

Environment Scrutiny Commission

Tuesday 10 March 2020

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Membership

Councillor Leanne Werner (Chair)
Councillor Graham Neale (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Radha Burgess
Councillor Tom Flynn
Councillor Richard Leeming
Councillor Damian O'Brien
Councillor Michael Situ
Jeremey Leach

Reserves

Councillor Peter Babudu
Councillor Karl Eastham
Councillor Renata Hamvas
Councillor Eleanor Kerlake
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Adele Morris

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Access to information You have the right to request to inspect copies of minutes and reports on this agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

Babysitting/Carers allowances If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities so that you could attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form at the meeting.

Access The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. Further details on building access, translation, provision of signers etc for this meeting are on the council's web site: www.southwark.gov.uk or please contact the person below.

Contact Julie Timbrell
on 020 7525 0514 or email: julie.timbrell@southwark.gov.uk

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Eleanor Kelly
Chief Executive
Date: 2 March 2020



Environment Scrutiny Commission

Tuesday 10 March 2020
7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Order of Business

Item No.	Title	Page No.
----------	-------	----------

PART A - OPEN BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

In special circumstances, an item of business may be added to the agenda within five clear working days of the meeting.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATION

Members to declare any interests and dispensations in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.

4. MINUTES

1 - 13

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the open section of the meeting on 4 December 2019 and 20 January 2020.

5. CARBON REDUCTION STRATEGY

Councillor Richard Livingstone, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency, will provide an update on progress and the engagement plan.

6. GREEN ENERGY ON ESTATES & COMMUNITY ENERGY

7. MOVEMENT PLAN

An update on the delivery of the Movement Plan will be provided.

8. SCHOOL STREETS AND LOW EMISSION NEIGHBOURHOODS

Officers will provide and update on school streets and low emission neighbourhoods including:

- a Liveable Neighbourhood pilot around South Bermondsey station and the Bonamy & Bramcote Estates
- Dulwich Healthy Streets
- Walworth Low Emission Zone.

9. WALTHAM FOREST VISIT

Commission members recently visited Waltham Forest to look at the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and Mini- Holland scheme.

10. REVIEW: CARBON REDUCTION STRATEGY 14 - 27

The Cabinet response to the Commission's scrutiny report is enclosed.

An Extinction Rebellion submission on carbon offsetting is enclosed.

Officers will be providing a briefing setting out the percentage of carbon offsets and how carbon offsets are used, to follow.

11. REVIEW: AIR QUALITY 28

A report on SELCHP emissions is enclosed.

A report on the percentage of car parking spaces in the borough is to follow.

12. WORK PROGRAMME

DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER OPEN ITEM AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING.

PART B - CLOSED BUSINESS

DISCUSSION OF ANY CLOSED ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING AND ACCEPTED BY THE CHAIR AS URGENT.

DISTRIBUTION LIST 2019/20

Item No.

Title

Page No.

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The following motion should be moved, seconded and approved if the sub-committee wishes to exclude the press and public to deal with reports revealing exempt information:

“That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1-7, Access to Information Procedure rules of the Constitution.”



ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMISSION

MINUTES of the Environment Scrutiny Commission held on Wednesday 4 December 2019 at 7.00 pm at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Leanne Werner (Chair)
Councillor Graham Neale (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Radha Burgess
Councillor Tom Flynn
Councillor Richard Leeming
Councillor Damian O'Brien
Councillor Michael Situ

**OTHER MEMBERS
PRESENT:**

**OFFICER
SUPPORT:** Pip Howson, Team Leader Transport policy
Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were none.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATION

There were none.

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the Environment Scrutiny Commission held on Tuesday 1 October 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

5. ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMISSION REPORT ON THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY ROAD MAP

The report was noted.

6. TRANSPORT POLICY AND PRACTICE

Pip Howson, Team Leader Transport policy, Place and Wellbeing introduced the Movement Plan.

The chair invited questions and the following points were made:

- i. A member asked the officer to sum up the plan in brief. She responded that the new Movement Plan is a people centric plan. The aspirations are considered to be ambitious and at the forefront amongst transport policy peers in Europe.
- ii. The officer was asked if the plan contained targets and she responded there is a target for 80 % of people to be walking, cycling or using public transport, when undertaking a journey. The plan also integrates of health objectives, which is strength.
- iii. A member said the plan's aims are very good, but queried if the council had the capacity to delivery; including sufficient expertise and financial resources. The officer responded that the detail covering delivery will be in a subsequent document, with a draft expected in February. Funds are available from TFL, though this is reducing gradually, even though costs are rising. Currently the council get approximately 2 million per annual, and a combination of, physical and social projects are funded through this source, with a plan for this spending approved by Cabinet annually.
- iv. The officer was asked about delivery and the relationship with the Highways team. She said that there is a matrix management approach with employees from highways combining with policy leads.
- v. A member commented that transport contributes 27 % of carbon emissions and asked what the council will need to do to achieve zero carbon by 2030? The officer responded that ambitious solutions would be included:
 - Rolling out a borough wide CPZ and restricting kerbside to Electric Vehicles (EV)
 - Ensure that almost nobody owns a car - but where they do

- it is an EV
 - All car clubs are EV
 - Council fleet is EV and only contracting with providers using EV
 - Cargo bikes are the preference for moving goods, where feasible.
- vi. She added all the above are dependent on partners and are a challenge in democracy, and where extensive consultation is required for every policy change.
- vii. A member cautioned against the approach of devolving choices to individuals given the risks associated with Air quality and Climate Change, and asked instead how the council can actively discourage car driving. The officer responded that there is a requirement to consult extensively; however this is also about the political leadership required for significant change.
- viii. A member added that given our public health responsibility members ought to be setting a vision, and this ought to include the that a car ought to be a vehicle of last resort. The officer agreed that we do need clear political leadership, particularly when there is push back on car parking provision. She added that officers have been insisting that all new housing schemes are advertised as car free on Old Kent Road, so clear expectations are set in advance.
- ix. A member commented that Canada Water is still allowing cars. The officer responded that she could not comment on that in detail as her role is focused on the Old Kent Road. She offered to respond to any additional questions in a follow report.
- x. There was a discussion about the capacity to drive change speedily. The officer said the process for highway change requires an initial consultation, followed by a formal consultation, and this must address any formal objections. She commented that the system is quite cumbersome. She said this procedure could be looked at to see if changes could be introduced more swiftly. Highways would need to look at the existing process in more detail. Members indicated that they would take away the point about cumbersome procedure slowing change, and the need to address this if the council is to deliver on a more radical ambition.
- xi. The officer was asked about the delivery of pocket projects, and why only 2/4 has been delivered. The officers said that delayed and blockages from TfL have stalled projects.
- xii. There was a discussion about political will and political pressure. Members that they are lobbied by residents in car free developments. They suggested that the adverts in Southwark Life advertising this coming Saturday as a car free days are setting an unhelpful tone, and queried if these are still needed? The officer said that the council have to balance the need for thriving

highstreets, however she added that there are alternatives that could be promoted, for example cargo bikes in London Bridge and many other ideas.

