



**Action notes of meeting held on
Tuesday 27th February 2024**

Attendees

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Camilla Rootes	Partnership Manager, SSTP (CR)
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Sarah Shorley	Street Tree Warden (SS)
Paul Selby	Community Planting (PS)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Mohamed Edroos	Sheffield City Council (ME)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Emily Standbrook-Shaw	Sheffield City Council (ESS)
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council (CD)
Lisa Welton	Sheffield City Council (LW)
Jerry Gunton	Sheffield City Council (JG) Item 3 only

Apologies

Caroline Campbell	The Woodland Trust (CC)
Nicola Dempsey	University of Sheffield (ND)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome and apologies</u>	
	NE welcomed and thanked all for attending the meeting and introduced Lisa Welton, the new SCC Streets Ahead Comms Officer.	
2.0	<u>Notes and actions from last meeting</u>	
2.1	Partners considered the notes and actions of the meeting held on 30 th January 2024. The Partnership agreed the notes of the meeting. ESS to upload onto website.	ESS
2.2	Partners picked up matters arising from the last meeting: CE agreed to share the list of overdue fells currently sat within the condition based fells consultation process. <i>Post-meeting note – this was circulated 27/02/24.</i>	CE
3.0	<u>Trees & Woodland Strategy Refresh</u>	
3.1	Jerry Gunton, SCC Tree Manager provided an update on the refresh of the Trees and Woodland Strategy. It was adopted in 2018 and it was considered the appropriate time to refresh and reflect issues such as the climate and nature emergencies, BNG etc. The broad structure would remain the same, but content amended where required. A key change would be incorporating the Sheffield Street Tree Strategy, which had not been developed when the Trees and Woodland Strategy had been adopted. JG was working with key contributors to update the relevant sections. There would then be an opportunity for stakeholder groups to comment – likely in April/May, followed by a period of public consultation in the summer. JG was keen to involve SSTP in the refresh, and was seeking early views. Partners raised issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether Highway Trees should be signposted in the refreshed document, or embedded. JG was keen to embed approach to Highway Trees where possible within the structure of the strategy. • The refreshed strategy should make clear that the focus of the strategy is on trees on council land, but that there are city wide elements related to planning, and commitments to working with private landowners. • Conversations around a city wide tree planting strategy were in early stages with the South Yorkshire Woodland Partnership. It would be important to ensure that objectives align with the Trees & Woodland Strategy and Street Tree Strategy. This work would be driven by 	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>SCC's Community Forestry Team, and JG would stay in touch with SSTP as it develops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE flagged the development of the Strategic Planting Palette, and that JG would be invited to the stakeholder workshops. <p>JG had agreed to take questions relating to the management of trees on housing land.</p> <p>JG confirmed that the estimated number of trees on housing land was 100,000. The species breakdown was available for trees on council land – but not specifically on housing land.</p> <p>CK raised the issue of consultation requirements under the Environment Act – and that there have been occasions where a tree on one side of the road is a highway tree and subject to consultation requirements, whereas a tree on the other side of the road is a housing tree and therefore not subject to those consultation requirements.</p> <p>JG confirmed that Tree Officers were clear on the legislation, but recognised that some cases were confusing for the public. JG informed partners that the Association of Tree Officers were currently reviewing the duty to consult, and he would update the Partnership when this was complete.</p> <p>NE thanked JG for attending the meeting.</p>	<p>JG</p> <p>NE/ND</p> <p>JG</p>
4.0	<u>Approach to CIP moving forwards</u>	
4.1	<p>NE talked about the positive forward facing activity that the Partnership had been undertaking, but that a challenging area for the Partnership was when one Partner had an 'ask' of the Partnership in terms of consultation – for example the CIP designs and consultations. This was a cultural issue for the Partnership, and there was a need for the Partnership to consider 'what good looks like' in this space. NE asked Partners to consider whether this conversation should take place at the March meeting, or May away day</p> <p>RE apologised to Partners that the timescales were not followed for the first phase of CIP consultations, and agreed that a conversation to explore sharing risk, responsibility and trust would be welcome, and should take place face to face. RE acknowledged that the CIP process hadn't given partners what they needed, and that learning from this to inform future phases was important.</p> <p>NE and CR would send out a poll re preferences for timing of discussion, and a mechanism for collecting partners comments in advance of the discussion.</p>	<p>NE/CR</p>

