



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**SUSTAINABILITY CABINET  
COMMITTEE  
City Sustainability Partnership  
Minutes 17 January 2011**

**3.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 9 FEBRUARY 2011**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

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



### City Sustainability Partnership Meeting – 17<sup>th</sup> January 2011

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

#### *Public Services:*

Councillor Ayas Fallon Khan

Councillor Paul Steedman

Dr Olumide Elegbe - Brighton & Hove Primary Care Trust

Deborah McGuchan – 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

#### *Business:*

Lorraine Bell - Brighton & Hove Chamber of Commerce

#### *Agencies:*

Phil Belden - South Downs Committee

#### *Guests Included:*

John Patmore - Brighton & Hove Wildlife Forum

Roger French – Brighton and Hove Buses – **Chair of B&HSP**

Richard Beard – 3Ts – Sussex Royal County Hospital Redevelopment

Claire Hall – Hall Creative

#### *Council Officers:*

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

Charlie Stewart – Director of Resources

Geoff Raw – Director of Place

Lisa Shaw - Policy Development Officer

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 Chris Wick, Cllr Gill Mitchell, Eleanor Bell, Mike Wenham, Charlie Allesbrook and Alison Hadfield.

**Action – Cllr Fallon-Khan to chase response from Hyde**

### Development regarding the CSP response to the Open Market Redevelopment proposals

#### 2. Introduction of new City Council strategic directors Geoff Raw and Charlie Stewart.

2.1 Charlie Stewart the new director of resources introduced himself to the partnership and explained his role within B&HCC's new organisational structure. He informed partners that although TC was within his line of management, sustainability was predominantly the responsibility of Geoff Raw. He went on to state that his role as Director of Resources was focused on systems and internal B&HCC resource management and efficiency, covering IT support, Property, Communications and Policy, Performance and Analysis. He stated that he did have responsibility for the property aspect of the sustainability agenda for B&HCC and that he was seeking to develop support services across the city and was having discussions with the B&HSP and the PSB regarding designing frameworks for the sharing of resources in various public service areas.

2.2 He emphasized that he was not responsible for defining outcomes or for commissioning except for 'city services' which covers births, deaths and marriages for which he was lead commissioner in partnership with David Murray, Strategic Director of Communities.

2.3 Geoff Raw then introduced himself to the partnership and described his role as Strategic Director of Place. His responsibilities include the environment, planning regulations, licensing, policy debates, waste, street cleaning, parks, city housing stock, major developments and economic development and encouraging industry into the city and service commissioning. He stated that he was looking to the CSP to feedback to him which services worked in regards to sustainability priorities and which could be done better.

2.4 He stated that his first impressions were that more could be done to utilise the natural assets of Brighton and Hove, particularly in relation to encouraging tourism and that there were significant issues around the city's infrastructure, particularly waste and water management and feed-in tariffs.

2.5 GR also told the partnership that he would like to see a 12 month work plan that was focused on 'do-able' actions and

embraced the opportunities for CSP contribution in regards to the commissioning of services. He also stated that that he was committed to developing an infrastructure that supported economic growth, demonstrated value for money, builds resilience into the local economy and improves residents' lives.

2.6 VB asked how the CSP could ensure that sustainability was built into the Intelligent Commissioning process. GR repeated that he would like the CSP to make recommendations on which service areas were not working and to think about the criteria by which services would be monitored for their sustainability performance and the degree to which sustainability priorities would be weighted to ensure good performance.

2.7 GR suggested that the Sustainable Community Strategy may have to be reviewed and amended in regards to the consideration of sustainability and the impact on economic development and growth and the particular agendas and priorities of the incoming administration after the local elections in May. Partners questioned the usefulness of reviewing the SCS and asserted that this would be a job for the B&HSP.

2.8 CS asserted that the work of the CSP within the IC cycle would be more practical in that once the priorities were agreed the thematic partnerships would focus on the outcome chains from the eight themes within the SCS, reviewing to ensure robustness and to review the performance compacts for new services.