- xiii. Members commented that there is a gap between aspirations of the Movement Plan and the delivery, which would need to be closed to reach zero carbon emissions.

7. PLAY STREETS

Fiona Sutherland, Deputy Director, London Play presented. Southwark has a play Streets policy in place for about 5 years. The procedure in place is fairly straightforward; a letter is required to residents and 4 weeks notice. She advised this is much better than some boroughs, some of which required 70% of residents to sign up in favour. This is very fearful and not really necessary as the evidence has shown that 90% of people will be in favour, 5% on the fence, and 5% against. Residents can still drive out, although slowly, if they need to, for example if some one has a disability. There is proposed legislation to make things easier.

She said that 80% of the urban fabric is tarmac. The growing dominance of cars over the last several decades has had an adverse impact on children, with freedom to roam reducing severely.

Members asked what approaches have been successful in other boroughs to increase the use of Play Streets. The Deputy Director said having one councillor to promote the scheme in each ward was effective in Redbridge. Encouraging Play Street activism can be effective, for example using Play Streets to have a temporary closure of a rat run street.

London Play said that have been asked to roll out and promote schemes in various boroughs to tackle themes, for example one in Greenwich was part of a programme to improve air quality and reduce cars use.

Member asked about the historical changes in car use. The Deputy Director said the 80s saw a big increase in car ownership and a switch in priorities, previously children came first on the road and any death was treated with horror.

Members asked how Play Streets could be incentivised further. She suggested that members holding Play Streets locally, to promote culture change. There are permanent Play Streets in Westminster borough.

There was a discussion about changing the colour of a Play Street and the Deputy Director said the children creating chalk drawings change behaviour.

A member pointed out that some people live on busy roads which cannot be Play Streets, and it would be unfortunate if initiatives like these were to divide people in neighbourhoods from those living on side streets from those living on main streets. The Deputy Director said that with the right publicity and promotion Play Streets encourage people from a wider area

to enjoy a car free space.

A member commented that Southwark's Play Street page could be more user friendly, and that it lacks joy. The transport policy officer said that resident feedback has been the process is was easy. She agreed the process ought to be a simple as possible, however she cautioned that setting up a Play Street involves taking on a legal duty. She offered to take this away and the comment on conveying the process as simply as possible, and the issue over the attractiveness of the design.

RESOLVED

Officers will provide a note on improving the application for Play Streets.

8. WALKING

Katherine Jacobs, Living Streets London manager presented. She started by saying that we are facing a global climate emergency, and that changing modes of transport plays a big role in tackling this. In the city 88 % of space is claimed by cars, and yet 60% of people do not have cars, which is 9/10 households.

She advocated filtering out cars though the implementation of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, which increase play, walking and cycling space. These can be introduced relatively easily though the use of chicanes, bushes, trees and simple structures. Alongside this complementary measures are needed on major roads to promote active travel and public transport, and the creation of people friendly places such as markets.

There are several Southwark groups working to increase green routes and engaging residents

Living Streets is working with schools on the 'wow walk to school', encouraging and rewarding hundreds of children.

Living Streets indicated they are keen to step up their work in Southwark and the transport policy officer noted that currently Southwark have adopted programmes such as Wow. There is a cycling stakeholder group, and they are now looking at walking group.

A member asked about Low Traffic Neighbourhood versus measurements to reduce car ownership and use overall. An audience member commented that the filtering effect of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods means the short journeys are just not worth doing, and this means there is an overall traffic evaporation effect.

9. AIR QUALITY CAMPAIGNERS

This item was deferred.

10. CYCLING

Peter Walker; cyclist, blogger, journalist, author and local resident presented first. He said that cycling is safer than not cycling because of the positive health impacts, however to encourage a wider uptake more is needed to be done to increase safety. This can be done through the provision of separate bike lane and modal filters.

He advocated reducing endless consultation and getting more changes done faster.

Peter Walker cautioned against a focus on EV, as there is rising evidence is that the emissions are still high from brake dust etc.; the safety problems of cars remain, alongside the predominance of roads given over to cars. The transport policy officer clarified she is not advocating wholesale switching from petro cars to EV , only that EV is a option of last resort.

Peter Walker highlighted the perverse parking charges; currently it is common for cars to be charged in the region of £125 per year, whereas a bike hanger is £48, despite the health benefits and low use of kerbside space. Nottingham has bucked this trend.

Simon Munk, London Cycling Campaign then presented. He said he lives in Waltham Forest, which has introduced Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and Mini Hollands. They have been very effective at changing transport habits.

He said there are bold targets in Southwark's Movement Plan and hitting these targets would go a long way to reaching zero carbon and improving Air Quality.

However he said the bad news for Southwark is:

- Cycling not changing
- Car ownership is high for the borough
- Some of the worst collisions data, and not on a downward trend.

He advocated:

- Doing a borough wide CPZ, like many other London boroughs
- Increasing Cycling lanes
- Reducing parking
- Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and active travel provision on main roads

He said the Movement Plan advocates behaviour change; however the evidence is that these will not be effective without the provision of safe routes.

There was a discussion about political will, which Simon noted is evidently

present in the Commission. He advised that that driving change requires retooling the engagement process. Social media means things can get heated. Political leadership is required to address this setting out the vision and consequences of not changing, with clear communication. He said that in Waltham Forest there was a scheme by scheme battle, and the approach was to do each one done faster and better .Provision on main roads is needed as well as Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. He advised the reduction of car parking step by step.

Simon said that Southwark are leaders in freight movement with London Bridge cargo bikes and Peddle Me and advocated using this to get out in front on delivery and freight movement.

He also suggested adopting a workplace parking levy, and again sited good practice in Nottingham.

Learning from both Waltham Forest and the consultation on the CPZ in East Dulwich is that it can get very fraught with traders, however the evidence is that footfall actually increases which is better for local business.

Peter Walker asked if there was scope for experiments. The transport policy officer that that there was and Southwark is undertaking schemes with 18 months experimental orders, which can be repeated.

