

Notes of City Sustainability Partnership Meeting – 06 March 2013

Committee Room 1, Brighton Town Hall, Bartholomew Square, Brighton, BN1 1JA

Present:

Public Services:

Becky Ritchie – Sussex Community NHS Trust (BR)
Councillor Ollie Sykes – Brighton & Hove City Council (OS)
Councillor Pete West – Brighton & Hove City Council (PW)
Councillor Tony Janio, Brighton & Hove City Council (TJ)
Dan Danahar - Dorothy Stringer School (DD)
Zoe Osmond - University of Brighton (ZO)

Community and Voluntary Sector:

Chris Todd – CVSF Environmental Rep – **Chair** (CT)
Christine Gent – Brighton & Hove Fairtrade Steering Group (CG)
Roger Carter – Brighton & Hove's Wildlife Forum (RC)
Vic Borrill – Brighton & Hove Food Partnership – **Vice Chair** (VB)

Brighton & Hove City Council:

Dean Austyn – Performance Analyst (DA)
Matthew Thomas – Council Ecologist (MT)
Nick Hibberd - Head of City Regeneration – representing **Partnership Manager** (NH)
Rich Howorth – Biosphere Reserve Project Officer (RH)
Sarah Jones – Senior Support Officer – **Meeting notes** (SJ)
Shelaine Siepel – Sustainability Consultant (SS)
Steve Foster – Project Manager, One Planet Living (SF)

Observers included:

Jon Patmore – Ecologically

1. Apologies

1.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Denise Cobb, Councillor Gill Mitchell, and Geoff Raw of Brighton & Hove City Council; Cat Fletcher, Mark Strong and Ruth England of CVSF; Alistair Hill of Brighton & Hove Primary Care Trust; Will Clark, Sussex Community NHS Trust; Patrick Pica, University of Sussex; Mark Brunet, Blatchington Mill School; Damian Tow, Sustainable Energy Working Group; and Danni Craker, Brighton & Hove Chamber of Commerce. Thurstan Crockett, Partnership Manager was represented by Nick Hibberd of Brighton & Hove City Council. Vice-Chair Vic Borrill was to leave at 6pm.

2. Actions and matters arising from last meeting

2.1 Chair requested updates on the following actions from the last meeting.

6.2.1 SJ had received additions from members for Sussex

sustainability organisations document. **Action: SJ will make final version available on CSP webpage.**

- 2.6.2.4 Work Programme Group had had its first meeting in February and had submitted a written update to the meeting.
- 3.2 City Energy Study workshop date had been announced.
- 3.3 Link to AECOM's study had been circulated.
- 5.2 SJ to circulate draft Economic Strategy to partners after its release following the 15 January 2013 workshop: there was to be an update item later in the meeting.
- 9.4 Link to Seafront Strategy had been circulated to members.
- 9.7 City Plan consultation responses had been circulated.
- 2.2 ZO advised that this point should be amended to show that Brighton & Hove 10:10 were one of the partners to secure DECC funding for Green Deal Pioneers scheme. **Action: SJ to amend minutes to reflect this.**
- 2.3 Chair announced a new order for the Agenda. The first two items were to be Draft Economic Strategy refresh & consultation and Sustainability Action Plan update. The rest of the items would then follow as on the published Agenda.
- 3. Draft Economic Strategy Refresh and Consultation – update**
- 3.1 NH briefed the members on the background to the Economic Strategy refresh. He advised that Adur and Lewes District Councils, Worthing Borough Council and Brighton & Hove City Council are currently in negotiation phase until the autumn with government re Greater Brighton City Deal initiative. The Economic Strategy will need to be aligned with our City Deal proposals.
- 3.2 NH advised members of the consultation event scheduled for 07.03.13, invited them to attend and asked for their input to the review.
- 3.3 VB expressed concern that the draft strategy had presented a high growth city in opposition to a sustainable city and Chair agreed that this was a naïve interpretation of the city's potential. NH advised that debate at the last consultation event had concluded that the city's sustainable economic growth should not be at the expense of its character. ZO's feedback from the event was that these were seen as complementary, and VB reiterated this on behalf of CSP.
- 3.4 VB was also concerned that no further information had been provided after the first consultation event and that there had been

no opportunity to comment on the refresh. She therefore felt unqualified to attend the next meeting, although she would attend on behalf of the CSP. **Action: VB to feed back and request input from members after the event.**