2.9 CW and CT raised the issue of funding and support for the partnership and CS replied that the PSB and B&HSP was reviewing the funding arrangements for all of the thematic partnerships and that the partnership should make recommendations and suggestions for funding in writing to him.

**Action – CS invited CSP to comment on which public services need to be re-commissioned in regards to sustainability and their environmental performance.**

### **3. Verbal Updates on key CSP work areas**

#### 3.1 Local Climate Impact Profile

3.11 Lisa Shaw updated the partnership on the progress of the Local Climate Impact Profile, informing the partnership that the

report would be focused on extreme weather events, the potential effect on service delivery and potential responding action. It would seek to assess the residual risk to business continuity, mitigation measures and the potential to feed this into the Intelligent Commissioning process. The draft report would be presented to the partnership on the 16.05.11 and the final report would then be presented to the B&HSP, the PSB and Cabinet in September 2011.

3.12 Partners questioned whether the report would cover financial costs incurred by extreme weather and the insurance implications / potential costs and asserted that this focus may achieve a level of buy-in from the business community. LS replied that this would be covered in the report but was not a main focus.

### 3.2 State of the Local Environment Report

3.21 LS informed the partnership that she was in the process of pulling together the data to give a decent snapshot of the natural and built environment of Brighton and Hove and that this would identify gaps in data, benchmark and track the direction of travel. VB asked whether LS was satisfied with the quality and spread of the data and CW asserted that there were contingent issues regarding the costs of measuring the quality of the of the environment.

3.22 The timescales for the report were to have a draft report ready by the beginning of May and a draft report taken to CSP on the 16.05.11

**Action – Lisa Shaw to include mitigation in regards to insurance and risk in the scope of the report.**

### 3.3 Best Foot Forward

3.31 Thurstan Crockett updated the partnership on the progress of the One Planet Living Plan and the consultants Best Foot Forward who had been selected from a shortlist of three consultancy firms to undertake this work. They were successful in their bid over the other two tenders as it was felt they had the most experience, they had worked with SEEDA on Diamond ecological footprinting, and they had developed a 'wiki' tool for ecological footprinting.



3.32 TC went on to describe the program for the work and the timescales laid out in the project briefing report, informing partners that there would be a facilitated workshop for CSP members to review and contribute to this work in late February and a second workshop would be run in late March to encourage participation and buy-in for the One Planet Living Plan by other relevant city stakeholders. The first draft of the plan was scheduled for completion by mid May 2011.

3.33 GR voiced his concerns that the plan would be focused on the most carbon neutral way forward and how this would impact on other areas of this SCS, stating that he would like to see considerations of all impacts. CT stated that given Best Foot Forward's experience of working with Local Authorities he would expect a degree of 'sense checking' as this was one of the reasons for their successful tender and that the wider stakeholders were aware of the potential ramifications of change. PS stated that the task of the stakeholder workshop was to get just this sort of feedback.

**Action – Thurstan Crockett to feed back to consultants that recommendations should be practical and should consider economic and social impacts.**

### 3.4 Biosphere Reserve

3.41 CT informed the partnership that the Biosphere Reserve Steering group were due to meet at the end of January and that he would email an update of the progress of this project to partners following this.

**Action – Biosphere Reserve - Chris Todd to email the partnership regarding the Biosphere Reserve bid and the outcomes of the steering group meeting due to be held later in January.**

### 3.5 Climate Change Action Plan

3.51 Susie Howells who is the new Senior Sustainability Consultant in Brighton and Hove City Councils Sustainability Team introduced herself to the partnership and gave an update on the progress of the work on the Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP).

3.52 SH informed the partnership that she had begun the work by reviewing the current draft to determine which elements were still useful, and was now focused on data use, prioritisation, performance and content structure. SH told partners that she was currently working on reviewing the actions within the SCS to determine how the CCAP work will fit with other work in the city.

