



**Action notes of meeting held on
Friday 11th November 2022 (via Microsoft Teams)**

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	Sheffield City Council (RE) (part)
Nikki Rees	Sheffield City Council (NRe)
Gillian Charters	Sheffield City Council (GC)
David Wain	Sheffield City Council (DW)
Nicky Rivers	Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust (NRi)
Kieron King	Amey (KK)
Carl Ellison	Amey (CK)
Catherine Nuttgens	The Woodland Trust (CN)

Notes

Amanda Preston	Sheffield City Council (AJP) (notes only)
----------------	---

Additional Attendees

Simeon Linstead	Trees for Streets (SL) (item 7 only)
-----------------	--------------------------------------

Apologies

Sarah Shorley	The Woodland Trust (SS)
---------------	-------------------------

		ACTION WHOM
1.0	<u>Welcome, introductions & apologies</u>	
	NE thanked all for attending the meeting. It was noted that RE had sent apologies that he would join the meeting late due to a diary clash.	
2.0	<u>Sign off of previous notes and update on actions</u>	
	The notes of the meeting held on 19 th October 2022 were agreed as a true record. <u>Action updates</u> Communications: Cassie Stewart's comments in response to the comms actions had been shared in writing prior to the meeting, with the agenda pack.	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>In relation to sharing information about whether there was any positive/negative/ambivalent feedback, Cassie had stated that this would need to be a manual 'lift & shift' from social media platforms. SCC don't have any programmes to track sentiment, but Cassie can highlight the overall feeling from coverage/comments when there is some. She will also ask communications reps from the other partner organisations to do the same.</p> <p>Cassie had also provided a written response regarding the question about a timeline for Core Investment Programme comms for the public.</p> <p>Membership of the Group: NE suggested, and the group agreed, that consideration of the membership of the Partnership should be discussed in early 2023. The focus for now is getting through as many CIP decisions as possible before the new year. NE said that he had some thoughts about who we could approach but would bring this to a meeting in the new year for discussion.</p> <p>Partnership Charter: All members of the Partnership will sign the Partnership Charter at the December meeting, as this meeting is scheduled to be held in person.</p> <p>BNG: We will take NRi up on her offer re BNG – this is now on the forward planner.</p> <p>Partnership ways of working: It was reported that Amey's technical issues regarding access to the Google Drive had been resolved. NRe to send NRi CE, KK & CK's Gmail addresses.</p>	NRe
3.0	<u>Short updates</u>	
	<p><u>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</u></p> <p>DW informed all that SCC had rejected Amey's LBAP because of contractual issues. KK confirmed that they would turn this around hopefully quicker than the 20-day timescale. This should hopefully be ready to bring to the December meeting.</p>	KK/DW
4.0	<u>Dates for 2023 and Draft 12-Month Partnership Plan</u>	
	<p><u>Draft 12-Month Partnership Plan</u></p> <p>NRe shared and ran through the plan and noted suggested changes. NRe to refine and circulate an updated version.</p> <p>NRi asked how this interlinks with the action plan. Does it replace it?</p> <p>NRe responded that we need to think about if/how we use the action plan going forward. NRe to take away an action to think about how the action plan is working and bring suggestions back to the Partnership.</p>	<p>NRe</p> <p>NRe</p>

