



Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 29th April 2022 (via Zoom)

Attendees

Nathan Edwards	Chair of SSTP (NE)
Christine King	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (CK)
Paul Selby	Street Tree Action Groups/Street Tree Warden (PS)
Richard Eyre (part)	Sheffield City Council (RE)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Amanda Preston (part)	Sheffield City Council (AJP) (Notes only)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CK)

Also in attendance

Item 1 only:

Peter Evans	Archives and Heritage Manager, Sheffield City Council (PE)
-------------	--

Apologies

Cassie Stuart	Sheffield City Council (CS)
Bethany Allsop	Sheffield City Council (BA)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome</u>	
	NE welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2.0	<u>Notes of the last meeting – 25th March 2022</u>	
	Partnership members agreed that the notes of the meeting on Friday 25 th March 2022 were a true record. These would be uploaded to the SRWT website.	NRe

		ACTION WHOM
3.0	<u>Update on Tree Archive and call for documentation – Pete Evans, Archives and Heritage Manager, Sheffield City Council</u>	
	<p>Pete Evans attended the meeting and provided an update regarding the Tree Archive. PE explained that all documentation relating to the street trees dispute covering the period 2013 - 2018 was to be published, alongside a detailed catalogue of the documents.</p> <p>PE stated that so far over 10,000 individual documents had been identified, almost all of which are digital files and explained that it's because of the scale that the archive hasn't yet been published.</p> <p>PE explained that for the archive to be fully rounded there is an ask for individuals and groups to donate into the archive; this is on a voluntary basis. Donations could be videos, photographs or documents. The Archive Service would be the custodian of the information but ownership of the information would be maintained by the individual or group providing it. PE explained that the Council has to work within the bounds of GDPR regulations etc.</p> <p>PE asked that if anyone wished to donate to the archive they should make contact with via: archives@sheffield.gov.uk.</p> <p>PE also stated that the archive team would like permission to include in the archive items which are already in the public domain, like minutes from the STAG website.</p> <p>NRi asked if there was a timescale. PE stated that there is no real deadline but the sooner the team receives the information, the sooner it will be published.</p> <p>NRi asked what the best way would be to transfer files. PE stated that web transfer was easiest for non-confidential information.</p> <p>PS asked about documentation which makes allegations of illegality - e.g., these are allegations, but they aren't proven in a court. What protections are there? PE said that he would have to have a look at those and work with the donor to discuss the best way to preserve the documents. PE stated that if the document was to be processed, the Archive Service would always check back the processed version with the donor before publication.</p> <p>DW asked whether the Archive Service would have a curation role after the Independent Inquiry into the Street Trees Dispute. PE responded that no, the Archive Service does not have a curation role, they just present the record that exists without comment. PE said that it would be possible to flag things up in the catalogue after the Inquiry if that was deemed to be appropriate, or to add annotations where it is known that information is incorrect.</p> <p>CK asked how relevant documents, e.g., news articles, that were previously available on the internet but have since disappeared could be included. PE responded that they had all the local press articles however with national</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>papers, if articles were no longer available, there wouldn't be much that could be done.</p> <p>PE said that the Archive Service would provide advice about how to search the catalogue. He also said that if gaps in the information were flagged with him then the Archive Service would try to track items down.</p> <p>NRi asked if there was anything available to have a look at now to see how the catalogue could be searched. In response to this PE shared this link: https://www2.calmview.co.uk/sheffieldarchives/calmview/</p> <p>In terms of asking for donations, it was agreed that all would welcome a formal invitation from PE, which individuals could then action. PE would be in touch with Partnership members about this.</p> <p>NE thanked PE for his presentation.</p>	PE
4.0	<u>Actions and decisions from the last meeting</u>	
	<p>Review and progress of actions not on agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Meeting pattern</u> At the last meeting, the meeting pattern of one meeting every 4 weeks was agreed; the format would be one meeting looking at one or two specific items/areas of the Strategy, with the next one being more general and receiving presentations etc, in an alternating pattern. NE stated that the meeting at the end of June would be looking at specific items/areas of the Strategy. • <u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u> – The Partnership was informed that, with apologies, the plan was still not ready for SSTP to view and comment upon. DW reported that there was no update at present as the plan had still not been received from Amey. A further update would be provided at the next meeting. • <u>5-year Tree Strategy & contract change</u> No update to report to the Group at present. • <u>Update concerning Community Planting Lessons Learnt session</u> AJP reported that she had written out to all attendees asking for their availability, but she was still waiting for some individuals to respond. AJP asked the question of who needed to be prioritised to attend as there wasn't a date when everyone was available. NRE and AJP to get together to sort. • <u>Update on Build out Document</u> NE outlined his process for resolving the disagreement. 	DW/CE AJP/NRe
5.0	<u>Update - Partnership Away Day</u>	
5.1	<p><u>Venue, date and timing</u></p> <p>It was confirmed that the away day would be held on Tuesday 7th June 2022 at Hector's House, Ecclesall Woods, 9.30 - 16.00.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
5.2	<p><u>Consideration of a Partnership Charter</u> NE stated that he felt that a Partnership Charter would be beneficial for the Partnership, so that there is something written down which outlines how partnership members work together. The Charter would provide a way to hold us all to account. NE asked all to think about this for a discussion at the Away day.</p>	All
5.3	<p><u>Proposed Sessions – what would the Partnership like to cover</u> NE suggested that the Away day would give us an opportunity for 2 or 3 sessions to discuss issues to develop and move forward, with the last session of the day focussing on looking forward, thinking about the strategic objectives of the strategy.</p> <p>NE asked for thoughts regarding this.</p> <p>PS stated that he felt that the group should focus on a limited number of things and do them well, rather than try to do too much; we need a discussion on what we're going to prioritise over the next 12 months.</p> <p>NRi said that she didn't want to see a repeat of the Miro board exercise that we ran in December.</p> <p>SS said that she would like to refresh her understanding of the Miro exercise.</p> <p>NRi asked if deprivation data could be brought to the meeting as this is a common theme.</p> <p>CE suggested a discussion about ways of linking in with the Planning Department around highways trees. NE suggested that it may be appropriate to invite someone from Planning to be a member of the Partnership in the future.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) NRe to recirculate the link to the Miro board 2) All to look at the Miro board and have a think about if there are any specific issues that they would like to see prioritised for discussion at the away day and to let NRe and NE know 3) NE & NRe to organise the away day and provide further updates as appropriate 	
6.0	<u>Progress Report update</u>	
	<p>NRe shared the Progress Report and the one-page infographic report on screen and ran through the key elements.</p> <p>NRe agreed to add the reports to the shared Google Drive folder and share the link so that everyone could comment.</p>	NRe