The cycling campaigners advised that there is a need for conviction and leadership, given the climate emergency and that car owners are not the majority.

RESOLVED

- Simon Munk offered to provide examples of good engagement and consultation guides.
- The Commission will visit Waltham Forest

11. WORK PROGRAMME

This was noted.



ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMISSION

MINUTES of the Environment Scrutiny Commission held on Monday 20 January 2020 at 7.00 pm at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Leanne Werner (Chair)
Councillor Graham Neale (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Radha Burgess
Councillor Tom Flynn
Councillor Richard Leeming
Councillor Damian O'Brien
Councillor Michael Situ
Jeremy Leach

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor Johnson Situ, Cabinet Member for Growth, Development and Planning

OFFICER SUPPORT: Juliet Seymour, Planning Policy Manager
Tim Cutts, Senior Regeneration Manager
Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Tom Flynn gave apologies for lateness.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were none.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATION

There were none.

4. MINUTES

The Minutes of the open section of the meeting on 4 December 2019 will be submitted to the following meeting.

5. NEW SOUTHWARK PLAN

Councillor Johnson Situ gave an overview on the New Southwark Plan (NSP), with support from Juliet Seymour, Planning Policy Manager, and Tim Cutts, Senior Regeneration Manager.

The New Southwark Plan (NSP) will be the new borough-wide planning and regeneration strategy up to 2033. Once finalised and adopted, it will replace the current local plan. The council submitted the NSP to the Secretary of State on 16 January 2020. It means the 'Examination in Public' process has now started, which is the last stage of the plan-making process.

They explained that New Southwark Plan is a living document, which they will continue to amend. Its development has coincided with the declaration of Climate Emergency.

One of the most impactful changes on carbon outlined in the New Southwark Plan is that we will now require a minimum of 40% on-site reduction on 2013 Buildings Regulations Part L, which are a measure relating to the conservation of fuel and power. Currently, the London Plan recommends that development must achieve a 35% reduction on the same 2013 regulations. This is the target that most boroughs in London have now adopted, and the Inspector's Report for the draft London Plan acknowledges that this target is realistic. This will require major developments in Southwark to exceed the Mayor's target by 5%. Officers said that currently buildings achieve 34 % on average and on occasions as high as 70%, so they know the 40% target is achievable

Juliet Seymour, Planning Policy Manager, drew members attention to a subsidiary plans, such as those on biodiversity, which can be amended in light of the Climate Emergency. These subsidiary plans require provision of walking and cycling routes, and a reduction in parking provision.

The chair invited members' questions and the following points were made:

- i. Will Southwark consider signing up to the delivery of [New Zero Carbon Buildings](#)? Officers said they are looking at this.
- ii. How are Carbon offsets payments in lieu used? Officers said that a plan on how they could be used is due February. Examples are improved lighting on estates.
- iii. Will you review this as better to do this 'on site' that than via Carbon Off-setting? Officers agreed it is better to meet energy targets 'on site' and they will be reviewing practices. They are also considering doubling the amount of carbon charged, i.e. increasing

the amount developers have to pay.

- iv. What about retaining existing buildings and the embedded carbon? Officers agreed this is an issue, and that conservation and could be looked as part of revised the policy. Currently carbon targets relate to the energy emissions of the final building, rather than the carbon generated by the erection of new building structures.
- v. How will the council tackle Town Centre developments that still allow cars, for example Canada Water, particularly when there is not the best public transport in place? Officers and the cabinet lead said this does need to pushed further to reduce parking , but also highlights the challenges and balancing act required in areas with poor public transport. Most new developments do not allow car parking. Officers said the Old Kent Road housing schemes do not have car parking, other than disabled parking, and they are working with planning to improve cycling and bus lanes. There is also virtually no residential parking in Canada Water. Tesco's have halved the car parking at Canada Water in response to negotiations with the council. The supermarket chain's demands for parking place the council in a conundrum as a Tesco is desired, but Tesco's have not moved the dial sufficiently in terms of carbon emergency.
- vi. Will sustainable freight opportunities in developments be adopted? The cabinet lead indicated that that the council will be looking at this, and linking this with other responsibilities such as economic growth.
- vii. Have you thought about ambitions for traffic reduction? That is an aim for no trip generation and more walking and cycling, but no overall target for car reduction has been set. This is something that could be looked at.
- viii. Will there be electric charge points provided? Possibly, and looking at providing on lampposts.
- ix. Are we pushing for passive house; ground heating; Community Energy? Officers said they have just updated the plan that increases energy efficiency. The London Plan forbids gas, so looking at other energy sources e.g. SELCHP. This is also better for air quality.
- x. What are you doing to improve air quality on the SELCHP chimney? There is a lot of heat lost, so looking at better efficiency, and reducing pollutants. More information can be provided.
- xi. What about Community Energy and solar in particular? The cabinet lead said that this does have a part to play and there is work on this that will be bringing forward. Officers said that air source pumps are being looked at in Council homes, which are low carbons rather than zero carbon.

- xii. How will the huge gaps in public transport be tackled? The cabinet lead said the aim is for a public transport network that is fit for 21st Century .This includes an extension of the Bakerloo Line, but also improved buses and cycling provision, and generally improving permeability. The plan for Old Kent Road is aimed at that.
- xiii. What about improved Green Space. The aim is to double the amount and improve quality and user satisfaction. The area action plan has specific ambitions. Officers said that land acquisitions are prioritising land to provide parks.
- xiv. Can you explain the reduction of some of the sustainable features of the Elephant Park? Officers said the Elephant Park pan had very high target, this scheme folded but Lend Lease are continuing to aim to be zero carbon.
- xv. Are wind turbines on tall structures a symptom of building failure? Yes, some are gimmicks that have not turned for 10 years as they are too noisy. Now there is more flexibility to meet zero carbon.
- xvi. What steps are being taken to examine current air quality and take steps if over the legal limit .Officers said that the council has required Old Kent Road developments to improve air quality. Regeneration does give the council an opportunity to dive improvements.
- xvii. The large scheme around Vauxhall does not seem beneficial to local people. How will benefits be delivered on the Old Kent Road, and will they go beyond the focus on the Bakerloo's line tube extension? The cabinet lead that there will be an increase in youth provision, as well as an increase in cycling provision and bus lanes.
- xviii. The document looks divorced from Climate Emergency, even though there are measures outlined above. What are the smart measures that can be included to meet the scale of the Climate Emergency? There is a planned Annual Report which will address progress and opportunities to go further.
- xix. Will you be able to provide more information on carbon offsets reduction? Officers offered to provide this.

