

Public Document Pack



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Virtual on Tuesday 5 January 2021 at 9.30 am

Members Present Mrs E Lintill (Chairman), Mrs S Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Briscoe, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Plant, Mr A Sutton and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent

In attendance by invitation

Officers Present Mr A Buckley (Corporate Improvement and Facilities Manager), Ms Stephanie Evans (Environmental Coordinator), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs S Peyman (Divisional Manager for Culture), Dr Andrea Smith (Climate Change Officer), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs V McKay (Divisional Manager for Growth), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Ms A Stevens (Divisional Manager for Environmental Protection) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

96 **Chair's Announcements**

There were no apologies for absence.

97 **Approval of Minutes**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 8 December 2020 be approved as a correct record.

98 **Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

99 **Public Question Time**

The following public question was asked by Tom Broughton:

While I am pleased that the Chichester District Council has an ambitious target in the Climate Emergency Detailed Action Plan (CEDAP) of an area wide annual

reduction of Greenhouse gases of 10%, it is not documented why this target was chosen and what the consequences of this target would be in the district's contribution to the Climate Crisis. It seems to fall between business as usual and what is needed in order to ensure the district keeps within the carbon budget enshrined in the Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement was informed by the latest science on climate change and defined in terms of science based carbon setting. This carbon budget is based on translating the "well below 2°C and pursuing 1.5°C" global temperature target and equity, principles in the United Nations Paris Agreement to a national UK carbon budget. The Tyndall Centre of the University of Manchester then further sub-divided this carbon budget to the local authorities of the UK. It concluded that the Chichester District needs to reduce its carbon emissions by 13.7% per year from 2020. If the district continues to cause the emissions of carbon at the current levels, then this budget will be expended by 2025! If the district reduces its emissions by 10% per year then the budget will be expended by 2030, only a further 5 years. So, for example a house that uses gas for heat will expend its budget by 2025, similarly a fossil fuelled car. The title of the document contains the word 'emergency', it needs to reflect that it its target. Could the justification of the 10% annual target be explained? Political expediency or what is perceived as possible is not enough. We are in an emergency, our house is on fire, the scientists have spoken, we need to act as if this has been fully understood.

Cllr Plant provided the following response:

Thank you for your question. The climate emergency needs to be addressed at all levels, local, national and international. Our plan sets out actions that the District can achieve, whether as individuals, households, partner organisation or directly by the District Council. The target reflects that. More could be achieved with greater action at the national and international level, indeed we are seeing the emergence of new programmes, policy and funding from the UK government. However we are wary of setting a target that relies on those as yet undefined higher level actions. We are aware that the target will have to increase by 2025 at the latest in order to catch up with the 13.7% reduction curve you mention. However, setting an unachievable target based on assumptions of action at a national level risks falling short, dispiriting those who want to back our action plan and emboldening those who think local action is not worth pursuing when compared to international action. We will be keeping the plan under regular review and should regional and national initiatives and policy allow us to increase the District-wide target further and faster, then we will do so. On a more technical note, we are aware of the Tyndall work and it is discussed in the Supporting Technical Information to the plan. The Tyndall figures do not reflect emissions relating to Land Use and Land Use Change and Forestry. Trees sequester significant amounts of carbon emissions in Chichester district as shown by figure 1 in the Supporting Technical Information. This therefore closes the gap between where we are and where we need to be according to the Tyndall centre. Furthermore we are about to embark on a significant tree-planting project in the district which will help still further. That said, we are not complacent. We know that we still need to do more and are developing a pipeline of activities to achieve the target.

100 Climate Emergency Detailed Action Plan

Cllr Plant introduced the item. She requested that the Cabinet vote on an additional third recommendation:

That authority be delegated to the Director for Planning and Environment following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Chichester Contract Services to make any minor or editorial amendments to the final version of the Climate Emergency Action Plan.

