

## RECORD OF WORKING GROUP MEETING

<b>GROUP NAME:</b>	<b>SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP (SCP)</b>	
<b>CHAIRPERSON:</b>	<b>Cllr Gordon McDonald</b>	<b>(GMcD)</b>
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	<b>29 April 2016</b>	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>Committee Room</b>	
<b>ATTENDING:</b>	<b>Cllr Gordon McDonald, Chair</b> <b>Rhona Gunn, Corporate Director (EDPI) as Lead Officer</b> <b>Stephen Cooper, Head of Direct Services</b> <b>Richard Anderson, Head of Housing &amp; Property</b> <b>Jim Grant, Head of Development Services</b> <b>Ann Davidson, REAP on behalf of TSI</b> <b>Gavin Clark, Scottish Natural Heritage</b> <b>John Thomson, Forestry Commission</b> <b>Councillor M Howe</b> <b>Tracey Gervaise, Health and Wellbeing Lead and Programme Manager – Early Years Collaborative</b>	<b>GMcD</b> <b>RG</b> <b>SC</b> <b>RA</b> <b>JG</b> <b>AD</b> <b>GC</b> <b>JT</b> <b>MH</b> <b>TG</b>
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	<b>Pam Gowans, Chief Officer (Health &amp; Social Care Integration)</b> <b>Paul Bellingham, UHI, Moray College</b> <b>Glen Adcook, Moray Housing Partnership</b> <b>Anita Milne, Moray Forum</b> <b>Fabio Villani, Third Sector Interface</b> <b>Graeme Henderson, SEPA</b>	<b>PG</b> <b>PB</b> <b>GA</b> <b>AM</b> <b>FV</b> <b>GH</b>
<b>MINUTES:</b>	<b>Caroline O'Connor, Corporate Secretary</b>	<b>CO</b>

<b>AGENDA ITEM/TOPIC</b>	<b>ACTION POINT</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>1. Minute of Meeting of 28 January 2016</b>	<p>The Minute was approved subject to the following amendment:-</p> <p>Page 7, Item 3c Climate Change – delete the word “not” so sentence reads “Noted one issue with peat bogs is that it slows run off on land which will help with flooding.”</p> <p><b>a. Carbon Management Report</b>  RA introduced the paper which seeks to look at what we are currently doing in terms of Moray 2026. Noted the focus has moved towards energy reduction, waste recycling and flood protection which are major factors in carbon management. RA explained the real issue is whether we want to move away from what we are currently doing and have a more strategic plan encompassing other CPP partners. The Scottish Government priority is that we look at whole issue of</p>	<p><b>CO</b></p> <p>-</p>

	<p>climate change/carbon management as a priority. RA's report raises the question of whether the Group want to do just enough to comply (resources and the low corporate priority given to this area mean this is the Council's current approach) or more. If they wish to do more RA indicated there would be a resource implication for partners.</p> <p>GMcD stressed targets in the plan are Community Planning Board targets, not council targets. GMcD suggested it should be put back to relevant representatives of Community Planning Board enquiring if this is an initiative they would be willing to resource and to what extent. RG advised that the Community Planning Board were of the view that management of targets and what was covered within agreed remits was delegated to the various partnerships, so the CPB would probably say that any initiative should be driven through the Partnership which should have authorised representatives for relevant partners within its membership who could commit necessary resources if minded to do so and it was unfortunate there was not better attendance today to progress the report.</p> <p>GMcD expressed concern at the lack of attendance which limited the ability to progress matters. He indicated it was hard to make a decision with lack of attendance and he was not happy to make any decision without the agreement of all partners.</p> <p>GMcD assumes carbon management reporting will have to take place across agencies and therefore all must have an ability to input. GC advised SNH will become statutory partners as a result of the Community Empowerment Act so they will have to report on what they do. TG advised the NHS have a heat standard target which could be contributed towards an overarching approach</p> <p>JG stressed it is important to gather a baseline from partners before setting a target, which should be able to come from their statutory climate reports.</p> <p>Noted RA thinks it is important to concentrate efforts on energy, as this gives potential to reduce carbon and while he thinks there are savings there he is unable to put a figure on it. JG stated all quick wins have been taken and there is now a need to produce more innovate solutions however these take up resources which we don't have.</p> <p>In response to a question from GMcD, it was noted a</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>
--	--	--

