



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**SUSTAINABILITY CABINET  
COMMITTEE  
Item 63 Report of the City  
Sustainability Partnership**

**3.00PM, FRIDAY, 25 MARCH 2011**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
63.	REPORT OF THE CITY SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIP	1 - 12



### City Sustainability Partnership Meeting – 14<sup>th</sup> March 2011

Committee Room 1, Brighton Town Hall, Bartholomew Square,  
Brighton

#### *Public Services:*

Councillor Ayas Fallon Khan

Councillor Paul Steedman

Olumide Elegbe - Brighton & Hove Primary Care Trust

Alison Hadfield – Eco Schools

Zoe Osmond – University of Brighton

#### *Community and Voluntary Sector:*

Chris Todd - Friends of the Earth - **Chair**

Vic Borrill - Brighton and Hove Food Partnership - **Vice Chair**

Mike Creedy - Brighton Peace and Environment Centre

Stuart Derwent - Brighton & Hove's Wildlife Forum

#### *Agencies:*

Phil Belden - South Downs Joint Committee

Chris Wick – Environment Agency – **Vice Chair**

#### *Guests Included:*

Markham Hanson – Square Bay Property Ltd

#### *Council Officers:*

Thurstan Crockett - Head of Sustainability - **Partnership Manager**

Susie Howells - Senior Sustainability Consultant

Shelaine Weller – Sustainability Consultant

#### *Meeting Notes:*

Catherine Miller - Senior Support Officer

### **1. Apologies and Actions from the previous meeting.**

1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr David Watkins.

1.2 CT informed the partnership that Stuart Laing had stood down as a CSP member due to work commitments; He thanked Stuart for his participation and contribution to the partnership. CT then introduced and welcomed Zoe Osmond to the CSP, who will now be representing the University of Brighton; and Stuart Derwent, representing the Brighton & Hove City Wildlife Forum.

1.3 CT informed partners that Olumide Elegbe, the representative

from Brighton and Hove Primary Care Trust would also be standing down after this meeting due to relocation. He thanked OE for his contribution to the partnership, particularly his observations and insight regarding the Royal Sussex County Hospital Redevelopment proposals.

1.4 CT also thanked Cllr Paul Steedman, who was not re-standing in the forthcoming local elections, for his contribution to the partnership, asserting that he had been a particularly committed partner and that his participation and efforts in working groups had been highly valued and appreciated.

1.5 Partners then discussed the procedures post election regarding representation on the CSP from the newly elected councillors. There was confusion regarding whether councillors would be attending the next CSP meeting due to be held on the 16.05.11 as this meeting is scheduled shortly after the election results, but before Annual Council decides representation on external bodies. There was discussion whether this would allow outgoing councillors to maintain their role on the partnership for the next meeting.

**- ACTION - TC to ask Legal & democratic services about the status of councillors for the next CSP meeting.**

1.6 PB informed the partnership that his role was uncertain as the South Downs Joint Committee was due to be replaced by the South Downs National Park Authority and as yet it was not yet certain that he would be continue to attend the partnership.

1.7 CT discussed Action at 1.1 regarding further appraisal of the sustainability of the Open Market Redevelopment planning application, AFK informed the partnership that the application was submitted three / four weeks ago and that Hyde had given concrete assurances at this time that the development would meet its commitments in regards to the sustainability of the development. PS told partners that the development would achieve a definite Code for Sustainable Homes Level three rating for the residential properties, He stated that the 'fabric' of the site achieved a level 4 and there was potential for the whole site to progress to level four in the future with the fitting of Photo Voltaic Panels.

1.7.1 CT mentioned that the transport considerations of the site would be agreed in response to further consideration of Francis Street and also discussed concerns over weaknesses of the Biodiversity SPD and said he would find out when it was adopted,

(25 March 2010) stating that if it had only been adopted recently the partnership may have to wait and use the Biosphere Reserve as way of getting it strengthened. **Partners agreed that the biodiversity and transport elements of the Open Market Redevelopment proposals were weak and needed to be revisited.**

1.8 Action at 4.11 was discussed and Cllr AFK informed partners that he had facilitated a discussion between 3Ts, the developers of the Royal Sussex County Hospital site and the Sussex Innovation Centre business Phlorum, which has developed a tool to measure embodied emissions of construction projects. ZO informed the partnership that the University of Brighton was working with Phlorum and they were interested in testing it on one or two major developments in the city. **Partners agreed that it would be useful to facilitate relationship building between Phlorum and the University of Brighton and big developers in the city to further work on measuring embodied emissions during the construction process.**

**- ACTION - CM to send final version of feedback report to Richard Beard at 3ts re: the redevelopment proposals for the Royal Sussex County Hospital.**

1.9 CT informed partners that he had raised the issue of funding and administrative support for the thematic partnerships at the last B&HSP chairs' meeting (Action at 5.6). He said that Roger French was now aware of the need to consider the requirements of all of the thematic partnerships. CT also informed members that he was waiting to approach Charlie Stewart regarding this issue until the CSP had designed its business plan for the year.