3.53 SH went on to inform the partnership of the outcomes of the CCAP working group session that was held on the 01.12.10. The main recommendations from the group were; that the mitigation and adaptation sections should be incorporated into the main document so as to illustrate the potential impact of climate change and corresponding potential action planning;

3.54 SH stressed that links need to be forged, particularly with transport and housing, to further the data collection and analysis stages of the work and to incorporate the CCAP into strategic planning in these areas; that National Indicator 186 (per capita CO2 emissions) is one of the national indicators that will be maintained.

3.55 SH informed the partnership that the first draft of the CCAP would be completed by the end of February 2011 and the e-version should go live by the end of July 2011

3.56 CT informed the partnership that he had written to the Economic Partnership, Housing, the City Transport Partnership and the Public Service Board to ask how they plan to quantify the impact of their work programmes in terms of the carbon emissions they are likely to achieve.

#### **4. Royal Sussex County Hospital Redevelopment Proposal**

4.1 Richard Beard from 3Ts gave a presentation to the partnership regarding the redevelopment proposals for the Royal Sussex County Hospital. He began by describing the current need to expand the Neuroscience Department which is too small for the requirements of the population of the city and the Trauma Centre which will become the main site for the South East and the need to bring them together within one location to improve services for residents. He also stated that the Sussex Cancer Centre was already operating beyond its capacity and that patients were currently being moved around available beds. RB stated that there would also be an expansion of the hospital's research and teaching facilities. He went on to state that the

project was focused on the rebuilding of the Jubilee and Barry buildings which were constructed in the 1890's and were seriously outdated.

4.2 RB detailed the three stages of the development, Stage 1 & 2 being focused on the construction of the two new buildings and the development of the Sussex Cancer Centre and the Brighton and Sussex Medical School, the third stage being concerned with the greening of the development with gardens and roof terraces. He stated that the building had been designed to allow for a view from every in-patient room.

4.3 The majority of these gardens would be accessible by all patients and staff though there are plans to have a dedicated area for patients undergoing Iodine Radioactive Therapy. The partnership was informed that an ecological advisor would be consulted to advise on natural species that would increase biodiversity in the city and would be suitable to the particular weather conditions of the site, i.e. salt water and high winds, to advise on suitable use of grey water that is sufficient to the health requirements and infection concerns particular to the site, and to off-set any potential Urban Heat Pool effect. RB also informed partners of the progress of the comprehensive transport review which was seeking to generate ideas and suggestions for the provision of transport to and from the site.

4.4 RB went on to discuss the particular power requirements of the hospital and informed partners that the site would be using CCHP (Combined Cooling and Heating Power) which is a system that provides cooling alongside heat and power from the same energy source. Here excess heat produced is cooled by absorption chillers linked to the CCHP system. This provides chilled water for cooling to be circulated around a building or community. This is particularly useful for schemes that require a large amount of air conditioning.

4.5 Partners asked whether there were plans to redevelop the rest of the hospital site, particularly the Sussex Eye Hospital. They were informed that this was not a priority at present as the main driver for the redevelopment was to rebuild the two most outdated buildings.

4.6 AFK inquired about the planned level of treatment at the Sussex Cancer Centre, whether it would be specialist or general treatment. RB answered that the plan was predominantly to expand

the existing capacity to treat more patients but that there would be some specialist treatment incorporated, particularly Stage 2 cancer treatment.

4.7 Lorraine Bell inquired to what extent local labour suppliers and contractors were being utilized in the project. RB informed the partners that the project adhered to the P21 system which requires that the development is centrally funded through a lead developer and all contractors feed through him. It was decided that this would ensure the greatest chance that the project would be completed on time and within budget. RB asserted that they were keen to use local workers and suppliers but that they would have to be insured within P21 requirements. LB stressed the importance of the employment of local sources of labour and materials in regards to the sustainability requirements to achieve the mentioned BREEAM status. RB replied that they were still developing this facet of the project and was open to any suggestions the partnership could make.