	<p>new Energy Officer has been appointed who is due to start soon. RA stressed there are only 3 people in that team and JG provides 1 resource in terms of climate change.</p> <p>Agreed GMcD write to partners as Chair of SCP enclosing the report, asking for their interest in participation and indicating to what extent they could resource any changes. GMcD also thought it would be beneficial to enquire about behaviour issues from partners. It was suggested that partners with only this narrow area of shared interest in terms of the SCP remit could be invited to the next meeting with discussion at the beginning of the Agenda.</p> <p>In the meantime it was agreed to continue with the current targets until the Group has clearer understanding of what options may be available and this would be reviewed once we have clarity from all partners. RA/JG to collate responses.</p>	<p><b>GMcD/RG</b></p> <p><b>JG/RA</b></p>
	<p><b>b. Possible alternative to Fuel Poverty Target</b></p> <p>RA explained the difficult thing is that 3 elements are outwith our control being:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fuel prices.</li> <li>• Low income</li> <li>• Private sector Houses with poor energy efficiency</li> </ul> <p>The Council has a programme to improve its housing stock through the HEEPS programme and EESH standard. Noted social landlords also have a requirement to meet and maintain the SHQS.</p> <p>RA advised the council have looked at energy performance certificates and what kind of band social housing was were sitting in. It has been agreed anything in bands E-G will be an issue to try to improve with the aim to get all properties up to D band.</p> <p>Page 5 of the report gives a suggested possible alternative target. On average 140 properties are being upgraded every year. EESH determines these works require to be done by 2020 which will give a target we can start to measure with 100% achieved for social housing by that date. The owner/occupied aim is improve the standard of properties by one band.</p> <p>RG made reference to an asterisk on the last paragraph on the report and queried whether the Group was happy with the information on one graph or, if not, 2 different graphs could be created.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>

	<p>AD was concerned about removing the fuel poverty target which encompasses important factors like in equalities for fuel advice. TG suggests that using SIMD quintiles as an overlay for the heat efficiency work may help address that side.</p> <p>RA advised we have no control of the current fuel poverty target, so it is therefore an illusion to set a target although fuel poverty is a big issue in Moray.</p> <p>JG agreed if the target is removed it will be easy to lose sight of where we are.</p> <p>The Group agreed with RG's suggestion that both graphs could be kept which would maintain the profile of fuel poverty but would also give a meaningful target of what the partnership can directly influence. The graph would show both targets for social housing and private sector but explain that what was meant by improvement differed: getting to at least a D rating was target for social housing and one band improvement for private sector housing.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p><b>RA/RG</b></p>
	<p><b>c. SEAP Briefing</b></p> <p>JG advised consultants have now been appointed whose main role is looking at greenhouse gas across the area and possible action to take across the region regarding renewables. Hoped the final report will be ready in October/November. Noted it touches on carbon management but also addresses wider issues.</p> <p>The baseline would take Moray as a whole looking at the public sector but also across all sectors. Noted this will be available as a baseline but it will not capture e.g. the NHS specifics as it narrows down to areas of industry.</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement will take place in June and will thereafter be brought to the Partnership.</p> <p>Agreed to add something in GMcD's letter to partners (Item 1a refers) with explanation of the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p><b>GMcD/RG</b></p>
	<p><b>d. Biomass in 4 schools</b></p> <p>RA introduced the report which pulls together why we opted not to go with biomass. The following points were noted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design element was limited in 4 schools. If biomass goes into school there needs to be backup system. What would be cost? View was it was too expensive.</li> <li>• Opted for gas solution instead as prices are</li> </ul>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>

	<p>currently low and the budget was constrained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insurance requirement is for backup in school and need to ensure schools are kept open.</li> <li>• A biomass boiler would have to be run at a certain capacity throughout the year and the cost of boiler is also higher.</li> <li>• The 4 schools projects also included looking at roofs, windows etc so the heating system was only part of the project.</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that by the end of the project the Council will have replaced 4 schools and this should be put in context against cost of building one new school – still good value for money.</p> <p>RA advised biomass is being considered again through option appraisals for boiler replacements and there may be other funding available. The Council now has a matrix of the school estate and the risky elements. It will be proactive rather than reactive and will be considering the next schools on the prioritised list so we are better placed to apply for funding.</p> <p>GC indicated it was unfortunate when talking about carbon management that gas has been installed in the schools, although SC noted that biomass is not carbon neutral given transportation costs associated with the biomass stock</p> <p>A query was raised as to whether anyone is doing an analysis of biomass stock. JT explained the price of biomass is determined by market resources. Biomass buyers are buying into a commercial sector however the volume available is difficult to quantify. He gave an example that Moray and Aberdeenshire have been producing 370,000 cubic metres a year and then received two calls over last year from biomass developments asking for 50,000 cubic metres each. This has to be planned for in advance as the Forestry Commission only cut down trees once the material has been bought.</p> <p>Noted the Partnership are now satisfied with the explanation received regarding installing the gas boilers in the 4 schools project.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>
<p><b>2. Updates from Working Group</b></p>	<p><b>a. Energy Group</b></p> <p><b>i Central Energy Efficiency Fund</b></p> <p><b>b. Housing Strategy Group/Homelessness Group</b> RA explained a decision had been made to combine the</p>	

groups as the same people were going to both meetings. The next meeting is to take place in June/July. GMcD to be invited. A report will go to Committee in August on the Strategy, and the homelessness one in June. The Housing charter is to be reported this year to the regulator. GMcD queried an issue in the media re rough sleepers in Edinburgh/Glasgow. RA advised this is not a problem in Moray at the moment although it was noted there are more “sofa surfers” and the housing options team are now finding out more about them. If Police come across rough sleepers they put them through to Cameron Park Brae.

