

27th July 2020

Summary note – Green City Partnership Board

PRESENT:

Liz Ballard (LB) – Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust
Councillor Mike Chaplin - (MC), SCC
Councillor Simon Clement-Jones – (SCJ), SCC
Councillor Peter Garbutt (PG), SCC
John Grant – (JG) Sheffield Hallam University
Fiona Griffiths – (FG) SHU
Edward Highfield – (EH), SCC
Prof Lenny Koh – (LK) University of Sheffield
Councillor Tim Huggan - (TH), SCC
Councillor Mark Jones (Chair - MJ)- SCC
Laraine Manley – (LM), Place Portfolio, SCC
Zac McMurray – (ZM), Sheffield CCG
Andy Sheppard – (AS) Arup
Thomas Sutton – (TS) Sheffield Chamber of Commerce
Cllr Alison Teal - (AT), SCC
Martin Toland - (MT) Amey
Rick Watson – (RW) Sheffield Climate Alliance
Nigel Wilson – (NW) Veolia
Mark Whitworth – (MW) Climate Change and Sustainability, SCC

Attending guests

Tom Finnegan-Smith – (TFS),
SCC James Harries – (JH) Ricardo
Lara Turtle – (LT) Ricardo
Victoria Penman – (VP) Economic Development, SCC

Apologies:

Emma Bridge, Greg Fell, Susan Hird

		ACTION
1.	WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND AGENDA REVIEW The Chair of the meeting (Councillor Mark Jones) welcomed all those in attendance.	
2.	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING The minutes of the meeting held on 10 th June 2020 were agreed as a true record with the exception of a repeated comment by LB which will be amended. There were no matters arising.	VP

3. ZERO CARBON COMMISSION – WORK PACKAGE TWO

James Harries, Ricardo (Principal Technical Consultant – Climate Action Planning and Transparency) presented slides recapping the aims of the project, the methodology and detailed findings for Work Package 2 of the commission, outlining the trajectory of anticipated CO2 reductions if the city continued to act in line with current national and local policies (see attached slides).

The modelling indicates that the city should anticipate a 23.4% CO2 reduction from 2017 by 2030 and 34.7% reduction by 2037. Zero carbon would not be achieved even by 2050.

It was emphasised that this is a modelled forecast and so isn't tremendously reliable, as demonstrated by the forecasting carried out in relation to Thurock's emissions and the actual reductions.

Key observations made by JH were:

- Sheffield has already made some good progress – the rate of emissions reductions so far has been higher than the national average.
- But the policy landscape is not sufficient to meet net zero by 2030, or even to continue this level of emissions reductions into the future.
- This reflects the picture at the national level, where the current policy landscape is not sufficient to meet the fourth and fifth carbon budgets, nor net zero by 2050.
- Much of the progress in recent years has been from grid decarbonisation, which has progressed at a rapid pace.
- The additional gains from this are lower than previously and more focus will need to be turned to tricky areas such as decarbonisation of heat and transport.
- Expected forthcoming policy announcements will have an impact, but still not enough.

Questions were taken from the Board.

Clarifications

- The analysis only covers CO2. It is recognised that there is a relatively small level of emissions from other GHG which will also need to mitigation.

Further questions.

- (LB) Is there always a negative correlation between growth in GDP and CO2 reduction? (JH) Energy accounting considers activity so there will always be a link between activity and emissions. It is

possible to decouple the two but generally there is a negative correlation. This isn't necessarily true if there is a move to a more circular economy where wealth is generated but not emissions, for example potentially in places that are starting to have doughnut or circular economies. (LB) suggested that there should be a discussion about the circular economy.