1.10 CT informed the partnership that he had received no response to his letters to John Barradell regarding the inadequacies of the Air Quality Action Plan and the Local Transport Plan 3 consultations.

**- ACTION - CT to chase up response to CSP concerns re: the Air Quality Action Plan and the Local Transport Plan 3 Consultations**

## **2. New England Quarter Redevelopment Presentation**

2.1 Markham Hanson from Square Bay Property Ltd presented the redevelopment proposals for site J of the New England Quarter to the partnership.

2.2 VB inquired as to the size of the allotments and whether the provision of allotments would be for public use or solely for site residents. MH replied that the allotments were approximately 3m<sup>2</sup> and were for the use of residents.

2.3 MC asked whether there were any specific issues with the typography of the site. MH replied that the site was fairly flat and the main consideration was the introduction of a retaining wall. MC inquired whether the disused goods tunnel under the site had been located. MH replied that although they were aware that there was local knowledge of a tunnel, Square Bay could not locate it and wondered if in fact it existed. MC replied that there were photographs of the tunnel on the internet. To be found:

Web Source:

[http://www.sussexhistory.com/bton\\_goods\\_tunnel.htm](http://www.sussexhistory.com/bton_goods_tunnel.htm)

2.4 PS made further inquiries as to the extent to which CHP had been considered for the whole site. MH replied that there had been considerable attention paid to the energy and heating requirements of the site and that Square Bay had consulted Hyde Property regarding the sustainability implications of CHP. They had responded quite negatively, asserting that from their experience communal heating led to higher wastage of energy as during summer months as water would be heated for central heating that would not be required and that residents tended to leave windows open to cool buildings. MH asserted that this led to a potential 30% level of efficiency compared to the stated 95% efficiency level of gas boilers. He told the partnership that there was a board report detailing the energy requirements and considerations of the site which he would forward to the partnership.

**- ACTION - MH to circulate the Square Bay Board Report re Energy considerations of the New England Quarter site to the CSP.**

2.5 VB inquired whether food waste separation and on site composting had been considered, MH replied that there was not suitable space for this, asserting that the only likely place would be the roof which was dedicated to the extensive provision of Photo Voltaic Panels and was unlikely to be used by residents for composting due to the effort required to transport food waste to the roof. VB asserted that more consideration should be given to this issue, MH replied that he was open to further discussion on this point. **Partners were agreed that the issue of on site**



## **composting should be further explored**

2.6 The partnership then focussed on the transport strategy for the site. PS inquired to the provision of parking for the hotel, MH replied that there were only three extra parking spaces designated for the hotel and that guest would use the existing station car park.

2.7 CT questioned the design and allocation of cycle parking spaces, noting that the majority were positioned at the back of the site away from the main entrance. He pointed out that the car parking should be furthest away from the entrance to encourage cyclists and that the positioning of cycle parking behind car spaces was inappropriate as this would make it difficult for cyclists to access and could lead to damage of both cycles and cars. CT suggested swapping some of the car spaces at the entrance for cycle parking, MH replied that this was open to amendment.

2.8 CT also questioned the design of the main path lead from the station through the site. MH had asserted that there was a need to block the path for cyclists as this was a shared space with pedestrians and given the gradient of the slope could lead to excessive speed and potential risk. He also stated that this would serve to discourage skateboarding on the site. CT replied that the design should be reconsidered to achieve this without requiring cyclists to dismount. **Partners were agreed that further consideration should be given to the design and allocation of cycle parking facilities at the site.**

**- ACTION - CM to draft feedback report for B&HCC planning department and Square Bay Property Ltd. Partners to review and suggest further comment before the 25.03.11 and report to be submitted to planning by 29.03.11.**

## **3. Food Strategy Review**

3.1 VB gave a talk to the partnership regarding the review of the Food Strategy and asked for any comments or recommendations from the partnership, particularly focussing on the two issues of consumption patterns and the transport of food. VB noted that there was an opportunity to link sustainable transport and sustainable food provision together on this point. She also pointed out that there was an overlap between Public Health and Sustainability in regards to consumption patterns, noting that the most likely high impact action would be to eat less. **VB**

