

Hello,

And thank you to the chair for allowing me three minutes of your time. My name is Christine Brittijn and I am a resident of Midsomer Norton.

I found out about this panel when doing research for the NOGASPs campaign that protested against the planning permission granted for a gas peaker power plant in Midsomer Norton.

I actually requested to be allowed to speak to this panel regarding this campaign at your previous meeting, but was denied this opportunity by the strict application of your rules. I think it was rule E subsection 32 that you threw at me and I realized that my input was not welcome.

And that got me interested in the work of your panel on climate change and BANES' target to get to net zero carbon emissions by 2030, a target which I fully support. I have spent quite a bit of time over the last few weeks going through the minutes of previous meetings, reading through the reports and plans that have been submitted to you and looking at the level of 'scrutiny' that you have given.

And I am very worried about what I have found.

I have found that the measures that are being proposed in these plans and reports, are nowhere near enough to reduce the net emissions of BANES to zero by 2030. In fact, these plans will probably not have any effect on emissions at all.

I have come to this conclusion after comparing the measures that are being proposed by BANES to those that are suggested in a report that has been published by Banes in September 2019. I trust that you are all very familiar with this document called 'Climate Emergency Study: synthesis of evidence'. It is a document that lays out very clearly the scope and type of measures that are needed to get as close to net zero as possible.

There are very large discrepancies between what this document suggests is needed to reach net zero, and the plans of the council.

I will bring three of these gaps to your attention:

Gap number one. The local plan update, which is currently out for consultation and on which you were asked to comment in August 2020, sets aims for housing emissions, transport and clean energy that do not even come

close to the type and scale of measures that are needed, according to the Climate Emergency Study.

In point 2.6 of the local plan update, it is stated for example that the council aims for a target of 110MW of renewable energy by 2030, when in the Climate Emergency study clearly indicates that a capacity of nearly 3 times that size is needed.

Another discrepancy is regarding electric vehicles (in point 2.37), where the council aims for half of new cars to be electric by 2030 when according to the Climate Emergency study, we should be looking at more than 75% of all cars electric, and all busses, and the rest hybrid.

In July 2020 you scrutinized the liveable neighbourhood plan, where the council states that it aims to reduce the number of car journeys by 25%. In order to have any chance of reaching net zero by 2030, that should have said a 25% reduction in car miles per person.

None of these discrepancies between the council's aims and what is actually required according to the Climate Emergency Study where picked up by the panel.

Gap number two: the panel does not seem to have noticed that there are areas that badly need a policy, but where the council has not created one at all. One of these areas is emissions from industrial processes. There are no plans to tackle industrial emissions, when these are actually a significant part of the emissions of this area.

The only mention of industrial emissions is in relation to gas fuelled peaker plants, and that is an addition, I would like to point out, that has been made in response not to your scrutiny of plans, but as a result of the hard work of a group of committed residents.

Similarly, the pathway that will take us as close as possible to net zero, suggest that 50% of all homes should be fitted with solar PV. There is no policy plan to facilitate this.

Gap number three: The panel also seems to have failed to notice that are no plans to reduce the Scope 3 emissions in the area, which account for the lion share of total emissions of BANES. There is hardly a word on these emissions in the plans that have been put before you and those that are currently out for consultation with the public, even though they are clearly mentioned in the Climate Emergency Study.

It has become obvious to me that both the council officers and this panel do not have the expertise or the drive required for the enormous tasks that bringing net emissions down to zero is. The council's plans and the scrutiny of these plans that has so far been provided by this panel are at best naïve, at worst, negligent.

I would urge the members of this panel to educate themselves much, much better as to the causes of climate change, the type and scope and the scale of measures that are needed and the urgency with which these measures need to be implemented.

Climate change is the most important issue of our times. By agreeing to sit on this panel, you shoulder the responsibility for Banes' response to this crisis. As it stands now, you are badly letting the side down

Thank you for your time.