RESOLVED

Officers will provide information on:

- The percentage of schemes utilising carbon offsets to meet targets, and how carbon offsets are used
- SELCHP air quality impact and improvement plan

6. REGENERATION AND IMPLEMENTING PLANNING POLICY

Tim Cutts, Senior Regeneration Manager gave a presentation.

The chair then invited comments and questions:

- i. Will there be increased tree cover to make walking more pleasurable in a hotter future? Yes, we are looking at the kerbside, and reassigning loading bays to walking paths and planting.
- ii. How do we best prepare the future with changing technology? District hearting is the most resilient and adaptable to change. One of the problems is individual gas combination boilers. The future is so changeable that we do need to keep moving and updating. The council is also working with outside researchers in partnership with other London clients. An agile and matrix management approaches are being adopted.
- iii. Are Town Centre plans providing wildlife habitats and specifically can you explain the initiative in Canada Water? Yes there are and the wildlife habitat is in the Canada Water basin. Officers offered to provide more details.

The chair invited two people in the audience from Extinction Rebellion to ask questions:

- i. Have lessons been learnt form Elephant Park where Lend Lease dropped the original low carbon plans and will now only deliver 3% on site? Officers and the cabinet member assured the audience participant that in future there will be far less flexibility about the use of carbon offset payments, which are being reviewed, and the new plan is much stronger on delivering on site. Officers agreed there must be a much stronger focus on this to meet the Climate Emergency.
- ii. Will green space be prioritised ; too often this is relegated to the shadow side of big buildings. The cabinet lead said one of the key aims of a development is it has deliver for people. This means balancing achievements across many areas: carbon reduction, provision of green and community space, housing, jobs and the economy.

The chair invited Extinction Rebellion to submit any further comments in writing for the Commission to consider.

7. ROAD USER CHARGING

Jeremy Leach , co-opted Commission member, commented that he requested inclusion of this report and advised that three boroughs are looking at Road User Charging.

Members queried if a council had sufficient legal powers to introduce this.

There was a discussion on the possibility of the Mayor of London adopting this and commented that a scheme like this would work best if it was done over a number of boroughs, either via the Mayor, or through a partnership approach.

A member commented that tackling larger higher emitting cars ought to be a priority, as well as driving down total car use. This ought to be done in tandem with providing alternatives such as more public transport, cycling and cargo bikes. All the measures that penalise driving cars ought to be investigated.

A member said the Commission ought to understand the present provision of parking places on Southwark roads.

RESOLVED

- Officers will be asked to provide information on the number of car parking spaces in the borough
- Legal advice will be requested on introducing Road User Charging.

8. WORK PROGRAMME

Members discussed coming climate change events that members will be attending.

The good work that Cllr Adele Morris has been doing on Planning Committee to press for schemes to deliver more carbon reduction on site was noted – her input will be sought.

Polly Billington, Director of UK100 was suggested as a speaker.

Item No. 10.	Classification: Open	Date: 4 February 2020	Meeting Name: Cabinet
Report title:		Environment Scrutiny Commission Report on the Climate Emergency Road Map – Cabinet Response	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
Cabinet Member:		Councillor Richard Livingstone, Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency	

FOREWORD - COUNCILLOR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY

In March last year, Southwark Council’s council assembly voted unanimously to declare the Climate Emergency. In doing so, it also committed the council to become carbon neutral by 2030 – bringing its previous target forward by 20 years.

Since declaring the emergency, Southwark council has been clear that this declaration is not an empty aspiration but must be delivered through a robust strategy which engages with the community. To achieve its aim, the strategy needs to look at everything that it does across all its activities, and beyond to tackle the carbon usage in our communities. The council therefore held its Climate Summit in July to bring partners together and cabinet agreed in October the process for developing a comprehensive strategy with our communities to tackle the Climate Emergency.

Before that October cabinet meeting, the council’s Environment Scrutiny Commission reviewed the emerging process, with input from Camden council on how they had used a Citizens’ Assembly approach in developing their strategy. The commission also took evidence from Extinction Rebellion Southwark on how engagement between the council and the community could work. This report responds to the Environment Scrutiny Commission’s recommendations arising from this work.

Since October, the council has continued to make progress towards developing its strategy:

- In the autumn, Southwark became the first council in the country to appoint a Climate Change Director to drive through its commitment to tackle the Climate Emergency – Chris Page started in this role in January.
- As part of the 2020/21 budget process, cabinet will be asking council assembly to agree to identify £2 million of reserves to be earmarked for this work.
- Work is progressing on the draft strategy for consultation, which will take place between March and May. As part of this consultation, the council’s first Borough Conference on 21 March will be dedicated to this process.

The valuable work of the environment scrutiny commission’s report has significantly helped in shaping this process and the proposals that will be included within the draft strategy. I therefore very much welcome their report and thank the commission for their commitment and hard work towards our shared goal of taking urgent action to protect our borough, our planet and our future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That cabinet notes the recommendations made by the environment scrutiny commission and agrees the response set out in this report.
2. That cabinet agrees that the recommendations of the commission, and response from cabinet, form part of the consultation on the climate strategy when it is published.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. The global challenge from climate change is unprecedented and urgent action is required now to tackle it. In March 2019, the council declared a climate emergency which recognised the scale and scope of the crisis and committed the council to doing all that it can to make the borough carbon neutral by 2030.
4. In July 2019 the council hosted a climate summit in response to the declaration. Officers were asked to develop a climate change strategy. In October 2019, Cabinet agreed the report "Delivering a Climate Strategy for Southwark" which agreed a timetable to develop and deliver a climate strategy for Southwark.
5. Following the summit, the council's environment scrutiny commission invited the cabinet member with officers to present evidence on the draft road map as well as taking evidence from other witnesses. The commission made a series of recommendations to cabinet which were received by Cabinet in October 2019.
6. Cabinet agreed that it would report back on the commission's recommendations. This report sets out this response.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

7. Officers are developing a draft strategy at the moment. As agreed by cabinet in October, there will be a full engagement programme and consultation from March. The outcome and a draft strategy will then come to cabinet in June ahead of our second climate summit in July.
8. The commission's work is timely and very welcome as officers develop this strategy. A clear recommendation that came from the commission was that the council must not hold back on green initiatives until a perfect plan is formed. They also stress the urgency of the climate crisis and urge immediate action across a range of areas. The council agrees with the commission and the urgency of the situation.
9. As a strategy is currently being developed, this report is intended to respond to the recommendations of the commission and indicate how the council plans to take these forward. However, we do not want to pre-empt the draft strategy consultation and so in a number of areas are proposing that the recommendations of the commission form part of the consultation.
10. In some areas, we do not consider that the commission is being ambitious enough, and where this is the case will make proposals outlining the council's ambition.