- (LB) Were there any particularly good Policies in Sheffield that have contributed to the decarbonisation? (AS) It's very difficult to quantify the impact of individual policies from the data.
- (ZM) Noted that from a GP perspective, reducing pollution or encouraging people to travel more actively is very much needed and a positive side effect of some carbon reduction activity to also reduce asthma and other health conditions. Asked if it is possible to look at interventions from a household or business level to demonstrate when there would be a return on investment and whether could be a single point of simple information to help people navigate what they can do to reduce emissions. Noted that the NHS will be changing the way they do things, for example up to a 25% reduction in outpatient appointments and increasing the amount of work being done remotely. Innovations like this may not be taken into account as 'policy' but could have a significant impact. (JH) The resources are probably out there, but not in one place. (AS) suggested that it is possible also for the council to invest a relatively small amount of money to support access to a much larger amount of external funding. (JH) noted that it would be beneficial to do work with the 'able to pay' market to enable people to access the information they need and support them to take action themselves. This is a way of buying some time to enable emissions to be reducing while policies are put in place.
- MJ asked about the benefits of citizen led science observations. AS/JH Replied that it's important to have citizen engagement, but the real impact comes from the policy change. Both are needed and together can be the sum of their parts - for example if you have people who want to have active travel as well as segregated bike lanes, you'll get a lot more people cycling than if you had one or the other.
- AT expressed concern about the incinerator due to the need to reduce waste as well as emissions, asked whether calculations had been done about the impact on emissions if the incinerator wasn't burning waste, and raised concerns about the long term implications for the incinerator if waste is reduced. Also whether calculations had considered the impact if there was no animal agriculture in the city. JH, this hasn't been done, there is potential for doing some of this in

WP3. AS noted that the way emissions are calculated means that emissions are very low. MJ expressed a view that the district heating network should continue, but that as there have been year on year reductions in waste, going forward it may be necessary to consider alternative ways of fuelling the district heating network. AT asked that if renewable energy could be used to fuel the district heating network that this be considered in future.

- MJ asked if the government's biogas consultations would be taken into account. JH/AS not as yet, but all options will be considered in WP3.
- JH there have been no consideration of meat agriculture emissions, and BEIS have also not considered this.
- PG asked whether counterproductive policies had been taken into consideration e.g. national policies investing into airlines, road-building, loosening of planning regulations. JH/AS it will have taken into account everything positive up to April 2019, but not negative. It would be likely to be difficult to reach assumptions, particularly to have the level of certainty needed for the work. It would be possible to include as a sidenote.
- TH would like to see a clear delineation of what Sheffield has within its control so we can squeeze down hard on that, where it can work with local colleagues and where we need to pressure government and join forces with other cities. AS this will take place in the next work package, and will explore the different options and responsibilities, and focus on what the council can do, and what else needs to happen through other groups and individuals, bringing back the focus to actions that the council can do (recognising the funding situation).
- ZM will the work include a cost-benefit analysis, for example for individuals, would it be cheaper to get rid of an older boiler and replace it with a heat pump: could the city buy e.g. heat pumps in bulk? AS this is the kind of analysis that will take place but not to an individual scale, but the work will compare costs and benefits and policies.
- RW notes that it is necessary to increase insulation before installing heat pumps. Asks that as well as providing information on what can be done, the Council communicate what is already being done because whilst there is a lot more than needs to happen, there is good work being done. The SCA is also doing more than people know. Also asks that minutes from these meetings be prioritised and circulated more quickly. MJ responded that he recognises that communication is not as effective as it could be and is looking to recruit staff to do this. Covid has impacted significantly on capacity

