



Climate and environment emergency executive panel

09:30 to 11:55

30 October 2019

Present: Councillors Maguire (chair, following appointment), Stonard (vice chair, following appointment), Carlo, Giles, Lubbock, McCartney-Gray and Osborn

(Members resolved to admit the public to the meeting from the start of the meeting.)

1. Appointment of chair

RESOLVED to appoint Councillor Maguire as chair for the remainder of the civic year.

2. Appointment of vice chair

Two nominations were received and on being put to the vote, it was:

RESOLVED to appoint Councillor Stonard as vice chair for the remainder of the civic year.

3. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4. Terms of Reference

The chair welcomed members to the first meeting of this panel and introduced the report, which set out the terms of reference for the panel.

During discussion members confirmed that the correct name for the panel as agreed at council (23 July 2019) was the climate and environment emergency executive panel (CEEEP).

In reply to a question, the chair explained that the proposal was that the panel would take up terms of reference from the sustainable development panel which were within its remit.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) confirm that the title of the panel is the climate and environment emergency executive panel;
- (2) note the terms of reference as agreed at council on 23 July 2019;
- (3) adopt the following points from the terms of reference of the sustainable development panel:
 - (a) monitoring the progress of the council's environmental strategy and carbon management programme;
 - (b) consider how the council's environmental strategy, carbon reduction programme and associated policies tackle the issues of climate change, carbon reduction and sustainable development;
 - (c) overseeing the implementation of the action plan for the integrated waste management strategy;
 - (d) the development of specific environmental strategies including trees, parks, play areas and natural areas;
- (4) agree to hold meetings of the climate and environment emergency executive panel in public.

5. Environmental Strategy 2019-2024

The chair introduced the item and suggested the procedures for the meeting.

The director of strategy, communications and culture explained that due to restrictions on local authorities and communications during pre-election periods, it would not be possible to hold the public consultation on a substantive item like the council's draft environmental strategy in November as planned. The consultation would therefore have to be deferred to after the end of the pre-election period, as it would be impractical to close and then open the consultation once it started. Cabinet would consider the draft strategy in the New Year following the completion of the consultation.

The environmental strategy manager presented the covering report and explained the procedure for reviewing the existing environmental strategy and the consultation on the draft Environmental Strategy 2019-2024, leading to consideration by cabinet at the end of the public consultation. Members were asked to consider whether the four main themes in the new environmental strategy (as set out in paragraph 14) and the priorities within these themes (as set out in paragraph 15) were comprehensive enough.

The environmental strategy manager then referred to the detailed action plan set out as Appendix 3 to the draft strategy and officers commented on a number of the key actions (as set out in the bullet points below):

- The environmental strategy manager explained that action *1.3 Updates risk register using UKCIP 18 and LCLIP (Local Climatic Impacts Profile)* would provide the most up-to-date assessment of how the climate of the UK might change over the 21st century, using a climate analysis tool that forms part of the Met Office Hadley Centre Climate Programme, supported by the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). This information would help with developing our climate change risk assessments and adaptation plans. The council's previous data used UKCIP90 which would be used to work as the foundation of any required changes.
- The communications officer referred to action *1.14 Continue to run an annual sustainable living event One Planet Norwich*, and said that the event was the pinnacle of the communications project and strategy to embed environmental behaviour change in the city and reach as many people as possible. The council had reached over 40,000 people on social media and publications such as TLC and Citizen delivered to households in the city. The One Planet Norwich programme also promoted a wide range of environmental issues, including pumpkin rescue and car free day. The event itself attracts 8,000 visitors and was hosted by the Forum.
- The interim director of regeneration and development provided background details to the introduction of the new cycle sharing scheme in the city as set out in action 1.19. The £7,000 scheme to provide pay-as-you go "Beryl" bikes was part of the Transforming Cities programme and would provide 580 manual and electric bikes in 100 locations across Greater Norwich from early 2020. The electric bikes would be available from the summer.
- The environmental strategy manager updated members on the progress of action *1.35 - To set up a Climate Leaders Group*, and said that Tyndall (UEA), Aviva and the Chamber of Commerce were developing a new climate leaders' group to help deliver the City Vision sustainability goals. This would be discussed at the City Vision event on 31 October 2019 and demonstrated the power of a shared target to reduce emissions in Norwich and embed sustainable transport use. He explained that every citizen could make a contribution by using electricity and/ or gas from a SMART renewable energy system like the Norwich Energy Company – Roar Power (actions 1.37 to 1.38). Roar Power could provide the residents in the city with all the 791 GWh of gas and 205 GWh of electricity. City Vision aspirations for fuel to be 100 per cent renewable by 2040 could be achieved by people using SMART renewable energy systems and through these there were opportunities for local innovation for community generation, grid back up, battery storage, connected homes, EV tariffs for EV charging at home, renewables, local eco-projects and peer to peer trading.
- Under *Theme 2: The council as service providers*, the environmental strategy manager commented that democratic services had contributed to the creation of this panel (action 2.7).
- The interim director of regeneration and development reported on the Transforming Cities Bid and said that Greater Norwich had been awarded

£6 million in the first tranche of funding with the expectation of further funding in the second tranche. There was no guarantee that bids would be successful but colleagues were working with the county council to capitalise on the funding to deliver sustainable transport measures in the city.

- *2.69 Carbon management programme* – The environmental strategy manager reported that the council had achieved 59.6 per cent of the 70 per cent reduction in emissions in the next five years. The council was committed to minimising its emissions as soon as possible but members were warned that it would be more difficult to deliver the remaining 40 per cent as “easy wins” had already been achieved. The council had just invested £265,000 in energy efficient lighting at St Andrew’s Car Park.
- Members were advised that under action 3.2, the council purchased all its electricity from 100 per cent renewable sources. This included all electricity in the council’s buildings, parks district lighting.
- The environmental strategy manager confirmed that under action 3.4, the council had a comprehensive ethical investment strategy,
- The council was making real progress in retrofitting its council housing across the city (action 4.1). The development at Goldsmith Street had received national recognition for outstanding environmental credentials.
- The council would continue microgeneration where possible and in line with the energy hierarchy.

The environmental strategy manager concluded with commenting that the draft environmental strategy would be subject to public consultation and then a revised version would be adopted by cabinet.

(The members of the panel then split into twos in preparation for the discussion that followed.)

During discussion members considered the targets to limit global warming to 1.5°C by 2050 and were advised that these were set out in the United Nations Paris Agreement. A member suggested that it would be more equitable globally if the UK reduced its global human-caused emissions (carbon dioxide) to be carbon neutral by 2030. He explained that this shorter target should not apply to unindustrialised countries in the southern hemisphere as these countries have the right to develop as the northern hemisphere had and would ensure that targets were achieved. The environmental strategy manager said that the council’s target of net zero carbon emissions by 2050 was in alignment with the Paris Agreement and other organisations, including the University of East Anglia. The action plan could make a greater impact sooner than anticipated; for instance, the target could be achieved before 2050 if legislation and resources were available. The UK was setting a precedent to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050 and businesses and organisations would contribute to this national objective.

A member asked that the Norwich Standard (programme for planned upgrading of council housing) was reviewed so that when bathrooms were refurbished showers

could be fitted. She suggested that this was about quality of life as much as saving energy and water. The environmental strategy manager thanked the councillor for her question and said that officers across the council were engaged in the action plan and this could be considered.

During discussion, a member said that the environmental strategy recognised the council's ambition to reduce carbon emissions and the importance of working in partnership to achieve net-zero carbon emissions by 2050. No small group could achieve the target working alone but the council was doing what it could, such as introducing ROAR Power and building high quality Passivhaus council housing. The council was also working with the county council to promote sustainable transport through the Transforming Cities bid and had improved cycling in the city through the Cycling Ambition funding. There was no option other than taking action to stop global warming but working in partnership was as vital as ambition.

A member said that she considered that the environmental strategy should be considered in the context of climate emergency mitigation; climate adaptation; action plan for addressing air pollution; renewable energy and action plan on bio-diversity. The present strategy wrapped all of these issues into one "environmental strategy". She said that it was difficult to see from the draft strategy where climate adaptation was included. She also pointed out that it was difficult to quantify the council's ambition. How was carbon reduction measured or monitored? Topics were broken down into a collection of actions which made it difficult to unpick and quantify. The structure of the strategy should be reviewed under policy headings rather than themes and pointed out that the actions ranged from strategic leadership role of the council to selling local honey. She also suggested that in terms of social equity, the target for net-zero carbon emissions should be shortened to reflect the global situation and questioned whether the per capita carbon emissions data took into account carbon emissions for production and consumption (including emissions from aviation and shipping.) The data could be more rigorous. The chair explained that the themes were linked to social and economic strategies and that without the use of themes the action plan could appear to be a disparate set of actions trivialising the council's environmental strategy. He pointed out that the terms of reference for this panel was the driving force for the thematisation. The environmental strategy manager commented on the difficulty of quantifying CO₂ emissions. He said that the ROAR power project would be evaluated over the lifetime of the project and would be modelled using a SCATTER tool. Asher Minns of the Tyndall Centre had been invited to the next meeting of the panel and would explain the use of the data in more detail. The environmental strategy provided a light touch suitable for a wide audience base. Each project had a set of detailed objectives that sat behind the strategy.