11. This report is therefore an initial response to the work of the commission, but hope that the commission continues to play an active part in the process going forward as the strategy emerges and is then delivered.
12. The commission has focused on the council's policies and strategies and offered helpful recommendations as we develop our climate strategy. However, if the borough is to be carbon neutral beyond by 2030 we need to look beyond those things that the council has direct control over and look at how the council can also use its influence, lobbying and networks to get others to play their part.
13. The council in its emerging strategy must look at a number of factors. As well as areas that the council controls directly or enables through funding, procurement, policy or partnership, the council must also consider how it can use its influence both locally and nationally to deliver change.
14. As agreed by cabinet in October 2019, we will consult with the public on our draft strategy from March to May 2020. A final strategy will come to cabinet in June 2020. We have agreed to establish a partnership steering group, which we hope will help shape the strategy as it is developed.

Policy implications

15. The commission made eight recommendations which are set out below along with corresponding actions.

Recommendation 1

16. The council must not hold back on green initiatives, until we have a perfect plan. The situation is an emergency and demands urgent action, and as such schemes, such as community energy, must be brought forward at the earliest opportunity. This will help build community engagement and confidence in our resolve and commitment.
 - a. We agree with the commission that green initiatives should not be held back until the perfect plan is in place. A draft strategy is being developed for consultation in the spring, and ahead of that a review is taking place across council services looking for opportunities which will tackle climate change.
 - b. In December, cabinet agreed a proposal to establish a climate emergency reserve of £2m 2020-21 to coordinate the various activities and action plans across the council and will support the delivery of the climate change strategy following extensive engagement during the first half of 2020. The council has also created and filled a new senior post to manage the council's response to the climate emergency.
 - c. Other initiatives we have taken forward. For example divestment from fossil fuels in our pension fund, reducing council carbon emissions rolling our school streets programme and making it easier to walk and cycle in the borough.
 - d. While we agree that we should not hold back on pursuing green initiatives until the plan is fully formed, we also need to ensure that any initiatives we do follow are going to be effective and deliver the outcomes we want for the

investment that we make. For example, the council has already taken forward the proposal for community led renewable energy as reported to cabinet in October 2019. There are challenges in developing sustainable energy projects on our estates but as reported, we are looking at a range of ideas to take work forward.

Recommendation 2

17. The engagement process should start with a leadership statement from the council about the Climate Emergency issue and the council's approach to environmental stewardship. How does fossil fuel burning, vehicle emissions, a denuded green environment, loss of species, all contribute to the climate emergency and why does it matter? What position does the council take for our borough, city and planet? This statement, and subsequent distribution and education in the borough, should be implemented before the rounds of engagement detailed below to ensure we have the best input from our communities. The statement should additionally overlay some of the wealth of information we have (council tax bands, indices of multiple deprivation, car ownership, road causality rates, air quality etc.) to fully understand who in the borough experiences the benefits and who suffers the most from our environmental actions and to integrate the principle of climate justice.
 - a. We agree that it is very important to publish a statement and will do so alongside our consultation on the strategy. The council has a crucial leadership role in responding to the climate emergency and we recognise that clarity on our approach is necessary for this.
 - b. We also recognise that while we have an important contribution to make on this issue, there is also considerable expertise in other areas. We can set out our initial position on these issues, but want to be open the expertise of others both locally and nationally so they can help shape out thinking as we develop our strategy.
 - c. We will ensure that through the consultation we make quality information available to help ensure an informed debate. Looking forward over the next decade as we work to meet our target, we will have ongoing consultation with the public where we ensure that there is clear and accurate information from the council about the climate emergency, what needs to be done and how everyone can play their part.

18. A borough-wide online engagement process to discover what residents feel about issues relating to the Climate Emergency and the sorts of actions they want the council to take. The Our Healthy Streets approach using Commonplace, an online platform, in Dulwich and now Walworth is a good place to start. The Council should work with a range of groups including environmental campaigners and residents associations to get them to feed into this process. We suggest that in order to bring this survey to life for residents, it is prefaced with a strong, evidence based statement
 - a. We agree that there should be a strong online presence. We will look at other initiatives in the council and beyond to ensure that we use best practice. Our ambition is for the engagement to be as full as possible and ongoing over the life of the strategy. To do this effectively we will look at a

range of approaches to ensure that we reach residents effectively and that they can properly engage with the council on this issue.

- b. We are developing the scope and nature of our engagement as part of the strategy consultation, but we will want to ensure that we reach the widest and most diverse range of people and groups – not just those already actively engaged in this issue. This will of course include campaigners and TRAs but we need to be more ambitious than that, and will look at how we engage all parts of the borough.
19. Multi-ward meetings across the borough where Councillors and residents come together to discuss issues around the Climate Emergency. This will give a sense of how issues may be viewed differently across the different parts of the borough.
- a. We would support the use of multi-ward meetings to encourage further action on this issue. Multi-ward meetings are led by members who decide on local priorities and the agenda. If members want to hold meetings on this issue, we would be supportive of this and can ensure that relevant consultation resources are available.
 - b. Members have announced that Southwark's first borough conference on 21 March will have the climate emergency as its theme. The borough's Community Champions will work with the Cabinet Member and officers to develop a series of workshops, and speakers for the conference and are exploring ways to engage with a range of community groups and other organisations based in the borough.
20. The use of the Youth Council/Young Advisors to engage in a structured and representative way with young people across the borough. This method of engagement is proving of value in relation to the Walworth Town Hall redevelopment for example.
- a. Young people and future generations are the people who will live with the consequences of climate change and the actions that we take today. It is essential that they are at the heart of our approach and that their ideas are central to this work moving forward.
 - b. We agree about the huge contribution that the youth council and young advisers can make and support their involvement in this process. We will engage with them, but also go further and look at what other ways, in addition to young advisers and the youth council, we can use to engage with and hear from young people.
 - c. We will learn from the 'Southwark Conversation', where young people were one of the hardest groups to reach. Through this process we will work again with established groups like the youth council and young advisers, but also consider whether there are other approaches such as sessions in schools, or through youth groups which are also needed to reach the widest range of young people.
21. Engaging with schools and the growing number of elected eco-councillors in primary and secondary to help children and parents contribute and build momentum.

