

City Sustainability Partnership Meeting - 1st November 2010

The Auditorium, Brighthelm Centre, North Road, Brighton, BN1 1YD

Public Services:

Councillor Ayas Fallon Khan

Councillor Vicky Wakefield Jarret (substitute for Councillor Paul Steedman)

Dr Olumide Elegbe - Brighton & Hove Primary Care Trust

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

Business:

Lorraine Bell - Brighton & Hove Chamber of Commerce

Agencies:

Chris Wick - Environment Agency - **Vice Chair**

Phil Belden - South Downs Committee

Guests Included:

John Patmore - Brighton & Hove Wildlife Forum

Elona Hoover - University of Brighton

Zoe Osmond - University of Brighton

Tom Chute - 10:10 Campaign

James Grugeon - Environmental Protection UK

Nick Hutchinson - Ecosys Environmental Management & Education

Council Officers:

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

Jan Jonker - Head of Strategy, Waste and Parks

Tom Hook - Head of Scrutiny

Karen Amsden - Overview and Scrutiny Officer

Richard Tuset - Head of Policy and Performance

Lisa Shaw - Policy Development Officer

Mita Patel - Senior 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, Cllr Paul

Steedman, Cllr Gill Mitchell, Deborah McGuchan, Eleanor Bell, Alison Hadfield, Mike Wenham (replacing Jan Jackson)

- 1.2 Chris Todd (CT) welcomed Olumide Elegbe to the partnership as the new representative from Brighton & Hove PCT. He also thanked Jan Jackson for her contribution to the partnership and informed members that her replacement representative from the Sussex Enterprise would be Mike Wenham who had sent his apologies for being unable to attend tonight's meeting.
- 1.3 Action 1.2 from the previous meeting - CT reported that he had written to Richard Davies regarding the Open Market regeneration proposal and had received further information which Catherine Miller had circulated to partners for their comments and suggestions. Phil Beldon (PB) asked the partnership if this would be discussed at tonight's meeting and it was agreed if there was time.
- 1.4 Action 1.52 from the previous meeting – CT informed the partnership that he had written to the South Downs National Park Authority and had not received a reply.
- 1.5 Action 3.5 from the previous meeting - **It was agreed that Cllr Fallon-Khan (Cllr AFK) would extend an invitation to the new strategic directors of Brighton & Hove County Council (B&HCC) to attend a future CSP meeting.**
- 1.6 Action 5.2 from the previous meeting - A short report by Catherine Miller regarding the Knowledge Transfer Partnership was discussed and partners were informed that although this avenue of funding had potential for future CSP work it was not suitable for the funding of a partnership support officer.
- 1.7 Action 7.3 from the previous meeting - Mathew Thomas had circulated further information regarding the Local Area Biodiversity Plan (LBAP) to the partnership.

2. Renewables Scrutiny Panel Update

- 2.1 Tom Hook (TH) and Karen Amsden (KA) informed the partnership about the progress of the Renewables Scrutiny Panel and described the rationale and processes involved. They were told it would be a short, focused piece of work that would cover best practice in other authorities' work, environmental factors and public safety in regards to renewables projects, and the extent to which B&HCC were

supporting renewables projects. The project was at an early scoping stage for which a scoping meeting was set to be held on 03.11.10 and the partnership was invited to make recommendations and to offer evidence and shape the focus of the panel's inquiries.

- 2.2. Partners asked whether the panel would cover Bio-fuels and what the natural boundaries would be, particularly whether the panel had the capacity to include the sea in its scope. Partners were informed that this would be decided at the scoping meeting but there was the capacity to consider these issues.
- 2.3 CT verified that the scoping meeting was due to be held in two days and inquired whether there would be potential to amend the decisions reached beyond this time. TH informed partners that the scoping report could be amended beyond this date. **Partners agreed to contact the scrutiny team with any suggestions for the scope of the Renewables Scrutiny Panel before 03.11.10**