- 3.5 NH stated that there was now a need to realign the Economic Strategy with the Sustainability Action Plan and allow more time for CSP and others to feed into process. NH reassured partners that there would be a further opportunity to comment on the draft following the event on 7 March 2013.
- 3.6 ZO asked for the strategy to emphasise the benefits of green growth and retrofit.

4. One Planet Living Sustainability Action Plan update

- 4.1 SF advised members that the Plan would go to Policy & Resources Committee 21 March. If approved, the Plan would then go to the Brighton & Hove Strategic Partnership on 25 June followed by submission to BioRegional for accreditation as the first One Planet City. Deadline for comments was 8 March 2013.
- 4.2 Next steps are to develop governance, project management, performance measurement and high level indicators; links will be made to the Sustainable Community Strategy when it is reviewed.
- 4.3 Phil Belden joined the meeting.
- 4.4 JP asked why there was no One Planet Council section in the Land Use and Wildlife chapter. SF advised that this is because all the actions are seen as city-wide. He also confirmed that the SAP is merged with the Local Biodiversity Action Plan.
- 4.5 VB wanted a forum for internal leads and external leads to get together and requested CSP to recommend this. NH confirmed that the new Chief Executive had made a commitment to this at the One Planet Living Board on 1 March 2013.
- 4.7 CT expressed concern at the Transport chapter, which had been written without discussion with the Transport Partnership or any other city partners. He found it disappointing and highly lacking in ambition and he has requested that this be addressed. SF reassured members that the issues raised by CT were being considered by transport colleagues.

5. Biosphere Management Strategy update

- 5.1 RH gave a presentation to members on the Biosphere Management Strategy.

- 5.2 RH asked members to promote the consultation to their networks. They had received 200 submissions online and 200 on paper. They required a minimum of 2,000 responses to demonstrate a robust process to the nomination panel.
- 5.3 CT asked members to promote the consultation to their networks. ZO requested RH send regular email updates for forwarding to networks.
- 5.4 VB left the meeting.

6. Local Biosphere Action Plan update

- 6.1 MP updated members on the revised Local Biosphere Action Plan (LBAP). He asked that members adopt the plan and presented it as their key to sustainable development in the city.
- 6.2 RC, PB and JP expressed their concern that the comments of the Brighton & Hove Wildlife Forum (BHWF) had not been included in the revised LBAP. They found the plan uninspiring, with few objectives to improve number of species, an emphasis on non-native plants, and no reference to geology, geomorphology or local features. They believed it was not fit for purpose, especially as a supporting document in the Biosphere Reserve bid.
- 6.3 MT advised that the LBAP has been revised as a scientific document to underpin the Biosphere Reserve bid, as required by Unesco. Its objectives have therefore changed since the start of the LBAP consultation.
- 6.4 Regarding the criticism regarding species: MT had avoided detailed lists of species and not included species that were dealt with in existing action plans. He had not included geology: as an ecologist he felt unqualified to approach this, and also felt that the LBAP was a forum to address species, not geology. Non-natives plants had been included on the basis of their high profile and popularity in the city; Rampion, he believed, was dealt with efficiently in the Chalk Grassland plan.
- 6.5 PB was concerned at the low number of responses to the consultation (13 in all) and that there was no response from key regional and national partners. MT confirmed that he had received input from South Downs National Park Authority; Natural England, Sussex Wildlife Trust and RSPB and as far as he was aware they were happy with the LBAP. As a partner, RSPB did not respond formally but MT offered to forward the relevant emails if necessary. Nevertheless, partners remained concerned that in its current form the LBAP was not accessible to a wider audience. PW advised that a presentation on the LBAP had been delivered to the Environment & Sustainability Committee which was in a more accessible format. MT was asked to ensure that the LBAP was presented in a more accessible way during the delivery phase.

