



**Action notes of meeting held on  
Monday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024**

<b>Attendees</b>	
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)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
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)
Lisa Welton	Sheffield City Council (LW)
Lizzie Pace	Trees for Streets (LP) Item 2 only
Dermot Reader	Sheffield City Council – Item 3 only
Adam Winson	AWA Tree Consultants – Item 3 only
Lucy Garbutt	AWA Tree Consultants – Item 3 only
<b>Apologies</b>	
Camilla Rootes	Partnership Manager, SSTP (CR)
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council (CD)
Nicola Dempsey	University of Sheffield (ND)
Camilla Allen	University of Sheffield (CA)

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Welcome and apologies</u></b>	
	NE welcomed and thanked all for attending the meeting.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Community Watering Champions</u></b>	
	<p>Lizzie Pace, from Trees for Streets, gave a presentation on a new pilot scheme being offered by Trees for Streets. The Community Watering Champions app enables people to sign up and pledge to water specific trees and receive watering reminders. Additional, optional features included a feedback mechanism for reporting any issues with trees. Trees for Streets were seeking 10 Councils to take part in a pilot scheme to help shape the scheme further.</p> <p>Partners raised issues around value for money per tree. All newly planted trees that are accrued are watered by Amey, and many community planted trees have volunteer 'stewards' allocated to them, however additional watering would be beneficial – there was no risk of overwatering. Partners did not feel that the optional feedback feature would be required in Sheffield, as it would duplicate existing mechanisms. SCC would need to consider whether the fee for the scheme would deliver savings.</p> <p>LP agreed to take any further questions via email.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>Stocksbridge High Street Redevelopment</u></b>	
	<p>Dermot Reader from SCC, Adam Winson, and Lucy Garbutt from AWA Tree Consultants attended to present proposals for the redevelopment of Stocksbridge High Street and discuss the potential impact on trees and mitigations.</p> <p>Partners welcomed the opportunity to discuss the proposals and raised several points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partners felt that the mitigation strategy could be more ambitious in future proofing the development - especially around climate change. As temperatures rise, public spaces will increasingly need shade - tree canopy will be fundamental to providing this. Partners reported that 30% canopy cover would provide multiple benefits including increased dwell time, active travel and cooling. The Market Square development in particular could benefit from a more ambitious approach to planting, including more larger canopy trees.</li> <li>Issues around parking. Partners suggested using hard data, rather than perception, in considering parking demand; and taking a holistic view of parking provision across the scheme – eg is on-street parking required when off-street supply is increasing?</li> </ul>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partners highlighted the need to frame consultation with the public carefully – especially around tree loss for parking retention. Trees are an important consideration, and sufficient evidence should be provided to the public to help them understand the role of trees in creating usable public spaces that are resilient to climate change.</li> <li>Partners flagged that in removing trees from the highway, the pollution absorbing benefits that street trees bring would be lost. This should be a consideration in mitigation planting – location and species.</li> <li>Partners suggested that new street tree planting should be within the highway network and accrued from day one to ensure trees are well maintained, and reduce the risk of failure. Partners also highlighted the importance of pit quality in planting trees in hard spaces. Sufficient budget should be allocated to ensure this is done well.</li> </ul> <p>NE thanked the team for attending, and welcomed further conversations on the scheme as it progresses.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b><u>Notes and actions from last meeting</u></b>	
4.1	<p>Partners considered the notes and actions of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2024.</p> <p>Subject to amending attendance of the consultation meeting and the dates for the Planting Palette Workshops, the Partnership agreed the notes of the meeting. ESS to upload onto website.</p>	<b>ESS</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b><u>Short Updates</u></b>	
5.1	<p><u>CIP</u></p> <p>NE informed Partners that the agenda for the awayday had been changed to accommodate a workshop on the CIP streets.</p>	
5.2	<p><u>Community Planting Costs</u></p> <p>CE reported that there would be a significant increase in community planting costs – these would be shared as soon as confirmed.</p> <p>CE recognised that these costs were not in line with other local authorities, and Amey were keen to keep the price as low as possible, but were not able to provide the service at a loss.</p> <p>CE said that if a third party were to be involved in community planting, Amey would not be want to enter into any sub-contracting arrangements.</p> <p>NE proposed that this was discussed further through the Community Planting working group.</p>	<p><b>CE</b></p> <p><b>PS</b></p>
5.3	<u>Ecclesall Road Additional Planting – ERF Funded</u>	

		<b>ACTION WHOM</b>
	<p>CE reported issues that had arisen around proposed planting at Banner Cross. The location had been identified through a competition run for street wardens by Amey, and there was an intention to plant the 8 replacement trees from Dunkeld Road in the same area, plus ERF funded trees. Political concerns had been raised around consultation with local businesses. CE confirmed that residents and businesses were being canvassed, which would give a clearer steer on next steps.</p> <p>NE asked for this issue to be kept on the agenda to keep Partnership up to date and enable SSTP to provide support where required.</p>	
5.4	<p><u>Charnock Planning Application</u></p> <p>Partners agreed the points that had been circulated by DW, and added that the trees on the highway should be treated separately from the trees on the site and should be mitigated separately; as well as stressing that BNG would need to be achieved on site <i>and</i> on the highway.</p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b><u>Close of Meeting</u></b>	
6.1	NE thanked all for attending and closed the meeting.	