3. Sustainable Cities Index

- 3.1 Thurstan Crockett (TC) gave a brief description of the results of the 2010 Sustainable Cities Index and informed partners that there was a separate document which was then circulated that detailed the background of the indicators and the specific outcomes for Brighton and Hove.,
- 3.2 TC stated that that Brighton & Hove was the only city to be in the top three for the four years the Index had been operating and went on to explain that the selection of indicators changed slightly from year to year which had some effect on the results of the index but stressed that this would have not have influenced the results in the ecological footprint measurement which was due to residents and visitors high consumption in such areas as air travel, dining out and food miles which was reflected in the low performance on the environmental indicators.
- 3.3 TC went on to state that the Index did offer a snapshot of how Brighton & Hove was performing compared to other cities and that indicators used could be considered in terms of adoption into the work of the One Planet Living Plan (OPLP) and the State of the Local Environment Report (SOLE)

- 3.4 TC went on to explain some of the ways in which the indicators had changed and could have had a negative impact on the reported performance of Brighton & Hove. These included, the previous measurement of the state of a city's river, which Brighton & Hove does not have, resulted in an average score in this area, and the change in how the indicator concerning sustainable transport was measured, which had previously been based on satisfaction with the local bus service and in which we had scored top, but had been replaced by a measurement of access to services without a car. TC argued that Brighton & Hove was particularly accessible in terms of public transport, walking or bike which was not reflected well. The final change that had affected the results was that of the quality of green space which had changed from a measurement of resident satisfaction with open spaces to a measurement of number of Green Flag parks in relation to the size of population.
- 3.5 Phil Belden (PB) noted that although Brighton & Hove was still in the top three we had slipped in ranking since the start of the Index and warned against complacency. He stressed that we had performed badly in regards to our ecological footprint and pointed to the poor performance in the green space and biodiversity and was particularly concerned at the ranking of 12th in recycling. Jan Jonker (JJ) replied that Cityclean was not complacent and had improved its' recycling performance and had a strategy for the implementation of further initiatives to improve the rate and coverage o Brighton & Hove's recycling.
- 3.6 Cllr AFK replied that he had heard an interview on Radio Sussex with Forum for the Future, the organisation that created and manages the Sustainable Cities Index, in which they had asserted that Brighton & Hove had performed really well over the entire package of measurement.
- 3.7 Cllr Vicky Wakefield-Jarret (Cllr VWJ) Noted that although we had performed well in the indicators for health and education this was not universal to all Brighton & Hove residents as there was still great disparity across the city in these areas.
- 3.6 Chris Wick (CW) argued against the adoption of the Index's indicators as he was not convinced they accurately reflected the city's environmental performance. He asked if the SOLE report would cover the replacement of the Local Area Agreement targets to which TC replied that the SOLE report was not concerned with the adoption of targets. CT noted

that the Index was useful to highlight areas which needed particular improvement but that targets should not be set directly out of it for the sake of performing well in this particular Index.

4. One Planet Living Plan

- 4.1 TC informed the partnership that Policy Development Manager Emma McDermott had written the reports that he would be discussing and went on to say that there was a brief of explanation for the planned progress of the OPLP. Partners were invited to comment on the brief and to make recommendations of other consultants who could be approached for tender for the ecological footprint work described. Lorraine Bell (LB) noted that it would be good to have a local business involved in this aspect of the work

Agreement- Partners agreed the brief as outlined and agreed to contact TC by 12pm 05.11.10 with further suggestions regarding other consultants to be approached for tender regarding ecological footprinting work

- 4.2 Cllr AFK asked whether the partnership would have to advertise the work to the European community under the guidelines of the OJEU but TC informed him that the budget at £15K was well below the threshold.
- 4.3 Partners inquired whether the CSP would be involved in agreeing the successful tender and it was **agreed that Chairs would be closely involved in the appraisal of tenders and the selection process for the ecological footprinting work required by the OPLP brief.**