**RA**

DRAFT

	<p><b>c. Transport – Community Transport Forum/HTAP (Health Transport Action Plan Strategic Group)</b>  SC advised there had been a presentation covering single point of contact for patient transport and the discharge lounge in ARI. Noted they are using both voluntary vehicles as well as ambulances. SC stressed there is a need to be more integrated with health and he has already been in discussion with PG re this. The way forward is to be creative about how we arrange transport.</p>	-
<p><b>3. Programme of Business</b></p>	<p>Items for June meeting noted as being:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual update on performance targets for Board</li> <li>• Update on Energy from Waste Plant and potential impact on fuel poverty.</li> </ul> <p><b>a. Waste Report</b>  SC spoke to the report on waste diverted from landfill. Noted this will be expanded as a national target and it is recognised there will be ban on organics by 2020.</p> <p>In terms of recycling we are currently at 57% based on figures from the end of 2015. As yet we don't have current figures but SC hopes that figure would improve. The target is 58% by end of 2017 and 60% by 2020. Noted the biggest jump will be when we have to find an alternative to landfill.</p> <p>SC is involved in ongoing work regarding the energy from waste plant. The likelihood is it will be the end of 2021 before the new plant is up and running.</p> <p>Given that there the ban on organics comes into force in 2020, SC indicated there are 2 options. The first option is to go back to government to ask for permission to keep using landfill until the new facility is ready or the other option is to go to a merchant facility to arrange a contract. If this option is used the likelihood is that it would go abroad however there would be unpredictability in terms of price.</p> <p>It is important that we are careful to minimise the threshold for the plant. It is mainly about providing capacity for 3 authorities with the possibility of then bringing in other private sector waste.</p> <p>SC advised the Council is looking to expand at Moycroft with a waste transfer facility for private sector.</p> <p>Noted most NHS waste goes to general waste but clinical waste will go to specialist plants.</p>	<p><b>ALL SC</b></p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>

DRAFT



	<p><b>b. Biodiversity</b></p> <p>GC introduced his short paper on biodiversity. The driving force is that species are still being lost and we are not making as much headway as we would like. The 6 Big Steps for Nature are the main priorities which are Scottish Government targets.</p> <p>SC said in terms of measuring it he would imagine it is difficult and resource intensive and queried how it is measured. GC advised there are methodologies and an index but he was unsure what these were and would need to clarify.</p> <p>A query was raised as to what urban trees are. GC advised that this refers to native species and those suitable for ground conditions. JG advised there is a list of suitable trees in the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The question was raised as to when you interfere or let nature take its course. GC stated we are still dealing with consequences of meddling with nature in the past. Noted the usual difficulty is funding for control. Later this year there will be the HLF project covering north-east Scotland. Programmes rely on volunteers due to lack of funding. Continuity of control is also an issue. Note American mink, American signal crayfish are creating real problems in rivers elsewhere in Scotland and there is no way of getting rid of them once they're there. They are very damaging to the fish population and would have devastating consequences if they entered the Spey.</p> <p>JT spoke to his paper in support of the paper by GC. The Forestry Commission use the term sustainability rather biodiversity. The paper provided background to the planning process that underpins what they do. The link attached in Appendix 10 details how they have worked through the District Strategic Plan and teased out targets.</p> <p>JG advised the council has a woodland strategy out for consultation and comments would be welcomed. JT replied advising that he had written to the Council CE and Convener re criticism in the press about their unwillingness to cooperate in terms of Roseisle. GMcD thought it may have been elected members who raised the questions rather than officers. RG confirmed with JT that consideration would be given to the letters.</p> <p>SC queried what the difference is between the Forestry Commission and Forestry Enterprise. JT advised Bridget Campbell is the leader at top level who oversees SNH, Forestry Commission etc. He believes the Forestry Commission was a body of Great Britain which is now</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>RG/JG</p> <p>-</p>
--	--	---

	<p>breaking up due to devolution. The then Forestry Commission then became Forestry Commission Scotland with overarching responsibility for public sector or private sector. Forestry Enterprise deals with the management of the state owned forestry in Moray. GMcD queried how Crown Estates fitted into this however JT advised it was not in their remit at the moment.</p> <p>RG queried if there are any areas of biodiversity we could have a meaningful target for in Moray 2026 as if partners feel that an area needs focus, the best way to achieve this is through a target. GC agreed to could give thought to whether Moray wanted to state a target and how that could be done. Agreed any overarching target would sit well within Moray 2026.</p> <p><b>c. Potential Food Target</b> AD produced an update paper from which it was noted the tsiMORAY Environmental Forum are to set up a group to develop a draft target for discussion at SCP. Agreed AD report back on progress to the next meeting in June.</p>	<p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>AD</b></p>
<b>4. AOCB</b>	None.	-
<b>5. Date of Next Meeting</b>	Thursday 30 June 2016 at 10am in the Committee Room.	<b>RG/CO</b>