Discussion ensued on the council's promotion of eco measures as a community leader and its assistance to redress fuel poverty and improve the energy efficiency of private sector housing, particularly difficult where there were conservation areas or Victorian terraces.

Discussion returned to the environmental strategy being a single document and a suggestion that it failed to address biodiversity and give greater priority to the biomass at a time where more species of wildlife was becoming extinct. The action plan listed things that could be done now but did not project beyond the five year life span of the strategy. The member referred to the graph *Norwich Per Capita*

Emissions (on page 24 of the agenda papers) and said that the SCATTER tool could potentially be used to update how we measure progress. The chair in response confirmed that there was a set of documentation behind each action on the action plan. He referred to the strategy said that the council's commitment to preventing pollution of the environment and its environmental policy was to protect and enhance habitat and biodiversity. The environmental strategy manager explained that the data for per capita emissions was derived from national data sets. It was within the panel's remit to investigate specific issues like biodiversity and waste management. He explained that the SCATTER tool would look at the emissions inventory for a set area and project forward based on 50 embedded pathways.

A member suggested that the targets were "back-cast" by starting where the council wanted to be and working backwards to carbon neutrality. She suggested that private and public sector houses were retrofitted and new houses built to be carbon zero standards. Private sector housing should be brought up to A rating for energy efficiency and actions should be taken to generate electricity by using photo-voltaic panels on roofs. There should be a high level of ambition and need to step up a level on existing projects but this would need government funding as the council could not do it on its own. The chair said that the strategy recognised the need for government funding to achieve net zero CO₂ reductions. The trajectory going forward was important rather than looking backwards and that the target should be met as soon as possible. As time goes on the council would need to optimise its actions and this might happen more quickly dependent on the government at the time. The environmental strategy manager explained once the SCATTER exercise had been fully developed it would be necessary to review policy decisions in relation to the specific targets for 2040-2050.

Discussion ensued in which a member commented that aviation and shipping; and the Norwich Western Link were not included in the assessment of per capita emissions. He said that transport emissions should be looked at more closely as emissions had risen since 2013. The environmental strategy manager referred to the answer to a question already provided in regards to the Greater Norwich Growth Board and said that transportation emissions had remained flat. The council had a scale of choices it could make consisting of what the council would need to stop doing; looking at what it could do and what was necessary. He suggested that the council stopped investing in the airport. In response the chair referred to the terms of reference for the panel and said that this would be something that the panel could consider in future and place it on its work programme. The vice chair pointed out that decisions were evidence based and would be reviewed if further information came forward. The cabinet had approached its decision on the Norwich Western Link with an open mind. In response to a further remark that aviation data had not been included or considered, the environmental strategy manager said that it was not uncommon to exclude emissions from aviation. He pointed out that it was difficult to obtain statistics on where a plane was coming from or where it was going and how this should be incorporated into the statistics.

Discussion ensued on the assessment of per capita emissions 2.09 tonnes of CO₂ (as set out on page 24 of the agenda papers). The environmental strategy manager referred to the report and said that a link to the data would be provided (see attached: <https://www.theccc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Net-Zero-The-UKs-contribution-to-stopping-global-warming.pdf>)

The UK target was to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050. The IPPC could not set targets for other countries. Another member commented that she disagreed on the assessment of carbon emissions. Members were advised that the environmental strategy did not need to be posted on the website at this point, as it was not yet going to cabinet, and that there would be an opportunity for members to consider the data set at the next meeting. The statistics on per capita emissions would be checked with the Tyndall Centre. Members were also advised that the set of data circulated to members of the panel by email did not form part of the committee papers and were reminded that in the interests of transparency, papers for consideration by the panel would be circulated by democratic services in advance of meetings.

During discussion a member commented on the role of the city council in supporting its residents in fuel poverty and the food waste strategy. Members noted that the food waste strategy was a project being progressed by the transformation team to reduce emissions from food waste and provide food to people in need.