Mrs Evans responded to members comments and questions. She explained that all targets would be subject to review. With regard to the Citizens Assembly funding has been allocated for professional support to aid the recruitment process to oversee the demographic representation on the Assembly. Mrs Evans confirmed the intention to launch a behavioural change campaign in line with other districts, boroughs and the County Council. With regard to the target figures referenced on pages 9 and 10 of the Cabinet papers she explained that people are prepared to make the sacrifices required for the greater good with the decarbonisation of electricity already happening nationally.

Dr Smith then responded to further comments and questions. She explained that many of the actions that would contribute to achieving the district wide targets sit outside of the council's control and are stimulated by government incentives, but the council has a role as community leader that could help others to make the needed changes. With regard to the small number of consultation participants she reported that the communication team said the pandemic which prevented face to face participation in locations such as the city's markets had impacted the number. Consideration will be given to improve participation in the future including engaging with younger people either through university, college and/or social media.

Cllr Sharp was then invited to speak. She supported the retrofitting of housing and requested a representative spread of age ranges on the Citizens Assembly. She asked with reference to section 3.11 of the report why section C removed the proposal to set up a road transport group. Mrs Evans explained that there were other existing Groups/Forums in place and that further Group was unnecessary.

In a vote the following recommendations were made:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

1. That the Climate Emergency Detailed Action Plan as set out in Appendix 1 be approved.
2. That the recommended Council responses to the consultation comments received as set out in Appendix 2 be approved for publication.
3. That authority be delegated to the Director for Planning and Environment following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to make any minor or editorial amendments to the final version of the Climate Emergency Action Plan.

101 Cultural Grants Funding Agreement Extension Request

Cllr Briscoe introduced the item.

Members commented on the need for a thorough review in a year's time in order to consider the cost/benefit analysis.

Cllr Oakley was then invited to speak. He requested clarification of when a full review would take place, when to expect a decision from that review and how that timetable would fit with the council's wider reviews. Cllr Briscoe responded and thanked Cllr Oakley for his input. He explained that the review would need to feed into the 2022/23 budget. He agreed to provide a full written response to his questions.

In a vote the following recommendation was made:

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

That a one year extension of grant funding to the 31 March 2023 be awarded to both Chichester Festival Theatre and Pallant House Gallery in line with Arts Council England funding.

102 Initial Project Proposals 2021-2022 and Corporate Plan

Cllr Lintill introduced the item. She explained that usually a new Corporate Plan would be brought forward but following the pandemic it is proposed to seek a one year extension in order to develop a new set of priorities. She then outlined the three IPPD's for 2020/21 projects that the Cabinet is requested to consider:

- Terminus Road Land
- 2022 Year of Culture
- Decarbonisation of CDC Buildings

Mrs McKay responded to questions related to the IPPD for Terminus Road Land. She explained that the initial work would look at the use of the land, taking into account the council's Climate Emergency Action Plan. An options appraisal will then take place to consider the possible uses for the land. With regard to not using land to the south of the site she explained that this area was not in the council's ownership.

Cllr Oakley was then invited to speak. He asked whether the Local Plan Review would be taken into account in relation to the IPPD for Terminus Road. Mrs McKay explained that it would be considered at the point it has reached at the time of the options appraisal.

In a vote the following recommendation and resolutions were made:

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

That the Corporate Plan 2018-2021 be extended for a period of one year.

RESOLVED

1. That the new project proposals for 2021-2022 as set out in appendices 1 to 3 be agreed.
2. That subject to the agreement of para 2.2 of the report that Cabinet approve the release of £40,000 from Chichester District Council's General Fund Reserve to fund the consultancy and feasibility work identified in para 5.2 for 2021-2022.
3. That it be noted that any projects that exceed £50,000 or have a major impact will be subject to a full Project Initiation Document (PID) and considered by Cabinet and Full Council, if over £100,000, at a later date.

103 Late Items

There were no late items.

104 Exclusion of the Press and Public

There was no requirement to exclude the public or the press.

The meeting ended at 10.44 am

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank