



**Action notes of meeting held on
Tuesday 30th January 2024**

Attendees

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Camilla Rootes	Partnership Manager, SSTP (CR)
Sarah Shorley	Street Tree Warden (SS)
Paul Selby	Community Planting (PS)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Caroline Campbell	The Woodland Trust (CC)
Catherine Nuttgens	Woodland Trust (CN)
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)
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council (CD)
Rich Ward	Sheffield Tree Action Groups (RW)
Mikhail Ishaq	Sheffield City Council (MI) Item 3 only
Michael Brearley	Sheffield City Council (MB) Item 3 only
Emily Hull	Sheffield City Council (EH) Item 3 only
Sammy Khatib	Sheffield City Council (SK) Item 3 only
Stuart Potts	Amey (SP) Item 5 only
Pete Hancock	Amey (PH) Item 5 only

Apologies

Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
----------------	---

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome and apologies</u>	
	NE welcomed and thanked all for attending the meeting. Apologies were received from CK, Rich Ward would be attending the meeting to represent STAG.	
2.0	<u>Notes and actions from last meeting</u>	
2.1	Partners considered the notes and actions of the meeting held on 5th December 2023. The Partnership agreed the notes of the meeting. ESS to upload onto website.	ESS
2.2	Partners updated on actions from the last meeting: SSTP Relationship with Housing – RE reported that discussions are ongoing. Urban Tree Challenge Fund – PS informed the Partnership that the first 20 trees from the UTCF had now been planted, so publicity would begin. LBAP – KK reported that work on the LBAP was being supported by the Amey non-core team, and was on track for the scheduled meeting of the working group. University Central Teaching Laboratory Proposals – NE reported that the planning application had not yet been submitted so not yet clear whether Partnership’s comments had influenced the plans. Strategic Planting Palette – NE reported that the project was currently at Ethics Committee. The team had successfully applied for a £3.5k grant from the University’s engagement funding stream. Leaning Tree/Risk – NE had had a conversation with Kate Josephs re using away day time for a conversation around approach to, and interpretation of, risk. DW and DM highlighted that SCC and Amey have legislative duties, and that contractually, Amey carries the risk.	
3.0	<u>Shalesmoor Roundabout</u>	
3.1	Mikhail Ishaq (MI), Michael Brearley (MB) and Emily Hull (EH), from SCC’s Capital Delivery Service, and Sammy Khatib (SK), Amey attended the meeting to share proposals for the Shalesmoor Gateway Scheme. MI introduced the scheme – a highways improvement project aiming to improve junction capacity on all arms by around 20%, reduce congestion	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>and queuing at Shalesmoor Roundabout, improve journey times and improve links to the cycle network.</p> <p>The scheme was not yet finalised, and funding had not been secured but was likely to impact on at least 40 highway trees – due to horizontal alignment and safety. The Team were keen to share the proposals and seek early comments from the Partnership prior to public consultation, and would return for further discussion on replacement proposals when detailed designs were complete.</p> <p>The team were hoping for a decision on funding in March, and were looking to go to public consultation in May.</p> <p>Partners welcomed the opportunity for early discussion on the scheme. Key points made by Partners included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSTP can help in species selection – canopy cover, biodiversity and resilience were all important factors to consider – keep talking to SSTP about this. • Consider mitigative and replacement planting on a ratio of more than 1:1, consider planting in advance and drawing up a ‘Tree Strategy’ for the scheme. • Consider where individual trees could be retained • Where impacted trees are not part of the highway network, work with the relevant landowners/partners on retaining/replacements. • Involve Kelham Island and Neepsend Community Alliance in the proposals. <p>NE thanked MI, MB, EH and SK for attending, and welcomed further conversations on the scheme in the future.</p>	
4.0	<u>Forward Look</u>	
4.1	<p><u>Draft Forward Plan</u></p> <p>CR shared the draft forward plan. It was intended to be a live document – working group leads would be able to update- and a tool to help monitor delivery and see where things are slipping as well as enabling prioritisation of key issues. The forward plan would flow through into agenda planning.</p> <p>Partners were asked to comment via the internal comms spreadsheet, and this would come back to the February meeting for a more detailed discussion.</p> <p>NRi suggested that for transparency, the forward plan should be shared on the SSTP on the website.</p>	All