		ACTION WHOM
	All agreed the report looked good and that lots of work had gone into this. NRe thanked both PS & CK for their input and asked that everyone finds time to review the report and add any comments/suggestions by Friday 13 th May 2022. NRe/CK will then finalise the report.	All NRe/CK
7.0	<u>Partnership Website</u>	
	<p>NRe updated all on the progress of the proposed Partnership Website.</p> <p>She had spoken to one company and had received a proposal. However, after speaking to SCC procurement professionals, she is working with them to go out to market for additional quotes.</p> <p>NRe shared the snapshot brief and proposed site map and asked if this felt like the kind of product that the Partnership wanted. She also asked if a separate working group should be formed to progress this or whether the Partnership should be kept in the loop via updates at SSTP meetings.</p> <p>NRi suggested that we test the proposed layout with different audiences/ask users what they think.</p> <p>NE agreed with this suggestion and thanked NRe for all her hard work.</p> <p>NRe asked how the group how they wanted to go about testing the proposed layout with different audiences/asking users what they think. It was agreed that the Partnership should explore this at the point when there is something to show people.</p> <p>CK asked if it was possible to have a blog area of the website to provide updates. NRe said that this would likely be technically possible but that she had concerns that if there was a blog then this would need to be updated regularly, as if the information became out of date then this would look unprofessional. Further thought would need to be given to how this would be best managed, therefore it might be better for a blog feature to be added to the website in a future iteration, rather than from the outset.</p> <p>It was noted that there needs to be a section added to the site map to enable people to see progress against the Strategy. NRe to include in spec.</p> <p>NRe agreed to add the proposed site map and snapshot brief to the shared Google Drive folder.</p>	NRe NRe
8.0	<u>Communications</u>	
	<p>On behalf of CS, NRe updated all as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cassie is working on a video to announce NE as the new Chair of the Partnership and a press release celebrating the Tree Cities of the World status • Cassie suggests that we promote the Annual Report on Gov Delivery & social media channels, using the infographic and directing people back 	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>to our webpage to read the full document (if they want to!). Partners can share with their contacts too, and share, retweet etc. on social media accounts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cassie had been keeping the Communications Plan on the shared Google Drive folder updated <p>NRe raised an issue regarding SSTP meetings falling on non-working days for CS and asked if partner organisations would consider sharing comms responsibilities across the Partnership, with Communications Officers attending these meetings for the 'Comms' slot on rotation. NRI/SS/CE all agreed to go and speak to their Communication Officers about this and report back.</p> <p>There was a suggestion made that if the other Comms Officers were also not available on Fridays, then there may need to be consideration given to when future meetings are held.</p> <p>NRe agreed to feedback the conversation to CS.</p>	<p>NRI/SS/ CE</p> <p>NRe</p>
9.0	AOB	
9.1	<p><u>The Politics of Street Trees</u> NE informed all that a book called The Politics of Street Trees had been published and asked if the group wanted Camilla to come to a future Partnership meeting to talk about the key messages.</p> <p>PS felt that the Partnership needed to prioritise their time on more pressing issues.</p> <p>NE said that he would pass on details of the launch event to all of the Partnership and said that all were invited.</p>	NE
9.2	<p><u>Annual Tree Celebrations</u> NRE flagged that she and SS were working with Catherine Nuttgens (Parks & Countryside, Sheffield City Council) on a tree celebration event, which would be held on Saturday 10th September 2022 in Botanical Gardens. This will provide a great opportunity for community engagement and we hope that we will have some tree wardens available to support the event, alongside members of the Partnership.</p>	
9.3	<p><u>Future High Street Fund</u> DW flagged that plans would soon be available for the first draft of the Future High Street Fund on Fargate. It's a grey to green inspired scheme with lots more trees and planting but there are some trees earmarked for removal. DW asked how the Partnership would want to engage with the consultation for the scheme. It was agreed that this would be brought to a future SSTP meeting. DW agreed to find out when would be an appropriate timescale for this.</p>	DW

		ACTION WHOM
10.0	Future meetings	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Partnership Away Day – Tuesday 7th June 2022, 9.30 – 4.00 p.m.at Ecclesall Woods, Hectors House ● Partnership meeting Friday 24th June 2022 at 10am ● Community Planting Lessons Learned session - time and date tbc. 	