	<p>but work is underway to make this happen because it is recognised that individuals can make a difference here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RW this is the 2nd emergency that the council has to had to respond to. Covid is being responded to but the council isn't treating the climate emergency as an emergency. MJ recognises that there needs to be more focus on the climate emergency and work with councillors and officers will be taking place to address this as part of this work. ● PG asked how the recommendations and actions that the report puts forward will become policy. Sitting on the Planning Committee he finds it perplexing how the Council is only working on 10% reduction in energy. MW responded that once the commission is complete there will need to be a process to disseminate and embed recommendations, across the council and across the city. The expertise that Arup and Ricardo bring from working elsewhere will help us understand how this has been done elsewhere, but we know this is not going to be an easy task. ● PG asked whether the Sheffield Plan will be taking into consideration the recommendations from this work? MJ The imminent consultation provides an opportunity for the Board and this commission to feed into this. This will be picked up with MW and VP. 	<p>MJ/MW/ VP</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Chancellor's summer statement</p> <p>MW presented the paper outlining proposals in the Chancellor's summer statement, a package of up to £3bn.</p> <p>The Green Homes Grant will provide funding for domestic retrofitting, including 100% of works for those on low incomes. Council's role in Green Homes grant is likely to be fairly small, but there is a question for the board about how we as a city could make the most of this funding. Does the Board consider that city partners have a role in promoting this scheme to ensure that we have wider take-up than in previous or how we could ensure fairness and that vulnerable households are protected? There were no responses.</p> <p>The public sector decarbonisation scheme is undetailed as yet but will provide £1bn - are other partner organisations considering how they might take advantage of this, or if they would be interested in a joint bid, or for the green jobs fund?</p> <p>LB responded that again there is very little detail around the green jobs fund at this stage and that they would be keen to expand existing placements but wary of providing short term displacement activity rather than longer term jobs, but happy to consider accessing and work with other partners as things become clearer. Sheffield & Rotherham Wildlife Trust will definitely be responding to the Nature for Climate fund, tree planting, peat restoration and working with the City Region Combined Authority.</p> <p>MW suggested that it may be helpful to bring this back in September and</p>	

	<p>that the Council are keen to explore the opportunities provided by the social housing investment funds further. Ideas were invited from Board members, including thoughts about how we might also start thinking of interventions to strengthen the economy.</p> <p>AT recalled a piece of work carried out with Regather, looking at the potential for installing solar panels which would reduce emissions and fuel poverty. Is revisiting this an option? MW will raise with housing colleagues and AT will also raise.</p> <p>LB raised that £16m come into the city for flood management, the majority of which is likely to be concrete, is there potential to consider how carbon accounting will be carried out while the Commission is still reporting? TF-S confirmed that carbon emissions will form part of the appraisal for flood management projects. More broadly, this is part of the conversations that are taking place within the council, and ideally it would be something that is part of the options appraisals rather than considered later in the process.</p> <p>RW asked should the council be carbon budgeting, for example in building roads? The accounting process is complex, but important.</p> <p>AS Embodied carbon accounting is not often mandatory and have various standards. this won't be included in the current work as it's consumption based rather than emissions based.</p> <p>RW this highlights a big gap as the current commission doesn't consider scope 3 emissions.</p> <p>MJ will take this away to discuss with MW and VP</p> <p>MW a form of carbon assessment tool will be created as part of this work, this will be simple because what has been found elsewhere is that these have been complicated and haven't been used. Hopefully this can be used across the Council and beyond.</p> <p>LB noted that as well as reducing emissions, potential actions should consider sequestration and other opportunities, and also that the focus for this is on carbon dioxide and not on the ecological emergency. Other places have declared an ecological emergency at the same time as a climate emergency but she is not clear what Sheffield City Council's position is. LB asked whether ecology and biodiversity can be considered as part of assessment processes.</p> <p>AS confirmed that this review will look at secondary benefits of interventions, be they social, economic, ecological etc.</p> <p>AT noted that SCC has a large amount of land, much of which is grass and this has the potential to be used to improve biodiversity etc. MJ responded that there is work taking place on this.</p>	<p>MW/AT</p> <p>MJ</p>
8	<p>AOB/CLOSE</p> <p>It was proposed and agreed that for the next meeting, board members would be encouraged to bring forward items to update the board on the</p>	

	<p>activity taking place elsewhere in the city and proposals to encourage collaboration.</p> <p>AT Extinction Rebellion have been in touch and asked if they could attend the sessions, and perhaps a Youth Climate striker.</p> <p>RW Climate Alliance is linking with the Green New Deal, and there may be an ask for more critical friends to be included in the group.</p> <p>MJ suggested that he is happy to keep this under review and consideration.</p> <p>JG noted that there are actions planned by Extinction Rebellion for September.</p> <p>Date for next meeting</p> <p>Invitations for the next meeting in September, along with an invitation for board members to bring items.</p>	<p>VP</p>
--	---	------------------