As discussion progressed a member suggested that in order to meet the 2050 target, there would need to be increased carbon storage reliant on specific technologies which did not yet exist. The environmental strategy manager said that to achieve the targets there needed to be some reliance on technologies which were developing at a rapid pace and would reduce carbon emissions. This included work on battery storage, shipping and innovative use of other types of fuel. The director of strategy, communications and culture said that the city council was a district council which, like all local authorities had faced a 60 per cent reduction in its funding and was working in partnership with other authorities and partner organisations. The county council was the highways authority. It would be necessary to ask for external funding. The council needed to determine what opportunities could make a difference, how it could work in partnership and what resources it could provide as part of the budget process. A member referred to working in partnership and said that the target for net zero carbon emissions should be set at 2030, as soon as possible. The chair pointed out that the city council could not dictate this to its partners. The director of strategy, communications and culture explained that other organisations were doing a tremendous amount and some much further advanced. The 2040 Vision for the city was the city council's response to collective leadership.

In reply to a question, the environmental strategy manager provided an update on action 4.10 – *To deliver large scale solar PV schemes on a minimum of 2 commercial or operational sites in the city*. He said that the council was exploring the installation of solar panels and microgeneration on its leisure centre to save energy and bring down operating costs. Any scheme would need to pay back and it was possible that a better project could come forward before 2022. Members were also advised that there was European Regional Development Fund funding, independent of Brexit, for virtual power plants (action 2.73) which provided a means for battery storage in households to store power released from renewable energy for use later where previously electricity from gas fired plants would provide a top up. It was hoped that this could be progressed through ROAR power in the future.

Discussion ensued on whether action 2.23 - *To implement the Greater Norwich Core Strategy by 2026* would be sufficient to meet the targets set in the council's environmental strategy. The interim director of regeneration and development said that the 2013 Joint Core Strategy had been environmentally ambitious as far as

permitted by government policy. He explained that the process of the Greater Norwich Local Plan and that policies would need to be consistent with government guidance. Most homes that will exist at the end of the GNLP period so the policies that will be contained in the plan will only influence a minor proportion of future housing stock. A member suggested that the housing stock needed to be retrofitted to the same high standard as new builds. The interim director of regeneration and development said that no one disagree that radical measures would be required and all areas of the council. When talking about the climate and environmental emergency, it did appear to be counterintuitive that the development plan review could not be completed before 2022 but the council did need to comply with procedures for plan preparation.

In reply to a member's reference to the actions *1.20 – Introduce a new cycle sharing scheme for Norwich City* and *1.21 Encourage more walking and cycling via the Transforming Cities Bid* and question about whether there was a link with Active Norfolk, the interim director of regeneration and development said that the Transforming Cities was encouraging sustainable transport including cycling and walking, encouraged by the health services to help people make their best life options and reduce the burden on the health services. The member commented that this linked well with the Active Norfolk fit steps. Another member referred to action *2.60 - To increase the number of 20 mph zones in the city to make cycling and walking safer* and said that whilst it might seem obvious, she asked what was being done to promote the important message to motorists that cycling and walking was beneficial to health and would save people money. The director of strategy, communications and culture said that the communications officer would be doing a communications plan around this.

The chair said that there would be an opportunity to look in detail at the data at the next meeting. He trusted that a disagreement about how it was worked out would not stop the council trying to achieve carbon reduction. A member suggested that it was important not to mislead the public and that the introduction of the environmental strategy should set out the scale of the task to address the climate and environmental emergency. She considered that there needed to be further discussion on the data set and actions required to achieve carbon reduction and in order to contextualise this, identifying what resources and legislation would be required by the government. She also considered that the environmental strategy was linked to biodiversity and referred to the motion on the biodiversity emergency (Council, 24 September 2019) which called on the council to undertake a number of actions including the storage of cut wildflowers on site and reducing or ceasing the use of pesticides. The chair said that the panel could look at the council's biodiversity aspirations.

In reply to a member's question, the director of strategy, communications and culture explained that the timetable for the consultation on the environmental strategy would be longer dependent on the comments received and amount of redrafting of the document before it went out to consultation and after comments had been incorporated. The interim director of regeneration and development said that it would be appropriate to update the strategy to reflect any outcomes from the City Vision 2040 conference (30 October 2019) prior to its publication.

The director of strategy, communications and culture said that updates could be made at cabinet member and shadow portfolio holders' meetings between meetings of the panel.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) note the comments of the panel and that further consideration of the draft Environmental Strategy 2019-2024 will be made at the next meeting prior to consultation;
- (2) invite Asher Minns, Tyndall Centre, to the next meeting of the panel.

6. Date of next meeting

RESOLVED to hold the next meeting on Wednesday, 18 December 2019 at 9:30.

CHAIR