- 6.6 Chair recommended CSP adopt the LBAP as partnership policy, but that it was not appropriate for the CSP to take the LBAP to the Brighton & Hove Strategic Partnership for adoption in its current form. This was agreed.

7. Big Nature Centre presentation

- 7.1 DD presented to members on the planned Big Nature Centre at Dorothy Stringer School.
- 7.2 In answer to questions from members, DD confirmed that £5m was required to fund the project; that it would take 3 years to build; that they had trustees in place and were starting a dialogue with potential partners.
- 7.3 PB said it was good to have a centre located in the city; citing its accessibility to local schools and the general public. ZO questioned the siting of a set of buildings and wildflower meadows on an intensive sports space. Would there be a conflict of land uses? DD confirmed that the Surrenden campus already has 6000 visitors per day and that quite a few schools have already demonstrated the ability to walk to the campus. The site is equidistant from the centre of town to the downs; Planners see no great problems associated with its use for such a venue; and the project fits with the idea of developing the campus into a biodiversity park.
- 7.4 PB suggested the Field Studies Council as a potential partner, and advised of the need to work in a complementary fashion with other providers (Sussex Wildlife Trust; RSPB, Pulborough Brooks; Railway Land, Lewes; other educational trusts / providers) to optimise the range, depth and quality of provision, and target the diversity of audiences. DD agreed that the FSC would be interesting partners and because the project is in its infancy, such a partnership is a real possibility.

8. Brighton & Hove Wildlife Forum priorities

- 8.1 RC drew members' attention to the minutes of the last BHWF meeting that had been circulated before the meeting. He confirmed that the forum's priorities were biodiversity, the LBAP, the Biosphere. He confirmed that their main concern was with the LBAP, as set out in section 6 of these minutes.

9. Updates and Information

9.1 Health & Sustainability Working Group

- 9.1.1 BR advised members that the group had had its first meeting on 27 February 2013 and referred them to the minutes that had been circulated before the meeting. The group is developing a

routemap for sustainable healthcare in Brighton & Hove. The group agreed that their focus would be on carbon and the use of resources.

9.2 Work Programme Group

9.2.1 CT advised that the group had had its first meeting, to look at the work programme for the CSP for 2013. They agreed three main priorities for the year: Zero Carbon, particularly retrofit; securing Biosphere Reserve status; and Better Business, a programme focused on local business. The theme of the May meeting was to be Equity and Local Economy, which would help in developing the CSP's third priority.

9.2.2 NH noted that this focus on Better business would be helpful to address the concerns raised in point 3.3 of these minutes, regarding the Economic Strategy. Members agreed with this.

9.2.3 The Group wanted members to identify what resources they can allocate to the agreed priorities. **Action: Chair asked members to respond on this in time for the next CSP meeting on 16 May.**

9.2.4 The group also requested a report on performance and indicators at the next CSP meeting in May, which DA agreed to prepare. **Action: TC/SJ to liaise with DA to bring this report to the meeting on 16 May.**

9.3 Fair Trade Steering Group

9.3.1 CG updated members on the activities that had been taking place during Fairtrade Fortnight.

9.3.2 The Group has developed a lesson plan for primary schools in the city, on how fairtrade engages with Brighton & Hove.

9.4 Waste and Materials Group

9.4.1 This is a new group and has not had its first meeting yet.

9.5 Sustainable Energy Working Group

9.5.1 The group had been working on the Zero Carbon chapter of the SAP.

10. Any Other Business

10.1 Members agreed to try and mitigate in the conflict over the removal of an old elm tree as part of the Seven Dials road improvement scheme. PW advised that the Transport Committee had approved the removal of the tree for reasons of safety and equality. Members

planned to look at options such as building a raised plot for the tree and the possibility of a shared space development.

- 10.2 CT advised partners that the Rampion resubmitted their plans for a development consent order on 01.03.12. This would be followed by a 28 day consultation period.

Date of next meeting: 16 May, 5pm-7pm, Conference Room 1, Brighton Town Hall, Bartholomew Square, Brighton BN1 1JA.