- a. We agree that young people are some of the most passionate advocates for this issue and their activism can drive change in society. Young people are helping to set the agenda internationally as well as driving change locally. We will look for every opportunity to engage with young people through this process.
 - b. We will work with our schools to find ways to align the work that they are doing with young people on this issue, with our approach.
22. A citizens assembly, where a representative sample of Southwark citizens (usually about 50) come together, to first learn about the challenges and possible solutions and then to deliberate and propose recommendations.
- a. Citizens' assemblies have been used in other authorities with an aim to build a demographically representative citizen consensus about how the local authority should address the issue. Camden Council has led some very interesting work developing this approach in relation to climate change.
 - b. As Southwark develops its strategy and approach, we would look at the experiences of Camden and others and explore whether this model is right for Southwark. We agree that there needs to be engagement from across the borough, representing the diversity of the borough and we will explore the citizens assembly model as one way of ensuring this.
23. Online testing of emerging themes of the strategy with those who are interested to participate (potentially identified from the original borough-wide survey) to help assess and modify emerging policies.
- a. The consultation will include online consultation but will be broader than this. We need to engage with those beyond people who are already interested and test our policies and ideas with the broadest range of residents. We will ensure that there is ongoing dialogue and opportunities for the public to engage and consult with the council on its full range of policies.
24. A rolling programme of People's Assemblies to discuss the emerging strategy and to help Southwark address the most difficult issues.
- a. As set out in paragraphs 21a and 21b we will explore the use of citizens or people's assemblies. We are very interested in this model, but at this stage do not want to limit ourselves to this as the best or the only way to address such issues.

Recommendation 3

25. Provide a timetable for reviewing all significant policies and action plans. This should include baseline data and milestones. The plan should go further than just reducing the rate of carbon emissions and instead must look at absorbing carbon, restoring ecosystems and opportunities to fund this.
- a. We agree. The final strategy needs to be comprehensive and measurable. In the same way the council is held to account on its council plan commitments, there needs to be measurable reporting on the progress that the

council is making to deliver this commitment. To enable this, we will develop a performance framework that is transparent and open to public scrutiny.

- b. There are many different ways to measure carbon emissions and different boroughs have employed different methods. In order for the data to lead to the greatest change it needs to be robust and enable effective comparison and accountability. We will therefore be working with London Councils to try and agree a single framework across London.
- c. This process may take longer than is ideal, but the benefits of a joint approach outweigh this. As with the concern about green initiatives being delayed (recommendation 1) we will ensure that this does not hold up action and will continue to take positive steps towards our commitment to being carbon neutral by 2030.
- d. Officers are already collating information about policies across the council that can impact on the climate emergency. As policies and approaches are being developed, such as the new homes design guide, the council aims to take a holistic approach to the issue and consider all aspects of work on the climate.

Recommendation 4

26. Adopt Climate Justice as a key principle.

- a. We are very concerned about the social injustice and inequality of climate change. In the UK and across the world it is those who are often least able to adapt to change who will be worst affected. Tackling social injustice will be at the heart of our approach to climate change. As we adapt to reduce our carbon, we must ensure that the burden does not fall disproportionately on the groups of residents with the least. The council's values and our vision of a fairer future for all is at the heart of everything that we do. This is also true of our approach to climate change.
- b. In establishing our approach to the climate emergency, we should define a set of principles that are clear and meaningful to our residents and wider community.

Recommendation 5

27. Review all the transport and planning policies to drive down total car use and increase provision of play-spaces, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and enhance sustainable transport options that prioritise vulnerable residents including children, schools, older people, disabled people and those with lower incomes. This ought to take a holistic approach to traffic management and ensure that the emissions burden is not unfairly moved to those communities least able to bear it.

- a. We agreed the council's movement plan in April 2019. The plan took a more holistic approach than past 'transport plans'. The plan aims encourage more people to make healthy choices in travel, reduce pollution and the space required for motor vehicles. The nine missions contained in the document set a clear vision for creating the environment for increased wellbeing and with this a reduction and more efficient network.

- b. In developing the plan we have set out how we will use traffic management, parking controls and other measures. We will encourage active travel and use more space that is currently for cars to encourage people to socialise and use these public spaces differently.
- c. The plan contains an equity framework. This will guide our work in delivering the movement plan ensuring that the needs of all people are considered. The framework considers access to transport (cost of travel or physical access, people's experience (how long it takes, how crowded it is) and the impact of movement (air and noise pollution, safety) and how this affects people's wellbeing. It is important that we reduce carbon emissions overall from travel and not simply displace them from one area to another. As set out in paragraph 26a, our approach must be one which reduces social injustice and social inequality.

Recommendation 6

- 28. Include a review of carbon offsetting with a view to a) eliminating or drastically reducing its use and b) ensuring any offsetting fund is used effectively and produces an annual report.
 - a. Carbon off-setting makes a valuable contribution to reducing carbon in the borough and will continue to do so. There is some production that will be unavoidable and where that is the case offsetting is necessary. Offsetting should therefore remain part of any plan to become carbon neutral.
 - b. We do however agree that we should aim to reduce the use of carbon offsetting and it should not be used in place of other methods which reduce or eliminate carbon emissions.
 - c. With any carbon offsetting which is used, it is important that this is effective and open to scrutiny.
 - d. Officers will be reviewing policies including supplementary planning documents which include our approach to carbon offsetting.

Following publication of the New Southwark Plan, the Cabinet Member for Growth Development and Planning announced that officers will review the plan in the light of the declaration of the climate emergency and bring forward a proposed amendment to further reduce carbon. Officers will also review our policy on carbon offsetting which could include increasing the amount we charge for offsetting.

Recommendation 7

- 29. A carbon rating system is recommended for all proposed developments in the borough, which must include embedded carbon.
 - a. We agree that a carbon rating system would be desirable. To be effective, this needs to be done at the regional or national level so that standards were enforced across the development sector. This would encourage improvements in building design and construction. Officers will explore this idea with London Councils.

Recommendation 8

30. Consider adopting the Circular Economy approach in the Climate Strategy, which also encompasses biodiversity and social justice impacts, as well as carbon emissions.
 - a. We will ensure that these ideas are part of the consultation. We already encourage people to firstly reduce waste, reuse what they can and then recycle what they cannot either reduce or reuse. Reducing our overall waste whether in our daily lives or in processes such as building needs is crucial if we are to reduce our carbon emissions.

Community impact statement

31. The council is committed to exploring all available opportunities for the borough to be carbon neutral by 2030. As set out in the report above, the council wants to engage with the widest range of residents including potentially through a citizens assembly. As also set out in the report, the council will take steps to reach harder to reach or potentially under represented groups.
32. The council is committed to the values of a fairer future for all, and as detailed in this report is also committed to narrowing social inequality and injustice. This will shape both consultation and subsequent policies.