4.8 Mike Creedy inquired as to whether any consideration had been given to the heat management / recovery of the site. RB answered that he would consult with the developers and get back to the partnership with information regarding this issue. AFK suggested that the developers consult the Sussex Research Centre regarding a project they were working on to evaluate the embodied emissions throughout the construction process. RB agreed to the suggestion that the partnership facilitates contact between the contractors and the Sussex Research Centre to discuss this.

4.8 Partners discussed the ecological aspects of the development and Cllr Paul Steedman stated that the partnership would welcome a consultation regarding biodiversity and greening of the site. CT questioned the suitability of the layout on the Eastern Road, particularly the size of the drop off area for cars. He pointed out that this design does not allow for a direct crossing point for bus users and pedestrians and increases the distance for users of public transport. RB asserted that the majority of patients, particularly the more seriously ill, use cars when attending appointments and it was therefore essential to balance the needs of patients against sustainability considerations. CT replied that it was the size of the drop off that compromised all other transport considerations and that some balance should be sought. RB replied that a comprehensive transport review had not been undertaken yet and that the present positioning and size of

the drop-off point was indicative rather than set.

4.9 The provision of Bus and Train information in the main concourse of the site was discussed and agreed to. The issue of expanding the capacity for car parking was discussed with RB. Olumide Elegbe questioned the need to expand the current parking provision and stressed the importance of encouraging local residents to use public transport wherever possible.

4.10 Partners then discussed the planning application timescales and requirements for the project. PS informed the partnership that the formal application would be submitted in April 2011 after which would follow a four month consultation period. VB added that there would also be a Healthy Living Impact Assessment before the proposal goes for planning permission.

4.11 OE questioned the potential health impact on the city of an increased capacity in regards to patient numbers and catchment area of the Sussex Cancer Treatment Centre and the South East Trauma Centre, pointing out that this would increase pollution and traffic. RB replied that there was no significant increase in the amount of beds.

**Action – Partnership to feedback to 3Ts CSP recommendations and comments regarding the redevelopment.**

**Action – Cllr Ayas Fallon-Khan to facilitate contact between the developers' architects and the Sussex Innovation Centre business that is developing a system for measuring the 'embodied emissions' of major builds.**

## 5. Partnership Administration Report

5.1 TC outlined the proposals contained within the administration report, with the main recommendation that the partnership consider other options for funding rather than rely solely on B&HCC for support and resource funding.

5.2 VB and MC were unconvinced by the suggestion to alter the status of the partnership, particularly to that of a Community Interest Company (CIC) pointing out that the partnership was not an 'asset' and that there would be contingent issues regarding appropriate models such as a co-operative or mutuality which would require a high level of knowledge building on the part of members to fully understand.

5.3 LB stated that it was very disappointing that B&HCC would not commit to funding the partnership for administration support for one day per week beyond April. VB agreed, stressing that her organization were supporting her role at the CSP financially. It was pointed out that budgets were being cut and that decisions on this were not due to be finalised until early March.

5.4 PS pointed out that the CSP was a young partnership and that it was dangerous to change the status of the partnership and to effectively separate itself from B&HCC in terms of administrative support as he stressed the level of support and the current holistic approach was unlikely to be met by another organisation. He also pointed out that B&HCC had the capacity to champion the partnership's priorities across all sectors.

5.5 LB commented that business cannot be the solution to all the gaps in funding, stressing that they were already donating time and money to the city through business rates. She also pointed out that the Economic Partnership was requesting funding from the PSB. PS stressed that this was the time to make funding bids and lobby the PSB and the B&HSP before they set their budgets.

5.6 CT stated that if the partnership were agreed that B&HCC should support the partnership then that should be fed back. VB asked whether the partnership would be writing to CS regarding this and partners agreed.