5. State of the Local Environment Report

- 5.1 Lisa Shaw (LS) presented her briefing paper on options regarding the structure and scope of the SOLE report and reminded partners that at the last meeting there had been an agreement that she would take forward the SOLE report and that tonight's report was a brief summary of some preliminary thinking regarding this work.
- 5.2 LS requested that partners agree to her setting up a working group to monitor and steer this work to ensure it maintains its independence from B&HCC. The group would be concerned with three main areas which were; firstly the structure of the report, options for which are contained within section 3.1 of

the paper but include whether it could be based on the structure of the Environment Agency's regional State of the Environment reports, or tied to the OPLP and Sustainable Community Strategy or a random collection of priority themes. This also presents other questions such as if it should look at the natural environment or cover the urban / built environment as well. Secondly the group would consider the basket of indicators to be included in the SOLE report. LS indicated section 3.1.2 of her briefing report and pointed out that this would be contingent on the availability and frequency of data and her capacity in the 5 months she would be working on this piece. Finally the group would consider the emerging issues and priorities to come out of the SOLE report. She therefore asked the partnership to consider the outlined structure for the SOLE report and to ascertain who might consider joining the working group.

- 5.3 LS pointed out to members that her report did not cover how the partnership should use the report once it had been developed, including how it should be communicated and interpreted. LS suggested that the partnership might want to consider this as part of its thinking about how the partnership functions within the Intelligent Commissioning process.
- 5.4 PB referenced Islington's SOLE report which had included both the natural and urban environments and stressed that this report had also included actions which he felt were essential. Vic Borrill (VB) agreed that there was a need to include the urban environment and inquired whether this was a capacity issue. LS replied that there was the capacity and it was simply down to the partners to decide the scope. **It was agreed that the SOLE report should cover both the natural and the built environment in its scope.**
- 5.5 Chris Wick (CW) informed the partnership that the Environment Agency was changing the scope of their State of the Environment reporting to include a more local level focus and also asserted that there should be an identification and examination of trends to facilitate a more forward thinking aspect to the SOLE report and that areas of duplication of other work should also be considered. LS stated that the SOLE could maybe serve to report other works finding rather than repeat existing work. CT suggested that indicators should be selected based on their efficacy and usefulness in relation to all current works and CW stated that the gathering together of well established indicators would facilitate better trend analysis.

- 5.6 CW went on to state that the lack of available data would mean that there would be gaps which would lead to a situation where the report would have to achieve a 'good enough' level of data gathering. LS suggested that the report could then serve to indicate where the gaps in data currently lie and suggest ways forward. TC agreed that identifying the gaps in data was important and also suggested an added criteria within section 3.1.2 of the report which would consider the cost of gathering data and also, given the abolition of the Local Area Agreement, would examine which of the existing indicators would be likely to be in existence into the future.
- 5.7 PB asserted that some consideration should be given to indicators that are accessible to the public and capture public interest such as the number of elm trees as these are more likely to encourage action on their part rather than the more scientific and specialist indicators. Olumide Elegbe (OE) suggested that there should be indicators that relate to health and are forward looking such as the relation between health and air quality such as 'new cases of asthma and other respiratory illnesses.
- 5.8 Other Stakeholders that could be approached for the working group were discussed and Cllr AFK suggested the Primary Care Trust to which OE agreed. **It was agreed that LS should set up an electronic working group that would consider the above discussed work. It was also agreed that those members that wanted to join the group or who had further suggestions for the inclusion of other suitable and useful participants should contact her by 05.11.10**

- ACTION - Catherine Miller to circulate email requesting that partners contact LS by 05.11.10 if they wish to join the working group and if they have suggestions regarding other stakeholders / participants.

6. Climate Change Action Plan Update

- 6.1 Mita Patel updated the partnership on the progress of the CCAP and the CCAP working group session. The key outcomes from the working group were that there was a general consensus that the action plan be less council centric and include greater representation from the city but that the council should be the lead in terms of coordinating content regarding actions and targets. There was agreement that there should be greater linking of actions to the Sustainable

Community Strategy and that these targets and priorities should be distinguished from those within the OPLP. There had been good suggestion regarding the lack of baselines regarding actions that would be needed to focus targets and there was recognition of the need to re-focus the chapters on waste, food procurement and renewables. There was also mention of the need for the working group to consider long term funding and resourcing of the CCAP.

