

NOTES OF MEETING

LIVERPOOL CITY REGION CLIMATE PARTNERSHIP

Thursday 24th November 2022, 4.00pm

Attendees:

Chair Gideon Ben-Tovim	Nature Connected/ Climate Partnership
Vice Chair Cllr. Gill Wood	Climate Partnership/ Combined Authority/Growth Hub
Don Naylor	Friends of the Earth
Nick Thompson	CPRE The Countryside Charity
Rachel Waggett	Liverpool City Region CA, Principal Environment Officer (meeting admin)
Nicky Crosby	Extinction Rebellion
Matt Ellis	Environment Agency
Cllr Phil Harris	Halton BC
Cllr Liz Grey	Wirral BC
Cllr Laura Robertson-Collins	Liverpool CC
John Mellors	Liverpool City Region CA, Environment Officer
Mike Wolffe	St Helens Borough Council
Elinor Bridges	Liverpool City Region CA, Management Graduate
Emma Galbraith	Liverpool City Region CA, Environment Officer

Apologies received from:

Cllr Liz Grey	Wirral Borough Council
Cllr Paulette Lappin	Sefton Borough Council
Annie Merrie	Faiths4Change
Stephen Sykes	2030 Hub
Jenni Brittlebank	Environment Agency
Omar K	Student representative
Andrea Watts	Sefton Council
Jonathan Edwards	St Helens Council
Claire Blott	Liverpool City Region CA
Peter Owen	Energy Projects Plus

1. Welcome and introductions/ apologies for absence

Gideon Ben-Tovim welcomed all attendees to the meeting thanking everyone for their attendance. All attendees introduced themselves as shown on the attendees list. There were some apologies also as listed.

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest noted.

3. Notes of last meeting for agreement

4. Matters arising

- RW provided an update on the Green Hydrogen Project on behalf of Martin Land-Consultants to undertake the project have been selected the project will be underway by Christmas. A vision report will be ready by April 2023 and Martin Land, or Mark Knowles will present this to the Climate Partnership

5. Discussion of LCR Five Year Action Plan draft actions

Overview

RW provided an overview of the Five-Year Action Plan highlighting the following points

- The Climate Partnership are the first external group to see the actions
- It was developed through workshops for each of the pillars
- All comments have been formulated into actions with priority and LCR role (lead/enable etc)
- The list remains at a very early stage with actions which need to be pulled out and formed into an overarching section
- Currently, no framing or general quantifying of carbon in 'normal terms'
- All actions will be shared with and worked on with LA partners
- The plan will be reviewed, updated, and revised annually

General comments on actions

- Mike Wolffe (MW) raised the need for clear mapping of the carbon reduction curve which is needed to be achieved. Matt Ellis (ME) observed that given the trajectory of the curve if you do not make carbon reductions in early years there is a need to go deeper later and even go under the curve to hit the reduction targets. RW said that there is a need for rapid action and to make significant progress in the first five years and there is a gap between where actions and need both locally and nationally
- Nick Thompson (NT) complimented the plan especially in being more comprehensive than previous plan but highlighted the need to link with Local Authorities and Central Government Policy. RW highlighted the instability in the policy environment and the need for stability from national government.
- Don Naylor (DN) highlighted the need to reach agreement with LA's and not impose responsibility on them
- Nicky Crosby (NC) felt it was impressive but felt it would be helpful to subdivide actions by heading as is done in buildings section, RW agreed this would be beneficial.

Energy

RW highlighted that the actions don't currently demonstrate the overall message which is the need to halve energy demand with actions including behaviour change

- PH raised that Cadent Gas won't supply blended hydrogen until 2035, is there an expectation of electrification. RW explained that the focus of hydrogen will be for industry not domestic use. DN broadly agreed highlighting scepticism to domestic use.
- Matt Ellis (ME) observed E1.3 may have regulatory/permitting implications and that the EA should be included to facilitate around hydrogen storage for example and Green Hydrogen should consult with EA
- MW noted lack of a push for heat networks in plan and potential for those benefits
- NC encouraged a greater focus on energy reduction
- PH noted the challenging in funding for electrification and challenges of lack of localised skills and manufacturing of equipment. RW agreed and highlighted need for confidence in government policy to promote long term investment. He also highlighted need for infrastructure change such as solar panels and EV charging

Buildings

RW clarified that this section is still being developed and a later version of this section has been received. She also highlighted need to encourage people to insulate homes and facilitate this. Whilst LCR has been successful in securing domestic retrofit funds, this needs to be done for commercial buildings as well

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ME shared that many communities with high deprivation may be reluctant to engage with local government services for retrofitting and whether this could be avoided by use of partners. - ME shared general experience of trying to combine action on buildings to facilitate cumulative gains of single interventions and avoid undoing previous work through multiple interventions - NT suggested adding actions for mandatory solar panels on new warehouses - PH shared challenges in retrofit (fear of rogue agents, cost) and need to address at a policy/regulation level as well as learning from Manchester’s experiences. - MW highlighted need to mandate climate adaptive new builds <p>Transport</p> <p>RW detailed that Transport is more quantifiable and actionable area but challenging in terms of public interaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NC highlighted need to explain jargon and acronyms - PH wanted reference to localised procurement <p>Natural Environment</p> <p>RW explained that is it the widest ranging and least quantifiable with a greater focus on co-benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DN wanted to clarification that Natural Capital will not include mineral extraction. It was also raised about the inclusion of traditional farming methods. NC suggested adoption of innovation in ‘farm free’ farming. - ME suggested adding EA as a stakeholder for NE8 & NE9. For NE10, ME suggested splitting into two to facilitate developing Risk and Vulnerability assessment and then subsequent strategy as well as his general support - MW wanted the plan to encourage people to produce their own food, use open spaces as flood defences and the need to focus on carbon sequestration. - PH pointed out that NE 5 stipulates the Mersey Forest but there is a need for wider community forests and NE 8&9 needs to add waterways/canals beyond just the river Mersey 	
<p>6. AOB</p>	
<p>Mersey Ferry- RW updated that the Mersey ferries which have been ordered are future proofed. It is currently not possible to purchase vessels with sufficient range for the needs so Diesel/Electric hybrids have been ordered. These will allow for the installation of batteries to replace diesel engines and terminals have also been updated to allow future electrical charging infrastructure to be more easily installed.</p>	
<p>7. Next Meetings</p>	
<p>4pm Thursday 19th January 2023</p>	
<p>4pm Thursday 16th February 2023</p>	
<p>4pm Thursday 30th March 2023</p>	
<p></p>	
<p>Useful Links</p>	
<p>Community Environment Fund 2022 Liverpool City Region Combined Authority (liverpoolcityregion-ca.gov.uk)</p>	
<p></p>	