		ACTION WHOM
5.0	<u>Forward Look</u>	
5.1	CR informed Partners that she was developing a Google Form to capture Partner comments to replace the internal comms spreadsheet. This would be brought to the Partnership for consideration in March.	CR
5.2	CR reported that the draft Comms Strategy had been amended based on Partner comments. Further discussions would take place with the new SCC Comms Officer and it would be brought back for sign off in March. Partners stressed the need for the Strategy to reflect the nuance of partners representing their organisations vs the Partnership, and consider how elected members are quoted in SSTP activity.	CR
6.0	<u>Short Updates</u>	
6.1	<u>Consultations</u> CD informed partners that a batch of consultations was due to complete shortly. Partners stressed the need for the consultation wording to better explain the rationale for replacement locations where this is different, and give clarity on the reasons for decisions in the feedback to the public.	CD
6.2	<u>Third Party Trees</u> DW reported that existing cases were awaiting responses from insurers. It was still the intention to bring the new consultant to a future meeting, when agenda time allows. Partners raised the possibility of using the consultant for independent expertise on tree issues as required.	
6.3	<u>Street Tree Wardens</u> SS reported that she was in the process of talking to wardens about developing the programme, and would bring a formal update to the Partnership in March.	SS
6.4	<u>Urban Tree Festival</u> SS informed Partners that this week long event would take place from May 11 th . SS had pulled together a small working group, including Community Forestry and the South Yorkshire Woodland Partnership, to look at developing a programme of small event across the city, in collaboration with community groups. SS was seeking ideas for sessions/event and would add a document to the google drive for partner comments.	SS/All

		ACTION WHOM
6.5	<p><u>Strategic Planting Palette</u></p> <p>NE reported that the Palette Project was now at the University Ethics Committee Stage.</p> <p>Stakeholder workshops were being planned for April/May/June and Partners were asked to suggest people and organisations to invite via the document on the googledrive.</p>	All
6.7	<p><u>LBAP</u></p> <p>KK informed the Partnership that the LBAP document was ready for consideration as soon as a date could be found for the group to meet.</p>	
7.0	<u>Forward Plan</u>	
7.1	<p>CR introduced the new Forward Plan document, that had been updated with intended outputs and next steps.</p> <p>CR asked Partners to go through the plan to identify action owners and complete the detail for each action.</p> <p>CR explained that the document should be kept up to date monthly, and would give clarity on who is doing what, and how actions are progressing. A paper summarising key points, flagging risks, slippage etc would be circulated with the agenda papers each month.</p> <p>NE asked all to engage with the document and put names and details against actions</p>	ALL
8.0	<u>Introducing Biodiversity Net Gain</u>	
8.1	<p>NRi gave a presentation on Biodiversity Net Gain, the requirement introduced by the Environment Act 2021 that any new planning application for development would be required to meet the objective that the <i>“biodiversity value attributable to the development exceeds the pre-development biodiversity value of the on-site habitat by at least [10%]”</i></p> <p>NRi gave an overview of what BNG is, how it can be achieved, how it is measured, and how it is calculated in practice.</p> <p>Partners discussed opportunities for SSTP in this area.</p> <p>NE flagged that BNG should be considered as part of the strategic planting palette work.</p> <p>NE noted that there were currently no urban schemes available for BNG offsetting, and there was an opportunity for the Partnership to explore whether an on street tree planting scheme could be viable. NE would reach out to a tree and BNG expert to discuss further.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
		NE
9.0	<u>Working Group Updates</u>	
	CR updated Partners on the development of the Engagement Working Group. CR would circulate list of potential members of the working group, with a request for Partners to comment and make further suggestions. It was intended for the working group to meet from May.	CR/ALL
10.0	<u>AOB and Close of Meeting</u>	
10.1	<u>Local Authority Treescapes Fund</u> PS updated the Partnership on a meeting that had taken place to develop a bid for the LA Treescapes Fund. Proposal was currently a bid for 500 trees, to be planted in verges in canopy deprived areas. Default locations would be identified, but aim would be to develop a mechanism by which residents could 'bid' for a location. Further work was required on financial implications, and approach to writing the bid. Partner views would be sought via googledrive.	CR
10.2	<u>Town Hall Plaque</u> RE updated that SCC was developing a proposal for a task and finish group to move the process for developing a commemorative plaque forwards. Details would be announced in March.	
10.3	<u>SSTP 'Wild Night In' Webinar</u> Partners noted that the SSTP Webinar held on the 8 th February had been a great success, and thanked all for their involvement and hard work.	
10.4	<u>Fibre Broadband</u> DW updated that the broadband companies were continuing to engage with SCC on their programmes. Representation from the Yorkshire Highways and Utilities Committee was being sought for a discussion with SSTP around how utilities companies work around highway trees.	
10.5	NE thanked all for their participation and closed the meeting.	