

NEIGHBOURHOODS, STREET SCENE & REGULATIONS CORE INVESTMENT PERIOD (CIP)

NOTES OF MEETING

Held on Tuesday 29th April at 10.00 a.m. (via Teams)

Present:

Councillors:

Barbara Masters (BM)
Joe Otton (JO) (Part Attendance)
Maleiki Haybe (MH)
Maroof Raouf (MR) (Part Attendance – upto Q&A session)
Alexi Dimond (AD)
Peter Gilbert (PG)
Brian Holmshaw (BH)
Marianne Elliot (ME Cllr) (Part Attendance – part way through Q&A session)

Mott MacDonald Representatives

Charlotte Osborne (CB)

SSTP

Nathan Edwards (NE)
Christine King (CK)

SCC Officers

Richard Eyre (RE),
Mohamed Edroos (ME offic),
David Wain (DW),
Richard Bulloss (RB)
Rebecca Boyd (RB)

Amey Representatives

Jeremy Hurst (JH)
Stuart Potts (SP)

Community Groups Representation
Paul Selby (PS)

Apologies: Amanda Preston

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
1.0	<p><u>Welcome and introductions</u></p> <p>RE welcomed all to the meeting and provided an overview of the CIP working group. RE also made note to the Terms of Reference.</p> <p>RE stated that the council understood the importance of delivering these streets but equally important was ensuring the right solution should be achieved. This would require working together and collaborating as key stakeholders.</p> <p>RE apologised to the group as he had to depart the meeting early due to a clash with another session. RE advised that ME will lead the delivery of the scheme on behalf of the council and that he would continue to monitor it progress.</p>	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p>ME provided a presentation outlining the Introduction to the working group sessions and a brief outline of the plans and procedures for delivering the remaining CIP streets.</p> <p>ME to share a copy of the presentation with all attendees.</p> <p>AD asked for clarification that if there was a need for a TRO, whether this would go to Transport Committee. ME confirmed that is would and noted that the exploration of the options would need to highlight what governance processes would need to be followed for the successful delivery of that option.</p>	ME
2.0	<p><u>Proposed arrangement for working groups including nomination of the chair</u></p> <p>ME noted during the introductory presentation that the working groups for each street shall be explored by ward, and that councillors from their respective wards will be invited to the relevant sessions along with core attendees including the chair, SCC officers, Mott MacDonald representatives, Amey representatives etc. ME noted that independent specialists (arboriculture, civils) would be brought in as and when required.</p> <p>ME noted that the sessions would commence with Dunkeld Road and Banner Cross as residents on these two streets had already been consulted.</p> <p>ME noted that an independent chair would need to be nominated.</p> <p>ME nominated NE.</p> <p>PG nominated PS, PS welcomed the nomination but noted concerns about availability particularly during June/July.</p> <p>The group agreed to nominate NE with no objections.</p> <p>BH suggested a deputy be appointed, all agreed to this.</p> <p>Peter Gilbert (PG) Suggested PS could be deputy, PS (subject to availability)</p> <p>The group accepted with no objections.</p>	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p><u>Appointment of Chair of the Group</u></p> <p>The group nominated Nathan Edwards and he accepted.</p> <p><u>Appointment of Vice-Chair of the group</u></p> <p>The Group nominated Paul Selby for vice chair and he accepted.</p>	
3.0	<p><u>Declaration of Conflict of Interest and A review of the Terms of Reference for the Working Group</u></p> <p>ME requested that any conflict of interest be brought to the attention of NE via chair@sheffieldstreettreepartnership.org</p> <p>A Conflict of interest for the purposes of this working group would be if any party attending the working group sessions either lives on a street or has immediate family living on a street subject to the proposed works.</p>	ALL
4.0	<p><u>A high level explanation of layouts considered to date</u></p> <p>CO presented a broad overview of the process followed to date and an outline of considerations made for several streets including the constraints assessed, and high-level options considered.</p> <p>ME noted that these were high level options and that as the working group begins to explore options around each street bespoke solutions would be considered.</p> <p>ME to share presentation provided by Motts.</p>	ME
5.0	<u>Q&A session</u>	
	<p>AD – Carbon footprint, will we be considering the overall carbon footprint and impact upon nature and biodiversity as we consider the options. Also queries whether there would be additional options for increasing planting, cycle parking etc.</p> <p>ME – Confirmed that all the options will be considered alongside the impact of the works. SCC will bring in extra resources from other teams where necessary.</p> <p>DW – confirmed that the CAVAT and Safe Useful Life Expectancy data as well as general condition / inspection data for each tree for each</p>	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p>street within scope will be brought to each working group so that the working group have the required data to aid discussions.</p> <p>ME reiterated that SCC's aspiration was not to remove trees, and to retain them wherever possible, and that SCC have already applied additional compensatory planting as a principle on Dunkeld Road, achieving an uplift in the number of trees within the community.</p> <p>NE – Noted that it will be important to set limits on the number of sessions held on any given street or ward and that if the working group could not reach a consensus in that time that options would need to be presented to Committee. NE also noted that if options identify the need for additional work SCC will need to be clear about any implications to delivery, cost or the need for other teams etc.</p> <p>CK – Noted that the SSTP had commissioned an iTree report and that this may be available to aid discussions.</p> <p>DW – Confirmed it is an option, if this is ready, but dependant on the timing of its readiness. There will be no delay to the working group if this is not ready.</p> <p>PG – Noted if data was not going to be available if it would be possible to release the relevant parts of it to aid discussions.</p> <p>PG asked about programme and whether Motts would be available for the duration of the task and finish group. ME noted that funding was finite and that a limit would be necessary, this would ideally be 3 sessions per road or group of roads discussed - allowing for exploration of the options and for a full feedback loop. ME also noted that officers can be more certain on the extent of the feedback loop once the working group sessions for Ecclesall Ward were completed.</p>	
6.0	<u>Any Other Business and next steps</u>	
	<p>Poll for availability will be issued shortly – please select multiple options – for the next working group sessions. Ecclesall Ward</p> <p>Please share conflict of interest with NE chair@sheffieldstreettreepartnership.org</p> <p>All attendees are kindly requested to sign off the Terms of Reference and share with SCC and with the chair, NE.</p>	<p>RB/AJP/ME</p> <p>All</p> <p>All</p>