

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

NOTES OF MEETING

Held on Tuesday 27th May 2025 in Town Hall.

Present:

Councillors: Barbara Masters (CllrBM) Peter Gilbert (CllrPG)	SSTP members Nathan Edwards (NE) – Chair Christine King (CK) Independent member Paul Selby (PS) – Deputy Chair
SCC Officers Mohamed Edroos (ME) Richard Bulloss (RB) Andrew Butler (AB) Rebecca Boyd (RB) Amanda Preston (AJP)	Mott Macdonald James Tweddell (JT) Charlotte Osbourne (CO) Amey Representative Peter Hancock (PH)

Apologies: Cllr Shaffaq Mohamed, David Wain (SCC) and Richard Eyre (SCC)

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
1.0	<p><u>Welcome and introductions and protocols</u></p> <p>NE welcomed all to the meeting and discussed the meeting protocols he would like to adopt. NE reminded everyone that even though CIP is a SCC task and finish group, non-SCC members are present, and we need to be clear on jargon etc. Don't talk over each other and raise your hand when you need to speak etc.</p> <p>In future the options designs will be circulated in advance for you all to look over and come back to the meeting with questions for all to answer/discuss.</p> <p>Access to store information for all to see. RB informed the group that she was looking into this and hopefully a SharePoint site will be set up for both SCC and external members for all to access. It needs to be user friendly/accessible to all.</p>	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p>CllrPG suggested sending information out by e-mail? CK replied e-mail is ok, but you will have issues with version control and the size of some documents.</p> <p>After a discussion it was agreed that a SharePoint site would be set up and both CK and RB test this before going live.</p> <p>NE asked what the timescale was? RB – the Business case was submitted to IT, and they discussed this at the triage meeting today. Waiting for decision.</p> <p>Agenda's NE reported that both NE and PS will set the agenda for the meetings and asked if everyone was Ok with today's agenda. Did anyone want anything adding.</p> <p>NE asked which order of roads the meeting would like to discuss in case time runs out - CllrBM asked that Dunkeld be discussed first as this one was more of an issue. All agreed.</p>	RB/CK
2.0	<p><u>Terms of Reference</u></p> <p>The Terms of Reference for the Group had been circulated for the group's approval.</p> <p>All agreed and signed to confirm they agreed with the document. ME to ensure absentees sign the form.</p>	ME
3.0	<p><u>Project Brief</u></p> <p>ME shared and ran through the attached Project Brief outlining the process to follow and ensuring the group that these are draft options, and other options can be considered.</p> <div data-bbox="279 1816 328 1874" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>CIP Working Group 1st Session Ecclesall V</p> <p>Our aim is to retain the trees (where possible) whilst keeping road safety as a high priority.</p>	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p>ME explained a fully designed standard compliant treatment for road subbase should have a design life of 20-25 years for the road and up to 60 years for the kerb installations. However, the council would look at alternative treatments which on balance lead to an appropriate sustainable solution. The council will aim to be as flexible throughout this process.</p> <p>This Working Group will feed into the options report, all options would be considered and if a solution cannot be agreed, then the proposals will go to committee.</p> <p>Questions/thoughts</p> <p>CllrBM asked if the residents' concerns will be taken into consideration. The main one is the maintenance of the trees; some do damage properties hence why people ask for smaller trees which are thought to be less problematic.</p> <p>ME said consultation process is planned for each street. The Working Group sessions are the first step in the process. If necessary, this will be followed by committee approval, after this, the council will hold a formal consultation to seek the views of residents and public.</p> <p>PS queried why the buildouts were typically 1.2m wide given that tree growth is typically 2cm per year.</p> <p>PH advised that this was to account for tree roots growth – particularly angling away from the base of the tree.</p> <p>ME added that the build outs were also designed to accommodate the tree roots plus additional space for future proofing.</p> <p>JT noted that one way to address this was not to apply a standard buildout of 1.2m for every street but that each street and each tree should be considered on its own merits and needs.</p> <p>PS – 1.2m build out will result in losing car parking spaces on each road. Need to look at each street separately and understand the assumptions.</p> <p>CllrPG asked what criteria would be assessed for each option.</p> <p>ME stated this would include, road user safety, cost. Environmental impact – carbon footprint and its benefits vs removal of a tree.</p>	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p>NE suggested ensuring a robust measurement tool is used for carbon assessments and the need to understand the tipping points – i.e. when an option is considered beneficial rather than neutral.</p> <p>ME agreed although noted that the carbon assessments would be measured against each of the options, therefore a qualitative assessment would be appropriate.</p> <p>PS asked that the lifespan of trees be considered as part of the discussion.</p> <p>NE thanked all for the comments/suggestions.</p>	
4.0	<p><u>Dunkeld Road</u></p> <p>JT and CO shared and ran through the attached slide deck.</p> <div data-bbox="277 1034 328 1093" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Street Trees Workshop 2 Dunkeld.</p> <p>The presentation outlined information summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use • Parking – showing unaffected and affected trees • Traffic Regulation Orders • Site Visit photos • Consultation results • Existing interventions – mainly parking • Street Wide solutions • Location Specific Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option 1 - Localised build outs ○ Option 2 - Localised build outs with half on and half off parking ○ Option 3 - Localised build outs with narrowed areas ○ Option 4 - Removal of tree • Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited benefit • Locations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Build out mostly appropriate ○ Parking pressures ○ Remove trees relieve parking ○ Half on Half off ○ 1 contentious issue – Ecclesall Road end 	

Page 5 of 7

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p>ME acknowledged this and noted that this will need to be decided on at a future meeting as a group discussion should tree removal be decided upon as the way to go.</p> <p>NE – we need to balance the decision against costs. Width of Carriageway around the tree, is there room for mobility scooters? And asked what the guidance is on space? Concern for 1m space when tree roots will still grow.</p> <p>CllrPG asked if situation regarding root growth for this tree was know or could be investigated. RB – this can be further investigated?</p> <p>The group considered that a broad cost for Option 3 was needed before a preferred option could be agreed. PH noted that there are several utility installations beneath the road that will need to be diverted. These will incur significant additional costs.</p> <p>ME suggested, Mott MacDonald develop Option 3 a little further and Amey will provide an outline cost estimate.</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>Motts / Amey</p>
5.0	<p><u>Banner Cross Road</u></p> <p>JT and CO shared and ran through the attached options report and asked for questions/comments.</p> <div data-bbox="277 1321 328 1379" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Street Trees Workshop 2 Banner C</p> <p>The presentation detailed information below with maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use • Parking – showing unaffected and affected trees • Traffic Regulation Orders • Site Visit photos • Consultation results • Existing interventions • Street Wide solutions • Location Specific Solutions • Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Street Wide solutions ○ Location specific solutions • Option 3 – footway 	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	<p>PS asked Mott Macdonald if there were any problematic trees on this road. JT replied no. Mainly about losing parking spaces.</p> <p>Due to time restraints, NE asked that we continue with discussion on this Road at the next meeting.</p>	
6.0	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>ME informed all that due to members availability the meetings will take place as and when they can be arranged for all.</p>	
7.0	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>AJP to send out availability for the next meeting.</p>	AJP