		ACTION WHOM
	<p><u>Dates of meetings 2023</u></p> <p>The Partnership agreed to the draft dates suggested. NRe to send the series of meeting invitations out for 2023.</p>	NRe
5.0	<u>Third party trees</u>	
	<p>The Partnership were asked to decide on the next stage of the appointment of an independent professional to advise the Partnership and Amey/SCC regarding subsidence claims and agree key timescales.</p> <p>NE talked though the proposal; a shortlist of 3 candidates was presented. NE went through the comments and questions that had already been added to the comms spreadsheet.</p> <p>NRi asked about traveling expenses for candidates based outside the city and DW confirmed that it wasn't an issue in terms of travel costs if the Partnership selects someone who doesn't live in Sheffield.</p> <p>CN explained some of the different arb qualifications/memberships that the candidates had referred to. She expressed a preference for candidate 1 (IM).</p> <p>It was clarified that the Partnership is looking for only one person.</p> <p>CK asked if the Partnership had enough information to come to a decision today and asked if it would be possible to have a Teams meeting with the candidates to ask them questions before a candidate is chosen.</p> <p>KK expressed a preference for candidate 3 (NG) because he has local authority experience.</p> <p>PS said that it was really important to him that the Partnership does not select a candidate who works for local government, as in his professional experience local government officers lack creative thinking and innovation.</p> <p>KK disagreed with PS. His view was that we're asking the independent professional to review our data and ask them whether the data is complete and sufficient to come to a decision - technical knowledge is paramount; they don't need to be innovative.</p> <p>RE said that he didn't feel that the comment from PS was fair or in the spirit of the Partnership Charter and he would ask Partnership members to refrain from comments like that, which are hurtful to colleagues, and do not support partnership working.</p> <p>PS said that his comments were not intended specifically to refer to SCC; he was referring to local government officers in general.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>NRI said that if CK felt that there wasn't enough information, could we fill in any gaps now rather than have another process.</p> <p>CN expressed that view that expediency is important – the longer this goes on the more exposed the accountable bodies are. She felt that the Partnership should take a professional approach and make a decision quickly. We only have 3 candidates and if we leave it any longer they might decline the offer. The priority should be to move forward now.</p> <p>CK said that she supported PS regarding not selecting a candidate who is connected to local government – this is about unconscious bias and the Partnership needs to be able to trust them.</p> <p>NE agreed that everybody needs to have confidence in the process and the individual; independence is a really important point. He asked if there was consensus that the Partnership had enough information to make a decision today. It was agreed that it did.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed to appoint Ian Murat for a trial period to receive his input on the immediate backlog claims. NE asked how many claims need to be looked at in the backlog? The answer was that it was in single figures.</p> <p>CK asked for clear information about what we're asking for back from them.</p> <p>NE said that we asking for a report for each claim.</p> <p>CG explained that how she sees this working is that the independent professional will receive the unredacted claim. They would then be able to ask Amey to see any of the reports that are mentioned in the claim form and test the robustness of the information to see if they are satisfied with the form and the actions that have been taken to reach a decision. The template is still the primary capture of the information about the tree but the independent professional would have access to the intelligence behind it. They would be able to say if the data was incomplete or if they deemed that there was sufficient information to reach that decision. They will come back and say either – 'I have seen sufficient information to agree with the recommendation' or 'I haven't seen sufficient information to agree with the recommendation'.</p> <p>NE was clear that the report that comes back needs to say more than whether they just agree or disagree – the report needs to assure the Partnership that a thorough process has been followed and be clear about all the checks/work that has been done for each claim.</p> <p>GC/DW to report back to the Partnership regarding the report that will be shared with the Partnership for each claim that has been considered by the independent professional.</p>	<p>DW</p> <p>DW/CG</p>

		ACTION WHOM
6.0	<u>Core Investment Programme</u>	
	<p>It was noted that there had been insufficient design progress from Amey so there wasn't much that could be discussed, however DW sought the Partnership's approval on one matter regarding a proposed way forward for Dunkeld Road.</p> <p>DW explained that SCC proposed to go out to consultation on removing 4 dawn redwood trees on Dunkeld Road, as the scheme can't proceed to design without the removal of these 4 trees. This was agreed and DW said that he would report back in December.</p> <p>CK asked if the Partnership could see the consultation. DW responded that it would be a standard appendix 5 consultation, with all 4 trees as one block. He explained that all 4 need to be removed, otherwise the road will need to become one way.</p> <p>GC said that they proposed to bring designs to Partnership in December. NE asked if KK could commit to the designs being ready in time. GC said that there is a problem with Amey's resource capacity for design.</p> <p>NE said that we have a session planned in December re CIP and we want to make the most out of that session to get decisions made. GC responded that she had heard the request and would see what they could do.</p> <p>NRi asked if the Partnership could discuss replant species, further to the exchanges on the communication spreadsheet. DW explained that on the 3 that he had asked about, he would give approval to fell and that the decision about replant species would be decided at a future point. This was agreed.</p> <p>It was noted that we need a conversation on a future Partnership agenda about replant species.</p> <p>There was a short break in the meeting just before 11am, so that attendees could observe the national two-minute silence for Armistice Day.</p>	<p>DW</p> <p>GC</p> <p>DW</p> <p>NE/NRe</p>
7.0	<u>Trees for Streets</u>	
	<p>Simeon Linstead, Project Director, Trees for Streets shared and ran through his presentation.</p> <p>TFS sits within the national charity Trees for Cities. It's a pretty agile organisation, they learn from experience and are working with lots of LAs already.</p> <p>TFS are getting really good at the engagement/marketing work. They engage with community groups and residents group. They use QR codes on trees to reach people, as well as social media. Simeon said that they haven't reinvented sponsorship but have tried to do it really well.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>Simeon shared the website on screen to show how this looks.</p> <p>3 key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Street trees ● Crowdfunding ● Business sponsorship <p>The details of the scheme can be designed by the individual Council. The web form takes the resident through a series of questions. Then there follows an explanation about how an appropriate tree is chosen for the location. Residents can add comments about what sort of tree they would like to be planted.</p> <p>Payment details are taken at that initial stage but payment isn't taken until all the details of the tree planting have been agreed.</p> <p>The resident is then sent a weekly email to remind them to water the tree.</p> <p>Simeon also explained the process for park tree sponsorship and crowdfunding.</p> <p>NE thanked SL for the presentation and asked for comments and questions.</p> <p>CN said that this looked brilliant and asked how Council's arrive at their costings. Simeon replied that every Council sets the amount of donation that they want.</p> <p>NRi asked a series of questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Partnership is interested in proactive (as well as reactive) planting – can the platform handle the proactive side of things? Simeon said that it could and that TFS also bring in grant money where they can target priority areas. ● Can Sheffield Street Tree Partnership have its own branding on flyers and leaflets? Simeon said that the commercial agreement would be with the Council – as long as they are happy, Simeon said that he was pretty relaxed about that. ● Can we use gift aid? Simeon responded that individual sponsorships are not gift aid-able. Crowdfunding falls more within a set up that would be gift aid-able and TFS are looking into that. ● There have been occasions when a pit has been dug but the tree then couldn't be planted in that location. Do you have that issue? Simeon said that those costs would need to be borne in as an average to spread across a number of donations. 	