**Action – Chris Todd to write to Charlie Stewart regarding funding support for the partnership and raise with B&HSP Chairs as a wider issue affecting the family of partnerships.**

## 6. Partnership Review

6.1 TC informed partners regarding the scope and purpose of the four reports which had been generated by the Partnership Review. The reports covered external and internal recommendations for the CSP, amendments to the CSP Terms of Reference and suggestions for changes to the membership of the CSP. He told partners that they should consider the changes and recommendations and that Catherine Miller would circulate an email garnering responses to the review points.

**Action – Catherine Miller to circulate an email to all partners requesting comment and suggestions regarding the review**

### **recommendations, changes to the CSP membership, constitution and Terms of Reference.**

6.2 GR told partners that they needed to focus on do-able actions and have a clear vision as to the purpose of future CSP work in the city and that this would govern funding gaps and opportunities that the partnership could then target outside / private / business funding and resources on a project by project basis.

6.3 Partners discussed the possible expansion of the CSP membership; **partners were agreed that they did not want more members as this would make the partnership unwieldy, but that efforts should be made to encourage participation from existing non attending members. Inquiries will be made to find out the underlying reasons for non-attendance and whether there are opportunities for changing the representatives from organisations.**

**Action – Catherine Miller and Thurstan Crockett will telephone non-attending members to inquire what the reasons are for non- attendance and whether they will be attending in the future.**

6.4 OE and PB pointed out that many of the non-attending partners' organisations were going through re-organisation and flux. LB pointed out that there were three business places on the partnership that could be better utilised. It was suggested that businesses such as EDF and Southern Water could be encouraged to join as a member of the Economic Partnership and it was also noted that if a structure could be created to support outside networks it could strengthen the community and voluntary sector. LB suggested that the partnership make contact with David Shepherd from EDF energy regarding future opportunities for joint working.

6.5 PB questioned the likelihood of companies such as EDF and Southern Water wanting to join the partnership. He pointed out that it would be beneficial to include them in work that was relevant to them and which they could have a real impact in delivering such as the South Downs and the Biosphere Reserve bid. GR and PS agreed that the partnership should decide on two or three initiatives that would change the city and approach companies will a clear idea of how they can contribute and achieve real impact. PS suggested that the partnership develop a work plan for the year to aid in identifying areas where

outside organisations could contribute to work. TC stated that he was working on the City Performance Framework which is the delivery plan for the SCS and emphasised that it was the ambition of the CSP chairs to shape all future CSP agendas around this.

**Action – Thurstan Crockett to feed back to Voluntary Sector and Ross Gilbert regarding the partnership's discussion of potential membership inclusion.**

**Action – Chairs to consider and select / amend the appropriate recommendations**

**Action – Chairs to consider the changes to the CSP membership, constitution and Terms of Reference finalise the amendments before presenting them to the Brighton and Hove Strategic Partnership for approval / sanction.**

### 7. A.O.B

- 7.1 Southern Water Peacehaven Water Treatment Plant Visit – CM requested that partners interested in the visit to the water treatment site contact her by email by the 21.01.11.
- 7.2 CT informed the partnership of the upcoming consultation by The National Grid re: The undergrounding of power lines due to begin on the 16.03.11
- 7.3 TC reminded partners that Sussex University's Green Week was due to begin on the 05.03.11, which was to include an Energy Union event for raising awareness in young people.
- 7.5 CT also informed the partnership of the upcoming Friends of the Earth event scheduled for the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> February
- 7.6 OE and VB commented that the Air Quality Action Plan consultation was complex and confusing. Partners also said there similar problems with the Local Transport Plan 3 consultation.

**Action – Chris Todd to feed back partners concerns to B&HCC**

- 7.4 Next meeting to be held **14.03.11 at Committee Room 1, Brighton Town Hall, Bartholomew Square, Brighton, BN1 1JA**