7th December at Ecclesall Woods Discovery Centre. CC would circulate the invitation and programme for the day for Partners who would like to attend.</p>	CC
3.3	<p>PS advised that there would be publicity planned for the Urban Tree Challenge Fund – likely in Feb/March time. Consultation with the Partnership on the plans would take place at the appropriate time.</p>	PS
3.4	<p>NE requested that an item on Partnership Comms be scheduled for the January meeting of the Partnership</p>	CR
3.5	<p>NRi suggested arranging a webinar event in the new year to launch the Annual Progress report. CR/ESS to action</p>	CR/ESS

		ACTION WHOM
3.6	CK reported that STAG were involved with efforts to establish a National Tree Coalition.	
4.0	<u>Short Updates</u>	
4.1	<p><u>CIP Designs</u></p> <p>DM updated the Partnership on CIP design progress. Preliminary designs had been received for the first four phases of the programme, and comments had been made. Road Safety Audits stage 2 would then be undertaken, and then detail designs would be submitted to SSTP for formal comment. To date, no designs proposed fells, so would be shared with Partners via the Google Drive.</p>	
4.2	<p><u>Tree Consultations</u></p> <p>CE presented a paper that proposed removing the requirement to consult with the public on condition based fells. Due to the lengthy consultation timeline, 60 trees were currently awaiting consultation and approval that were past their target removal time, with a further 77 that would shortly exceed their target removal time – creating a safety risk. The Environment Act does not require consultation on condition based fells and there was no proposal to change the consultation process for trees being removed for damage, subsidence or on discriminatory grounds. The proposal would still require the public to be informed about condition based fells, and they would be able to influence replant species through direct contact with Amey. Authority approval from SCC would still be required.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed with the proposal in principle, and asked that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with the Partnership on condition based fells should continue. • The list of trees past target removal time should be shared with Partners as soon as possible. • A comms plan and timeline should be drawn up and shared with Partners via the Googledrive for sign off. It should be transparent about why the change is taking place. Comms should come from the Partnership, as the ‘owner’ of the current process (appendix 5 of the Street Tree Strategy). 	CE/DW/ CD
4.3	<p><u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u></p> <p>NE advised that suggestions on the LBAP structure had been added to the Googledrive. KK would consider and revise the structure, and convene the LBAP working group in the new year to focus on content. KK advised that support would be brought in from off-contract to help with this work.</p>	KK

		ACTION WHOM
4.4	<p><u>Tree Cities of the World Application</u></p> <p>Partners agreed that ESS should co-ordinate the 2023 application for Tree Cities of the World, with no further need for consultation with the Partnership.</p>	ESS
4.5	<p><u>University of Sheffield Central Teaching Laboratory Proposal</u></p> <p>NE updated the Partnership on a productive discussion with NE, CK, ESS and the UoS Estates Team on their Central Teaching Lab proposal, which would involve the removal of several healthy mature trees that impact on the highway. The requirements of the new building and the limitations of the site meant that retaining the trees was not an option. Concerns were expressed about the tree loss, and mitigation planting was discussed - UoS was advised to consider species selection; location; existing planting and to review container planting. They were strongly urged to consider street tree planting on the highway in front of the proposed building, given the high footfall and 'gold route' status of the street. ESS would link UoS with SCC and Amey to explore this.</p> <p>NE signalled that the Partnership would comment on the planning application once submitted.</p>	ESS
4.6	<p><u>Third Party Trees</u></p> <p>DW advised that the independent contractor had been appointed, and a small number of reports would be shared over the coming weeks on urgent cases. DW reported that the backlog would be recovered quickly, and 'business as usual' would resume.</p> <p>DW proposed inviting the new contractor to a Partnership meeting in the new year.</p>	DW
5.0	<p><u>Fibre Broadband Installation & Impact on Street Trees</u></p> <p>DW informed the Partnership that SCC had become aware of 260 tree lined streets where four high-speed fibre broadband installation companies were seeking to put up telegraph poles to install their infrastructure which would require cutting sections out of highway trees in order to run their cabling from point to point between these new poles.</p> <p>DW reported that SCC were exploring all available options to prevent this from happening or deter the companies from doing this, but they can legally do this work under permitted development rights and their role as a statutory undertaker. This had been escalated to the highest levels in SCC, and the Leader and Chief Executive had written to the four companies.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>Partners suggested considering Tree Protection Orders, and stressed the importance of inspecting compliance of contractors, and using powers to stop works where necessary.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed to write to the four companies, to remind them of the sensitivities and history of protest around street trees in Sheffield, and urge them to work with the Council and the Partnership to devise a programme of works that minimises disruption and damage to street trees.</p> <p>DW would share the list of affected street with partners, and the contact details for the companies.</p>	<p>NE/CR</p> <p>DW</p>
6.0	<u>Strategic Planting Palette Update</u>	
	<p>NE and ND gave an update on the Strategic Planting Palette, sharing the proposed programme for the project.</p> <p>January to June would be a period of 'Co-Creation' with students developing the evidence base, supplemented by engagement workshops. 3-4 stakeholder workshops were proposed – to include representation from LACs, SCC, environmental organisations, UoS and external experts. Suggestions were being sought on individuals and organisations to invite.</p> <p>The evidence base and engagement would be drawn together during July, and academic papers would be drafted and brought back to the Partnership. A detailed update would be brought to the Partnership April Away Day.</p> <p>Partners were asked to provide feedback on the proposed programme via the Google Drive, and to suggest invitees to the workshops.</p>	<p>ND/NE</p> <p>All</p>
7.0	<u>i-Tree Eco Calculations</u>	
7.1	<p>CK presented a paper on i-tree eco calculations. The Strategy states that i-tree eco will be recalculated annually in spring and reported as a five year moving average.</p> <p>The paper proposed moving to a minimum 5 yearly calculation cycle, as the change over the period of a year would be too small to be meaningful; there were significant resource implications to annual calculations; and Strategy actions and policies were not linked to the i-tree eco data. A 5 yearly reporting cycle would retain the ability track on the value of the network benefits measured by iTree-Eco, and would align with the 5 yearly highway tree survey cycle.</p> <p>Partners discussed the proposal. PS felt there was still value in measuring annually. Other partners were broadly supportive of moving to a 5 year frequency, given the cost and time involved, and synergies with the 5 year network inspection regime.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	The Partnership agreed that before any final decisions were taken, a further piece of work was required from the Data and Evaluation Working Group, looking at what the Strategy asks us to measure/report on and why, and the best approach to collecting the data for this. This would be discussed further at the February Partnership meeting.	CK/CE/CR
8.0	<u>Leaning Trees</u>	
8.1	<p>NE referred to the Partnership’s previous discussions on the leaning tree on Wollaton Road. The Partnership had agreed that the tree needed to come out, but concerns had been expressed about the wording of the consultation, particularly references to government guidance, and the risk of unintentionally setting a precedent.</p> <p>NE suggested that a wider discussion around how SCC and Amey approach risk in cases such as these would be useful and should be scheduled for the January meeting of the Partnership.</p> <p>PS agreed to look at how the consultation might have been worded differently and share with Partners via the google drive for comment.</p>	NE/CR PS
9	<u>Biodiversity Net Gain</u>	
9.1	The Partnership agreed to move this to a future meeting due to time constraints.	
10	<u>Forward Plan</u>	
	<p>Partners considered a draft forward plan document, based on discussions held at the October away day.</p> <p>NE was keen to see 2024 as a ‘doing year’, making progress on delivering objectives in the strategy, as well as identifying issues to feed into a future strategy refresh. Working Groups would start to define their plans, and recruit new members, supported by the new dedicated Partnership Manager resource.</p> <p>The forward plan should set out what the Partnership wants to achieve by the end of 2024. Partners made comments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of linking working group priorities into the plan • Using the tree equity map to inform activity • Data & Evaluation Working Group to consider data requirements of other working groups <p>The draft document would be shared with Partners via the googledrive for comment, and CR would develop it further.</p>	AII/CR

		ACTION WHOM
11.0	<u>Working Group Updates</u>	
	Deferred to future meeting due to time constraints	
12.0	<u>Any Other Business and Close of Meeting</u>	
12.1	Partners agreed that SCC and Amey officers in roles supporting the Partnership should be included on the website. CR to action photos.	CR
12.2	ND reported that the University of Sheffield were seeking external speakers for University events. Partners were asked to forward any suggestions.	All
12.3	NE thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.	