Resource implications

33. The council has previously committed to consultation at October 2019 Cabinet "Delivering a Climate Strategy for Southwark". There are no further resource implications arising from this paper.

Legal implications

34. There are no significant legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

Financial implications

35. There are no financial implications arising directly as a result of this report.

Consultation

36. This report recommends (recommendation 2) that the views of the commission and the response from cabinet in this report form part of the consultation on the climate strategy. This is currently scheduled to take place in the spring and early summer of 2020. A final climate strategy is due to cabinet in the summer of 2020.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Director of Law and Democracy

37. The report recommends that cabinet notes the recommendations made by the

scrutiny commission and that these and the cabinet response are included in the consultation on the climate strategy. This will be finalised in summer 2020. There are no significant legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report but the director of law and democracy and her staff will provide advice to officers on any legal and governance issues arising during development of the strategy. The cabinet will need to ensure that the public sector equality duty is taken into account in developing and finalising this policy i.e. to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people with protected characteristics and others.

38. This report is being considered by the cabinet in accordance with the cabinet rules in the constitution.

Strategic Director of Finance and Governance (FC19/029)

39. This report is requesting cabinet to note the recommendations made by the environment scrutiny commission and agree the response set out in this report and also ensure that these are included in the consultation on the climate strategy.
40. The strategic director of finance and governance notes that there are no immediate financial implications arising from this report. Any resource implications that may emerge in the future will be subject to further reports for formal approval.
41. Staffing and any other costs connected with this report to be contained within existing departmental revenue budgets.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Draft Environment Scrutiny Commission report on the Climate Emergency road map	Constitutional Team, Southwark Council	Everton Roberts 020 7525 7221
Link (please copy and paste into your browser): http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s85360/Appendix%203%20Environment%20Scrutiny%20Commission%20report%20on%20the%20Climate%20Emergency%20sent%20to%20cabinet.pdf		
Delivering a Climate Strategy for Southwark	Constitutional Team, Southwark Council	Paula Thornton 020 7525 4395
Link (please copy and paste into your browser): http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s85359/Report%20Delivering%20a%20Climate%20Strategy%20for%20Southwark.pdf		

APPENDICES

No.	Title
None	

AUDIT TRAIL

Cabinet Member	Councillor Richard Livingstone, Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency	
Lead Officer	Caroline Bruce, Strategic Director for Environment and Leisure	
Report Author	Chris Page, Climate Change Director	
Version	Final	
Dated	21 January 2019	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
	Officer Title	Comments Sought
	Director of Law and Democracy	Yes
	Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes
	Cabinet Member	No
	Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	24 January 2020

Climate emergency – We need carbon reduction not carbon offsetting

When politicians debate whether we should be ‘carbon neutral’ by 2030 or 2050 they are really debating what target they think is achievable. They don’t say whether meeting either of these targets will succeed in preventing the climate and ecological crisis. In fact the crisis is already here.

The world is already 1 degree hotter than in pre-industrial times and on course to get 1.5 degrees hotter. This doesn’t sound like a lot but it is destroying lives and livelihoods across the global south; making whole regions uninhabitable; and wiping out entire ecosystems such as coral reefs.

All we know for certain now is that the only *chance* we have of lowering the *probability* that temperatures will rise even further, is to cut greenhouse gas emissions as dramatically and as quickly as we can and to take measures to draw down as much of the carbon already in the atmosphere as possible. It may already be too late to stop runaway ecological collapse but we don’t know.

Real zero not net zero

This is why Greta Thunberg appealed to world leaders in Davos to stop talking about ‘net zero’ targets and start implementing ‘real zero’ policies. So what does that mean?

‘Net zero’ is a calculation that equates the amount of greenhouse gasses being emitted with an amount of carbon dioxide to be drawn down from the atmosphere at the same time. The greenhouse gasses emitted are then said to be ‘offset’ by the carbon that is captured and stored and therefore those emissions are said to have a neutral or ‘net zero’ effect on global warming. In a best case scenario this carbon-neutral approach to new emissions only stabilises rather than reduces the amount of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere. In the worst case scenario, carbon offsetting is used as a justification for increasing the amount of greenhouse gasses emitted and the carbon capture element of the equation is simply monetised to pay for environmental projects which may or may not involve removing carbon from the atmosphere at all. In this ‘cash for carbon’ scenario, new developments, power stations, airports etc can claim to be ‘zero carbon’ while pumping out vast amounts of greenhouse gasses, so long as they make ‘offset’ payments to cover the cost of reducing emissions somewhere else (often over a very long period of time in the far distant future...). But there is no Planet B, no somewhere else - we need to reduce emissions everywhere. So ‘net zero’ all too often means business as usual for the big polluters while we, as the employees and consumers and citizens, are duped into believing that real action is being taken.

An analogy we could use is the scenario of a morbidly obese man who has been given a matter of months to live if he doesn’t lose weight rapidly. His doctor advises that his first step must be to reduce what he eats to the minimum calories necessary to survive and to burn them off by going to the gym for an hour every day. But the owner of a fast food company convinces the man that he can eat twice as much so long as he goes to the gym for 2 hours a day to offset it. Instead of reducing calories and increasing exercise in order to *lose* weight, the man stays morbidly obese and moves ever closer to the tipping point beyond which he has no chance of recovery. Then it gets worse. An enterprising fitness instructor sells the man a great value yearly gym membership so that he can eat even more and offset it by exercising for as long as he wants every day – but only once the new gym opens next year some time. We might pity a man in this situation, so full of good intentions and so doomed to failure, but when we are thinking about the future of humanity we need to rage against these profiteers who are diverting us from what we need to do to survive. We need to reduce carbon, increase carbon-capture and work towards a society in which all energy comes from non-carbon, renewable sources. In the process we need to stop further ecological destruction and facilitate natural ecosystems to recover and regenerate. Every other solution on offer is a con.

The carbon offsetting con in action

What does it mean when building developments are described as 'zero carbon'? Carbon ratings for new buildings are calculated against a Target CO2 Emission Rate (TER) for a standard building of that size, set by building regulations in 2013. Builders must reduce this emission rate through energy efficiency improvements or renewable energy and then make an offset payment for every remaining ton of carbon likely to be emitted over 30 years in use. This TER covers only regulated emissions - basically heating and lighting - but not emissions from portable appliances like cookers, or IT equipment. It also doesn't include emissions created by actually constructing the new building (or demolishing the buildings that were there before) even though construction and maintenance can account for more than 50% of carbon emitted through the lifetime of a building (Leeds University 2017).