**asked the partnership to suggest four / five actions re: the issue of food transportation and consumption patterns**

3.2 AFK noted that GPs were in a particularly good position to influence people's eating habits due to the existing levels of trust which would allow them to affect behaviour change more effectively than other mediums. He suggested that information regarding healthy and sustainable eating could be mainstreamed by being incorporated into GPs' work which could overcome potential scepticism regarding environmental information. OE asserted that although there was merit to this idea, GPs' simply do not have enough allotted time within patient consultations to take on preventative work although there had been support from GPs for such cross-over work through the Public Healthcare strand of the 10:10 City Campaign. He suggested that a more practical approach was through supporting Public Health work to this end. **Partners agreed that there was potential to work in partnership with Public Health and GPs to develop education initiatives regarding healthy eating and sustainability.**

3.3 TC inquired whether there was appetite for a working group to further discuss the Food Strategy; as MC was the only volunteer VB replied that she would discuss this with him and other any partner that wished on a one to one basis. **Partners agreed VB to discuss with Mike Creedy and other interested CSP members.**

**- ACTION - CM to circulate email requesting comment regarding the Food Strategy to the partnership.**

#### **4. Partnership Review**

4.1 TC began by asking the partnership to consider the two annotated recommendations reports and to feed back any final suggestions or comment to CM.

**- ACTION - CM to circulate an email requesting further comment on the Terms of Reference and the annotated recommendations.**

**- ACTION - Partnership to feed any further comment regarding the Terms of Reference and the annotated recommendations to TC and CM before the 22.03.11.**

4.2 TC then presented the proposed new Terms of Reference to the partnership, giving a brief rationale for each change and amendment. He then invited comment from the partnership.

4.3 PB asserted that the wording of Objective 3 regarding the selection of appropriate indicators should be changed from 'long-term' to 'enduring' to reflect the need to select indicators that are likely to remain and be monitored into the future. TC agreed and informed the partnership that this was a major focus of the State of the Local Environment work that Lisa Shaw was undertaking and that she was fully aware of this priority but the lifespan of indicators remained difficult to predict and **Partners agreed to ZO's suggestion that the Terms of Reference should include wording that pulls together the main CSP work areas into a coherent whole.**

4.4 The issue of CSP membership was discussed with partners noting that various partners' organisations were experiencing change and flux. The abolition of the Primary Care Trust was raised as was the contingent issue of identifying a suitable replacement representative organisation. OE made a number of recommendations and TC agreed to make inquiries regarding potential health representation.

**- ACTION - TC to contact potential health representatives from Public Health, Sussex Community NHS Trust and the Royal Sussex County Hospital and inform chairs about their interest, for decision.**

4.5 The lack of business representation on the partnership was again raised and the potential for relaxing the requirements for membership from representative to individual organisations was discussed but members agreed that the Terms of Reference allowed for outside participation on working groups and the inclusion of other voices through the public nature of meetings. It was agreed that the conditions would stand for the 'core' partnership but that efforts should be made to co-opt appropriate participants when needed. **Partners agreed that further representation from the business community and public health should be sought**

**4.6 Partners agreed to AH's assertion that efforts should be made to include a representative from state schools onto the partnership.**

**4.7 Partners agreed that there was a need to update the induction process for new members before the next CSP meeting.**

**- ACTION - CM and TC to update the induction process for new CSP members.**

4.8 Partners agreed that the Terms of Reference needed further work and therefore would not be presented at the next B&HSP meeting.

**- ACTION - TC to amend and re-circulate Terms of Reference and also contact Anthony Pope regarding rescheduling the CSP TOR for B&HSP Agenda item from the 22.03.11 to the 24.05.11**

## **5. One Planet Framework Workshop Feedback**

5.1 TC gave a brief description of the agenda of the CSP One Planet Framework workshop that was hosted by Best Foot Forward (BFF) at Hove Town Hall on the 28.02.11. He then detailed the main outcomes and asked for feedback from the partnership to BFF regarding their impressions and suggestions for the Stakeholder workshop due to be held on the 23.03.11.

5.2 PS and SD were very positive regarding the focus and coverage of the BFF event, noting that the work focussing on trajectories based on current and required actions to achieve commitments and targets was particularly clear and well illustrated. Partners were agreed that BFF's approach to this work had already brought some clarity to the inter-connected relationships between environmental areas of work / focus and the need to identify and map out these relationships to identify actions and responsibilities that will achieve the required impacts.

5.3 **Partners were agreed that the main issue with the Framework workshop was that of resourcing and capacity in regards to the delivery of the Framework and that they would like to see this explored by Best Foot Forward at the Stakeholder Workshop on the 23.03.11.** TC stated that this would be a major focus of the stakeholder workshop.

5.4 **Partners agreed that more time should be given to unpacking the One Planet principles at the Stakeholder Workshop as they were likely to be less familiar with the key concepts than CSP members. They also stressed that more time should be allowed for discussion within the group work session to explore the issues in greater depth.**

**- ACTION - TC to feed back to Best Foot Forward the partnership's observations and comments regarding the workshop. Particularly mentioned were the need for a more detailed breakdown of the One Planet principles for the Stakeholder Workshop and longer group sessions to discuss**

the framework.

