




**Action notes of meeting held on
Tuesday 17th September 2024**

Attendees	
Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Nik Baker	SSTP Partnership Manager (NB)
Richard Eyre	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Rebecca Boyd	Sheffield City Council (RB)
Amanda Preston	Sheffield City Council (AJP)
Mohamed Edroos	Sheffield City Council (ME)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield City Council (NR)
Karl King	Amey (KK)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CE)
Nicola Dempsey	University of Sheffield (ND)
Camilla Allen	University of Sheffield (CA)
Douglas Fraser	Sheffield Hallam University (DF)
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)

Paul Selby	Sheffield Tree Action Groups and Street Tree Wardens (PS) (Part of the meeting due to commitments)
Additional Attendees	
Grace Smith	Student at Sheffield University (item 3 only)
Apologies	
Claire Duffield	Sheffield City Council
Sarah Shorley	Street Tree Wardens
Dean Fearon	Sheffield City Council
Colleen Eccles	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust
Rich Ward	Sheffield Tree Action Group

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome and apologies</u>	
	NE welcomed and thanked all for attending the meeting; reminded partners to send apologies if unable to attend in future. NE also welcomed new member Douglas Fraser (DF) to the Partnership Group. DF introduced himself and gave a brief outline of his role on the Partnership. Everyone introduced themselves to him.	
2.0	<u>Presentation from SCC Housing on management of trees on housing land.</u>	
	Item deferred to a future meeting.	NB
3.0	<u>SURE project results</u>	
	<p>Grace Smith (GS), a second year Landscape Architecture student studying at the University of Sheffield, attended the meeting. Grace shared and ran through the results from the SURE project. – SURE stands for Sheffield Undergraduate Research Experience.</p> <p>The report can be found here:</p> <p> SURE report.pdf</p> <p>The hypothesis that Grace established was that people's perceptions of street trees would improve and that they would wish to see more trees planted if they were presented with the benefits of street trees.</p> <p>NE thanked Grace for her detailed presentation and opened it up to Partners for any questions.</p> <p>DF – The presentation focuses on the positive issues. Were there any negative issues brought up and how did you deal with them? GS – yes I was open and honest with them.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NR – the report highlights that there is still a public perception of issues with the management of trees which isn't the root cause of the issues we actually face – there is a need for wider consultation.</p> <p>RE – Use of visuals is a really good way to show the public what the impact would be.</p> <p>CK – We are good at giving information out to public but not telling them why the information is important. Public perception about street trees stems from previous messaging.</p> <p>CE – Many of the issues people identify in Sheffield are the same outside of Sheffield. Trees vs cars will always be contentious.</p> <p>CA – asked Grace what is next? What role do you see landscape architects undertaking? GS – to be more open minded and to advocate for the benefits.</p> <p>ND – Thanked Grace and asked the Partnership Group to look at the report, posters and that if they had any further comments to please direct these to NE+NB.</p> <p>All agreed that the report and a short explanation of its findings should be added to the Partnership website</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>NE / NR / ND</p>
4.0	<u>Sign off of previous notes and update on actions from 30th July, as appropriate</u>	
4.1	Tree Tagging – DW confirmed that he had circulated the list.	
4.2	Forest for the Nation – Training costings needed. NB reported that she had added a document in the folder. NB to circulate the link to the folder for all to look at.	NB
4.3	TCF Darnall/Attercliffe proposal presentation – NE queried whether a formal response had been sent on behalf of the Partnership Group. NB to look into this and circulate a response if this had not already been sent.	NB/NE
4.4	DW also informed the Partnership Group that both himself and RB are meeting the manager this week to discuss the Tree selection. DW agreed to update all afterwards.	DW

		ACTION WHOM
4.5	CITU Scheme – Discussed the possibility of visiting the site and / or hearing about the scheme. DW confirmed that he would follow up and action this on Friday 20 th September.	DW
4.6	SST Partnership Vice-Chair – NE reiterated that he felt a vice chair was needed and that he would give this further thought.	NE
4.7	Third Party trees – DW confirmed that orders for 3 locations had been sent to Barnsley Associates (Under writers of Arborist). DW agreed to circulate reports when they are back.	DW
4.8	LBAP – NR asked KK for timescales due to the meeting being put back. KK to follow up with Amey Ecologist and confirm	KK
4.9	Street Tree Palette – NE updated all that the data had been processed and will come back to this partnership group with the information and proposed next steps at a convenient point.	ND/CA/ NE
4.10	Tree Watering App – GDPR – CK suggested adding a disclosure to the Trees for Streets website. DW and CE to take this away and action RE, PS left at 2.00 p.m.	DW/CE
4.11	iTree Eco On behalf of the Partnership Group and further to the last meeting, CE shared information including the finance for the data and a number of options. CE asked for a broad agreement today to commit, and then final details can be decided at a later stage. NR suggested adding this to the Forest for Nation Bid? NE agreed and asked NB to add this to the application. After a discussion, Amey committed to 1/3 of the cost of this project and the University of Sheffield agreed to contribute up to £2,000. NE asked SCC colleagues if they would contribute and in the absence of RE, DW agreed to take this away to chat to RE and come back to the Partnership Group.	NB
5.0	Short Updates	

		ACTION WHOM
5.1	<u>University of Sheffield Central Laboratory</u> NE confirmed that on behalf of the Partnership Group, a letter of objection had been sent to SCC planning. NR informed the Partnership Group that the letter had been sent to the developer for consideration. Noted.	
5.2	<u>SCC Governance Committee – Engagement Workshop</u> NE informed the Partnership Group that he had been invited to and attended the first of a number of workshops looking at the way in which SCC undertake engagement. There was a report produced by Innovate and it gave everyone an opportunity to comment on the recommendations. NR asked if the report could be shared. NE confirmed that he would ask.	NE
5.3	<u>Annual Report</u> NB informed the Partnership Group that she was preparing to collect the information for the annual report. A folder had been set up on google drive for all to access. This will be discussed in detail at the planned awayday on 22/10/24.	ALL/NB
5.4	<u>Town Hall Plaque</u> CA informed the Partnership Group that 2 meetings had taken place. The first one was facilitated externally and that she and a gentlemen called Brian George had been elected as co-chairs for the remainder. Details of the plaque wording and imagery are to be discussed and a brief drafted.	CA
6.0	<u>CIP</u>	
6.1	NE set out his opinion that whilst the SSTP should continue to play a key stakeholder role in the development of CIP, that by its nature and complexity discussions about CIP had become a distraction from the delivery of the strategy. NE reminded partners that CIP was not part of the Street Tree Strategy and that the development of CIP remained the responsibility of SCC in consultation with STAG. NE suggested that CIP was discussed and delivered by a task and finish group. A group could expand its membership as necessary to address local issues or wider expertise and that a dedicated group could focus on CIP rather than try and discuss matters among other Partnership business. NE said that “The Council are moving in the right direction, but we need to move more	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>rapidly on this issue and separate these matters from our wider agenda. Regular updates can be brought to the Partnership Group meetings so that those members not directly involved in the task and finish group can keep informed. A task and finish group could be independently chaired and set out its own terms of reference as necessary.”</p> <p>CK – agreed as it is not directly relevant to some partners so it's more efficient as a separate group.</p> <p>DW – need to be clear on terms of reference and what level of scope the group will have.</p> <p>ME – raised some concerns that the T&G group will be considering draft designs and that it would be important to ensure confidentiality until such time as plans were agreed or could be shared more widely.</p> <p>NE – Agreed with comments and offered to chair the meetings – if considered appropriate.</p> <p>Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Partnership Group agreed to set up a Task & Finish Group for CIP; ● Terms of Reference to be drawn up ● Attendance list be drawn up and agreed <p>MH updated all regarding CIP progress as follows: From the list of streets identified as low complexity designs had now all been agreed and Amey are preparing a programme which is due to see roads commenced in October; Medium and high complexity streets – ME has commissioned a separate team to address and look at the options.</p> <p>The Council and Senior Leadership have been notified that they will NOT meet the original deadline set out in the Lowcock report but are now targeting April 2025.</p> <p>ME's update was noted. NE raised the importance of considering some remedial / temporary mitigation works in the medium / high complexity streets if these were not due to be completed this year.</p>	NE/RE

		ACTION WHOM
8.0	<p><u>Miro Board</u> NE shared and ran through the suggested Miro board for items for discussion at the Partnership Group meetings.</p> <p>All to add items for discussion. NE will periodically review the board and develop agenda time according to priority.</p>	ALL
9.0	<p><u>Any Other Business</u> Nothing reported at the meeting.</p>	
10.0	<p>Date of next meeting Tuesday 22nd October 2024 – Workshop (full day) 9.00 – 5.00 p.m. - Details to be shared with partners separately.</p>	