In Southwark, the development in Elephant Park, formerly the Heygate estate, is an example of how misleading 'zero carbon' claims can be. The development was initially touted as a flagship environmental project incorporating a new 100% renewable energy plant. The developer, Lendlease, decided however that this was not financially viable and was permitted by the terms of their planning application to simply convert the carbon reduction targets that would have been achieved through renewable energy, into a recalculated offset payment. The development will now generate just 3% of its energy needs through solar panels and the rest through fossil fuels, but the increased offset payments mean that it is still described as 'zero-carbon'.

If developers can simply choose not to use available technology to reduce emissions in order to boost their profits, then carbon offsetting is really a 'pay to pollute' racket.

The Lendlease offset money has yet to be spent and in all likelihood will be invested in schemes to reduce energy usage in other council owned buildings. A laudable and necessary project to reduce emissions but not one that actually removes existing carbon from the atmosphere.

If what we need is 'real zero' as soon as possible then the fastest way to achieve that is not to build these developments at all. And that is the radical, immediate solution that we must fight for.

But what about homes, jobs and improving people's lives?

Is it really possible or even desirable to *build nothing*? Everything we do involves energy, resources and emissions of some sort. But just like the morbidly obese man who must cut his calories down to the minimum, we have to make choices about what energy use is necessary and what emissions we can cut back straight away. Developments that replace structurally sound buildings are a good place to start.

In Elephant and Castle, hundreds of jobs could be created refurbishing rather than replacing the shopping centre and the LCC university building - with a fraction of the energy, resources or air pollution, let alone the social cost to the community, which a decade of demolitions and rebuilding would lead to. If the social housing that is needed could still be provided in the redevelopment, but not the luxury apartments, would that be such a terrible loss?

Likewise on the Old Kent Road, residents have been presented with a model of 'development for the sake of development' when what we need is regeneration solutions that serve the needs of the existing community and minimise the environmental impact of doing so. We are told we need 20,000 new residential units on the Old Kent Road to make the Bakerloo line extension financially viable. But what if we had the option for a less intrusive, less energy-intensive solution to improve public transport on the Old Kent Road? Such as bus or tram corridors instead of the tube? And then

built less housing but built the low-rise, family friendly social housing that we actually need, instead of 40 storey concrete towers catering to speculative investors.

We will need to offset the emissions that we still expend on vital infrastructure and daily living, but real carbon capture projects such as planting thousands of trees and green roofs would also vastly improve everyone's quality of life. The transition to a zero carbon economy can be a just transition that improves all our standard of living through improvements to public transport, reduced energy costs and cleaner air. If all development plans start from this urgent need to cut emissions and to replenish nature then they will be infinitely more sustainable for our communities as well as for our climate.

Now is the time for residents in Southwark to call a halt to the incessant drive towards over-development that has already wreaked misery on so many in our communities, like in the Heygate and the Aylesbury, as well as driving us into this environmental nightmare. The developers make their millions before the first brick is laid on these projects. They will be long gone when future generations reflect in horror on why we were building skyscrapers while the sea was rising around our feet. The cost of delaying the changes we need to make mounts daily, and it cannot be measured in money.

No More Cash For Carbon.

We need to #RefurbishNotDemolish

Real Zero not Net Zero.



SELCHP Ltd Emissions Environmental Position Statement

SELCHP Ltd. is operated and maintained to meet the highest standards of environmental care, meeting or exceeding emissions legislation.

South East London Combined Heat & Power (SELCHP) Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) was constructed to operate in compliance with all applicable environmental legislation post commissioning in 1994.

Since the implementation of Integrated Pollution Prevention & Control (IPPC) regulations in 2005, under the Waste Incineration Directive (WID), the facility has been retro fitted, in order to comply with more stringent Emissions Limit Values (ELV). As of January 2014, the WID was incorporated into the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) for existing facilities.

The facility is regulated by The Environment Agency (EA) through its bespoke IPPC Permit (Permit number: NP3738SY), which sets out ELVs for emission to atmosphere, acceptable European Waste Codes (EWC), as well as, the requirement to control of noise and odour from the site. Regular reporting to SELCHP's designated EA inspector ensures permit compliance, minimising environmental impact.

SELCHP's flues are fitted with Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems (CEMS), which measure and record all emissions to air from the facility, as specified in the environmental permit. It is a condition of the environmental permit that, these emissions do not exceed the specified half-hourly and daily average limits (see 'Our Emissions' page at selchp.co.uk).

The facility is also required to carry out periodic stack sampling and monitoring, to determine the concentration of metals and organic carbons entrained in the flue gases, ensuring compliance with ELVs. Periodic monitoring is carried out by an independent accredited third party contractor.

Energy recovery facilities like SELCHP play an important role in the UK's waste management strategy¹.

Understandably, concerns are often raised by the public regarding the impact of ERFs on local public and environmental health. SELCHP endeavours to meet or exceed all current environmental regulations. A position statement released by the Health Protection Agency (HPA) regards the local health impact of modern ERFs as negligible and unmeasurable².

1. See policy paper: [2010 to 2015 government policy: waste and recycling](#)
2. See government guidance: [Municipal waste incinerators emissions: impact on health](#)

Veolia ES SELCHP Limited

Landmann Way, Off Surrey Canal Road,
Deptford, London, SE14 5RS
Tel: +44 (0)20 3567 6162

www.veolia.co.uk

Registered Office:
210 Pentonville Road, London N1 9JY
Registered in England & Wales: 03294518

A group company of
Veolia UK Limited



ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMISSION**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019-20****AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)****NOTE:** Original held by Scrutiny Team; all amendments/queries to Fitzroy Williams Tel: 020 7525 7102

Name	No of copies	Name	No of copies
		Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Team SPARES External	10
<p>Electronic Copy</p> <p>Members</p> <p><u>Councillors:</u></p> <p>Councillor Leanne Werner Councillor Tom Flynn Councillor Radha Burgess Councillor Michael Situ Councillor Richard Leeming Councillor Graham Neale Councillor Damian O'Brien</p> <p><u>Coopted member:</u></p> <p>Jeremy Leach</p> <p>Reserves Members</p> <p>Councillor Peter Babudu Councillor Karl Eastham Councillor Renata Hamvas Councillor Eleanor Kerslake Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE Councillor Adele Morris</p>			<p>Total: 10</p> <p>Dated: September 2019</p>