## 6. Key Work Areas

6.1 CT informed the partnership about the outcomes of the meeting between the CSP chairs and Geoff Raw on March 4. These focused on the CSP deciding what would be their 'Big Asks' for the post-election administration and with regards to the Intelligent Commissioning process. TC noted that these would fit with the CSP main priorities and would be likely to address major initiatives such as large scale retro-fitting, the Biosphere Reserve and the One Planet Framework.

6.2 These main priorities should form the bulk of the work streams incorporated into the CSP business plan that would be developed in partnership with the Sustainability Team and CSP Chairs for the next meeting. **Partners agreed that TC would develop a CSP business plan for the next year in partnership with the Sustainability Team and the CSP Chairs.**

**- ACTION - TC to feedback to Chairs and Geoff Raw the CSP's draft 'Big Asks' for the new administration and in response to the council restructure and Intelligent Commissioning.**

6.3 TC then detailed the sustainability strand of the Interim City Performance Plan to the partnership. He informed them that this work was to a very tight deadline, 01.04.11, and hence the intention that it is an 'interim' plan. He agreed that Lisa Shaw would circulate the draft plan to the CSP chairs for immediate comment. **Partners agreed that TC and LS would develop the sustainability section of the interim City Performance Plan as there was a tight time limit on submission.**

**- ACTION - LS to circulate the draft City Performance Plan to CSP Chairs for comment.**

## 7. Brighton and Hove City Wildlife Forum

7.1 Stuart Derwent introduced himself to the partnership and presented the minutes from the last meeting of the Brighton and Hove City Wildlife Forum, held 22.02.11

7.2 SD discussed with partners the need for a positive approach, good consultation and inclusion practices with local groups and residents and the ongoing issue of support and buy-in from local communities for environmental initiatives in the city. Wild

Park was cited as an example bad practice that had resulted in a lack of joint working and antagonism which could have been avoided. The partnership whole heartedly agreed and stated that the CSP had a role to play in bringing people together and mending bridges. CT particularly noted the need to consult with local people before the development of management plans for sites

7.3 PB noted that the solution was usually simply better communications and engagement practices. SD agreed that there was a need to provide better and more timely information that was generally simple, understandable and brief.

7.4 SD then raised a concern about the Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP), stating that there was only a two week consultation on such a long anticipated and important document. CT informed him that this was a pre-consultation period and that there would be a full consultation of 12 weeks following this.

7.5 MC noted that the University of Brighton had designed its own Biodiversity Action Plan which may be of use in shaping the LBAP.

**- ACTION - MC to forward the University of Brighton's Biodiversity Action Plan to Mathew Thomas.**

7.6 The format of the B&HCWF minutes were discussed and CT requested that any specific actions for the CSP be highlighted within the summary box on page one. SD agreed.

**8. A.O.B**

8.1 The Friends of The Earth Question Time event, held 05.01.11 was discussed. CT informed partners that this could be viewed online at:

Weblink: [http://connect.brighton-hove.public-tv.site/player/pl\\_v7.php?a=54471&t=0&m=wm&l=en\\_GB](http://connect.brighton-hove.public-tv.site/player/pl_v7.php?a=54471&t=0&m=wm&l=en_GB)

**- ACTION - CM to circulate Friends of the Earth Question Time Event Weblink to CSP partners**

8.2 The CSP trip to the Southern Water Treatment Plant at Peacehaven was briefly discussed. Attending partners agreed that it had been an interesting and useful visit and a very impressive

project, but indicated that there were various issues they would like to note and explore through feedback to Southern Water.

8.2.1 The main concerns raised here were the lost opportunity to impose sustainability conditions on tenant farmers leasing back land from Southern Water at the site; the unsuitable nature of the green roof for grazing, recreation or agriculture; the assertion by Southern Water that they would be achieving an industry standard level in the treatment of waste water, with partners being not wholly convinced by the argument that tertiary treatment with ultraviolet light was too energy intensive to be sustainable environmentally; and finally the partners would like more information regarding the energy requirements of the site as they felt the stated running cost of £1 million per annum seemed excessive.

**- ACTION - CM to draft a feedback report to Southern Water regarding the Peacehaven Water Treatment Site, this will then be circulated to the partnership for further comment and suggestions.**

8.3 Work being undertaken by focussing on public procurement standards and procedures was raised and the partners considered whether this may be an opportunity for the CSP to make recommendations. TC informed the partnership that joint procurement procedures had been raised by Geoff Raw at the recent meeting with CSP chairs so could be followed up in the "big asks".

8.4 Next meeting to be held **16.05.11 at Committee Room 1, Brighton Town Hall, Bartholomew Square, Brighton, BN1 1JA starting at 5.30pm**