- 6.2 Actions that arose from the working group were: that the Action Plan needed to be tweaked in order to sharpen it's focus; that the section on adaptation and mitigation needed to be reconsidered so as to illustrate the difference between them which would also be informed by LS's work on the Local Climate Change Impact Profile (LCLIP); the potential for future support and research from the University of Brighton; and the need to include the City Transport Partnership and other suitable contributors in the work on the transport section and the development of a transport strategy which was considered to be weak.
- 6.3 The timescales for the progress of the CCAP were contained within the report though MP did stress that responses to the actions should be received ASAP. She stated that as well as ongoing CCAP working group sessions there would be workshops to include other stakeholders and that an e-version of the CCAP should be finished by July 2011.
- 6.4 Partners discussed the potential structure for the split between the Adaptation and Mitigation facets of the plan and there was a suggestion by PB and CW that rather than independent chapters both should be incorporated into the chapters so as to illustrate what could happen in a given situation regarding climate change and then what actions can be taken to deal with such an occurrence.

7. Waste Strategy Group

- 7.1 Jan Jonker (JJ) discussed with the partnership the current strategy to improve consultation and community engagement n regards to the council's policies of waste management. He complimented the partnership on their level of feedback and informed them that in the last few months there had been the formation of an advisory group consisting of interest and knowledge based contributors that were committed to the creation of waste strategy for Brighton & Hove.

- 7.2 JJ went on to point out the success of the partnership with VB regarding food waste recycling, whilst stressing that the success of this and future projects hinged on uptake by communities and not upon Cityclean undertaking the majority of work per se. JJ stressed that the future success of projects was to be facilitated by the support of trial projects by community groups that could be rolled out on larger scale across the city.
- 7.2 JJ informed members that the next stage was the creation and dissemination of leaflets across the city to publicise recruitment to the advisory group and invited questions from the partnership.
- 7.2 VB asked whether the community and voluntary sector had been approached regarding community engagement and also whether Angie Greaney and the Communities Team at B&HCC had been included in the programme. She pointed out that the role of facilitator was particularly demanding and would need supporting. VB also asked if this could be seen as a move towards community composting initiatives and what other organisations had been approached outside of the University of Brighton.
- 7.3 JJ stated that the facilitators would be supported by Cityclean and that the project was at an early stage but that it was envisioned that other organisations would be involved and supported and that he would like to see stronger ownership and involvement by community groups.
- 7.4 PB inquired after the usage of communal bins and their effect regarding individual responsibility for waste recycling. JJ answered that they were monitoring the levels of recycling in relation to the introduction of communal bins. PB asked if this monitoring was focused solely on the bins in the city centre. JJ replied that this monitoring was focused on both residential and city bins and he stated that there did seem to be a contingent drop in the levels of recycling.
- 7.5 Partners discussed the issue of 'ownership' of issues affecting recycling pointing out the lack of action on the part of supermarkets in this area and the need to educate consumers. JJ mentioned the legal guidelines regarding the over packaging of products and informed the partnership of Cityclean's web information on this issue. VB suggested a 5

point Action Plan regarding Cityclean's programme for food waste recycling.

- 7.6 CW pointed out that there was a danger that community engagement on the issue of waste could become a forum for discussion regarding service provision and asked if Cityclean had considered the possibility that discussion of the issues could be clouded by negativity and dissatisfaction over other council services and decisions such as Hollingdean depot and wheelie bins. He also pointed out that the document presented at the meeting already stated 'what Cityclean wanted to achieve' which he felt was too far along the process for satisfactory community engagement and he suggested that residents should be asked what they wanted. JJ replied that the intention of the Action Plan was to mitigate against such negativity. CW suggested that the very name of the forum could be reconsidered to mitigate against such negativity pointing out that 'The Waste Advisory Group' implied all waste issues. He also suggested a separate forum to allow residents to voice their opinions regarding other waste issues. CT argued that he did not see the issues as separate and that Cityclean would have to push through initial unburdening process.
- 7.7 The constitution of WAG and likely stakeholder engagement at meetings was discussed. CT pointed out that there must be a balance of experts and residents present. JJ responded that they envisioned that project leaders would attend whilst there may not be a huge or regular attendance by the residents' network and CT suggested the creation of representatives from the network who would be asked to attend on the part of their particular communities.