		ACTION WHOM
4.2	<p><u>Comms Strategy</u></p> <p>CR was in the process of redrafting the Comms Strategy and would circulate for comment. Comms colleagues would be included in that.</p> <p>CR also reported that alternatives to the internal comms spreadsheet were being explored. Google Forms could provide an easier way for Partners to share information.</p>	<p>CR</p> <p>CR</p>
5.0	<u>Short Updates</u>	
5.1	<p><u>Fibre Broadband</u></p> <p>NE and DW fed back on meetings that had been held with the fibre broadband companies planning works that may impact on street trees. The discussions had been constructive, with all companies willing to share proposals and forward plans in advance, as well as information on how they plan to prevent damage to trees. These would be shared with Partners.</p> <p>NE felt reassured by these discussions, and DW noted that the proactive approach taken by the SSTP, Leader and CEx of SCC in contacting the broadband companies had been instrumental in ensuring their engagement and collaboration with SCC, and this constructive approach.</p> <p>It was agreed to keep Fibre Broadband as a short update on SSTP agenda for monitoring purposes.</p>	
5.2	<p><u>CIP Update</u></p> <p>RE provided an update on CIP designs. Phases 1, 2, 3 and 5 detailed designs had been shared with SSTP for comment. Phase 4 had Road Safety Audits completed and detailed designs were expected early February. Phases 6/7 were ahead of schedule. Drafting of consultation material was underway and would be shared with SSTP as soon as possible. A Comms Officer would shortly be in post which would assist with the consultation process.</p> <p>Partners had raised some issues with the designs shared to date – particularly around the portrayal of parking loss in the consultation materials and the size of some of the build-outs, which some partners felt to be extreme.</p> <p>SP explained that the approach to build outs had been to look at historical information on root zones to determine sizes, and an attempt to keep a uniform dimension and shape across the network. All designs had an RSA and were within acceptable carriage way widths. There was discussion over the relative merits of uniformity vs individual tree requirements.</p> <p>DM and DW confirmed that impact on parking would be included in the narrative for the consultation, but would not be a specific question. As part of</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>the consultation, drop in sessions would be held to give members of the public an opportunity to understand designs and answer any queries.</p> <p>It was agreed that a separate meeting with partners and the design team should be set up, to enable a more detailed conversation about these issues.</p>	
5.3	<p><u>Third Party Trees</u></p> <p>DW advised that the new independent contractor had completed their first reports. There were technical queries outstanding and the reports would be shared as soon as these were resolved.</p> <p>It was agreed to invite the new contractor to a future Partnership meeting.</p>	
6.0	<u>Communications for consultations</u>	
6.1	<p>CK raised the question (via email) of whether a process was in place for consulting on third party trees, highlighting guidance from section 20 of the Environment Act that street trees that are causing damage to private property or the highway, but not posing an immediate danger, even where a risk of legal compensation and liability are likely, are not exempt from consultation requirements.</p> <p>DW flagged that currently, consultation on these trees does take place with the Partnership, but that a sensitive public consultation process needed to be developed.</p>	DW
6.2	<p>Comms re change to consultation process on condition based fells</p> <p>CE had shared a revised version of the draft comms around changing the consultation process for condition based fells in advance of the meeting. This had been amended to reflect comments made by partners via the internal comms spreadsheet. Partners agreed the content of the comms, and that the new process should start once the current cycle of consultations had completed – from March 1st 2024.</p> <p>CR/ESS would work with comms colleagues to publicise the change.</p>	CR/ESS
6.3	<p>Consultation format and wording going forward</p> <p>NE highlighted the importance of ensuring SSTP has sufficient time to input into consultation for CIP designs. PS noted that tight timescales made it difficult for partners to help with consultation, and ultimately make the process easier.</p> <p>RE was happy to accommodate the needs of the Partnership, but noted that longer timescales could result in delays to public consultation, particularly as</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>consultation could not take place in the run up to the local elections in May, due to PERP (pre-election rules on publicity).</p> <p>The Partnership discussed whether it would be possible to change the sequence of consultation, starting with the less controversial streets first. KK took away an action to check whether it would be possible for Amey to change the planned build programme to reflect any changes to the consultation scheduling.</p> <p>SCC confirmed that the draft wording of the consultations would be shared with Partners as soon as possible,</p>	<p>KK</p> <p>DW/CD</p>
7.0	<u>Town Hall Plaque</u>	
	<p>NE explained the background to the proposal that had been shared with Partners prior to the meeting. SCC had asked SSTP for support in the process to develop a plaque to commemorate the Street Tree campaign. NE and RE had discussed the possibility of SSTP facilitating a wider discussion about what the brief for the plaque should be, and how it should be commissioned. NE asked Partners whether they could be involved on this basis.</p> <p>NE reported that he had received several communications from stakeholders who felt that SSTP should not lead this process on the basis that it is not within the Partnership's remit and that campaigners should be involved.</p> <p>Partners discussed the proposal and came to the conclusion that it would not be appropriate for SSTP to lead this process. Partners felt that it was outside the Partnership's core business and would divert capacity away from delivering the strategy. Partners agreed that the process for developing the plaque should be open, transparent and apolitical, and involve a wide range of voices. Partners suggested that SCC set up a separate task and finish group to carry out the work, and that SSTP members could be a part of this, independent to their role on the Partnership. NE indicated that he would be willing to be involved on this basis.</p> <p>NE and RE agreed to follow this up outside the meeting.</p>	NE/RE
8.0	<u>Working Group Updates</u>	
8.1	<p>PS provided an update on the Community Planting Working Group.</p> <p>A high level document setting out the next steps for the working group would be circulated for comment via the internal comms spreadsheet. The proposed scope of the group would be on finance – bringing the cost of community tree planting down; operational issues; maximising locations; publicity; strategic planting and collaboration with other working groups.</p>	PS

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>The first 2-3 months would focus on set-up, next 6 months on operational issues, with the aim of being more pro-active by the end of 24/25.</p> <p>PS informed the Partnership of the Local Authority Treescapes Fund which was open for applications until the end of June. PS proposed developing a scheme and submitting an application as soon as possible.</p> <p>DW explained that the nature of the funding would require SCC to carry forward debt into future years. SCC took away an action to consider whether it could support the financial risk that an application to the fund would incur.</p>	DW/RE
9.0	<u>Any Other Business & Close of Meeting</u>	
9.1	<p>CN reported that she was leaving the Woodland Trust. There was a question mark over whether there was sufficient capacity within the Woodland Trust to continue on the Partnership in the current format. NE agreed to pick up the conversation with the Woodland Trust around a proportionate way to involve a national organisation in a local Partnership going forward.</p> <p>NE highlighted the importance of independent voices, such as the Woodland Trust, on the Partnership and asked the Partnership to consider where else this could come from. Partners agreed that the two Universities, given their expertise and independence, should be approached to gauge interest in involvement with SSTP.</p>	NE NE/CR
9.2	NE thanked all for their participation and closed the meeting.	