		ACTION WHOM
	<p>RE said that he was really excited about this – this presents lots of opportunities, including potentially like getting capital from developments to go towards proactive planting. Also potentially contributions from private landlords via the Good Neighbour Forum with the universities. And maybe also bereavement trees.</p> <p>Simeon was thanked again for his time and he left the meeting.</p> <p>NRi asked about costs. GC said that the Council would pay for the scheme; aiming for the 23/24 programme. GC explained that the Council are also working with colleagues in Housing and Parks to see if they would like to come on board. We can confirm all the costs once we've met Simeon again.</p> <p>NRi said that she felt that it looks flexible enough to accommodate our needs.</p> <p>PS said that he was very excited about this but that he wants the partnership to be involved with key decision making. GC committed that SCC would come back with more detail and would bring regular updates and bring Simeon back into Partnership meetings, where appropriate, to share things as it progresses.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed to pursue the Trees for Streets proposal but confirmed that the project needs to come back to the Partnership for key decision points.</p>	GC/DW
8.0	<u>Consultation Outcomes</u>	
	It was agreed to have a short discussion about replant species in December, so that it is clear what the list is that trees are being selected from. NE will talk to CE about this separately and would share something in writing before the meeting.	NE
9.0	<u>Strategic Planting Palette</u>	
	It was agreed to discuss this item in December due to time constraints.	NE/NRe
10.0	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
10.1	<u>December meeting – update</u> <p>It was noted that the meeting would stay at the original time of 10.00-12.00 on Friday 9th December. The meeting would be held at SRWT offices and all Partnership members are invited to stay after the meeting for a hot drink and a mince pie. It was noted that the Partnership Charter would also be signed then.</p>	

		ACTION WHOM
10.2	<p><u>Trees Cities of the World application</u></p> <p>The Partnership was informed that the closing date for applications for Tree Cities of the World membership 2022 is 31st January 2023. The Partnership agreed for NRe to manage and submit the application. If any Partnership member wishes to be involved or wants to review the application then they should let NRe know.</p>	NRe/All
10.3	<p><u>Tree Fayre – rearranged date</u></p> <p>It was confirmed that the rescheduled date for the Tree Fayre is Saturday 20 May 2023. NE flagged that this is a hard deadline for getting the Street Tree Warden scheme improved.</p>	
10.4	<p><u>Volunteer Celebration Event</u></p> <p>Nikki drew Partnership members' attention to the flyer that was circulated in the agenda pack. The celebration event will take place on 19 January 2023 and Street Tree Warden are invited. CE/CK to share the information with Street Tree Wardens.</p>	CK/CE
10.5	<p><u>Sefton Road</u></p> <p>The Partnership noted the information in DW's email of 31 October and agreed to DW's proposal to "deaccrue" from the contract all the trees on the roads shown in green on the map. This is because these roads are not part of the adopted public highway.</p>	DW
10.6	<p><u>SSTP as a formal consultee on all planning consultations</u></p> <p>It was noted that the Partnership had been offered the opportunity to be a formal consultee on all planning consultations. But it should be noted that Planning would not flag up which applications have tree impacts.</p> <p>CK said that she would welcome this.</p> <p>GC made it clear that the Council does not have any resource to filter applications to flag up ones with tree impacts.</p> <p>NRi asked if only PS and CK have time to respond, how is that a Partnership response – i.e. how does it get signed off so that the response is truly reflective of the whole Partnership?</p> <p>NE said that he would take this away, reflect on it and come back to the Partnership. NE asked that a holding response is provided to Planning by DW. NE said that the other consideration is that we seek someone from Planning to be a member of the Partnership, which would help to join this up.</p>	DW/NE