8. 10:10 Campaign Update

- 8.1 James Grugeon (JG) introduced the 10:10 campaign update and Tom Chute (TCh) who then gave a Power Point presentation to the partnership detailing the progress and main outcomes and issues surrounding Brighton & Hove's 10:10 City campaign. He stated that Brighton & Hove's campaign had been a huge success, garnering 1,000 sign-ups which represented 12.5% of the total national figure and had become a model for other cities such as Mexico City. The engagement of the business community had been particularly high and he pointed to the excellent branding and immediate recognition value of the logo as being instrumental in this. TCh went on to state that the campaign

was multi stranded with businesses being targeted through the educational awareness programme and group work which included work with *Profitnet* and the Chamber of Commerce. Communities and residents were targeted through various local awareness raising events and added that the cost of delivery of the programme was cut enormously by the high level of voluntary engagement by individuals.

- 8.2 TCh went on to discuss what the future may hold for the campaign. He stated that greater communication with sign-ups was required to push for further action and that the formation of a steering group was required to discuss how to inspire these pioneers to go forward. He informed the partnership that funding existed until April from SEEDA for the collection of case studies and that a big wrap up event was being planned. There was a suggestion that the campaign may look to target retro fitting in the private sector to combat CO2 emissions from private housing but beyond this he looked to the CSP, PCT and the business community to suggest what the future may hold during phase two.
- 8.3 Partners thanked TCh and JG for their work and discussed the sign-up levels of residents and businesses and how to increase this number. It was questioned whether a shift in attitudes had occurred or if those that had signed up were already committed to the values espoused by the campaign. JG replied that the true figure of sign-ups was expected to reach 2,500 and pointed out that others were inspired by the campaign's values to reduce waste and emissions without officially signing up to the campaign and OE suggested that more could be done to emphasise the lack of negative publicity or sanctioning if individuals and businesses did not hit the campaign targets. OE also suggested the creation of 10:10 buddies to inspire and motivate each other, particularly for the business community
- 8.4 Cllr VWJ suggested that students and landlords in the private sector could be targeted and TCh replied that this was an integral facet of the future national campaign. VB asked whether the campaign would continue and if it would need re-branding, TCh replied that the campaign would definitely go on and that future overarching message of the campaign would now shift from cutting waste and emissions by 10% in 2010 to 10 ways to cut emissions by 10%. LB pointed out that with a budget of £23K the campaign had achieved outstanding results.

- 8.5 CT suggested that the success of the campaign and future implications should be reported to the Brighton & Hove Strategic Partnership for further discussion.

9. Brighton and Hove Wildlife Forum

- 9.1 John Patmore briefly discussed the minutes from the previous meeting of the Brighton & Hove Wildlife Forum drawing partners attention to the discussion regarding the Sustainable Cities Index. He questioned the relatively poor performance in the areas of ecological footprint and biodiversity and suggested that this was partly due to a disconnection between B&HCC and the countryside.

10. Dates and Venues

- 10.1 **The programme for future CSP meeting dates was discussed and agreed and partners were asked to note a change to the next meeting date which would now be held on the 17.01.11**
- 10.2 The venue for future CSP meeting was discussed and it was agreed that, given the limited funds available to the partnership, it was acceptable to hold future meetings within B&HCC premises. **Therefore it was agreed that Committee Room 1 at Brighton Town Hall would be the most suitable venue.**

ACTION- Catherine Miller to book Committee Room 1, Brighton Town Hall for future CSP meetings -

11. A.O.B

- 11.1 MP reminded partners of the Biodiversity 'Big Nature' Conference to be held at Dorothy Stringer School on the 10.11.10 and to register online on the council website if they wished to attend.
- 11.2 Next meeting to be held **17.01.11 at Committee Room 1, Brighton Town Hall, Bartholomew Square, Brighton, BN1 1JA**