

## Environment and Sustainability Panel

8 February 2024

**Present:** Councillor Steph Nissen (Chair)  
Councillor Tracey Arnold (Deputy Chair)  
Councillor Pam Cox  
Councillor Paul Dundas  
Councillor Andrew Ellis  
Councillor Mark Goacher  
Councillor Sue Lissimore  
Councillor Natalie Sommers

**Substitutes:** Councillor Michael Lilley for Councillor Molly Bloomfield  
Councillor Sam McCarthy for Councillor Venessa Moffat

**Also present:**

### 114. Minutes of the previous meeting

*RESOLVED* that: the minute of the meetings of 6 December 2023 be confirmed as a correct record.

The Panel noted that since the previous meeting work had been carried out to promote energy efficiency grant funding to residents. Consideration was being given to additional promotional work which could take place, and the Council's social media channels had been used to promote the Home Upgrade Grant in particular.

### 115. Have Your Say!

Martin Pugh attended the meeting remotely and addressed the Panel in accordance with the Council's Have Your Say! arrangements. A letter had been sent by 17 naturalist experts via email on 5 January 2024, and Panel members were urged to check whether they had received this. The letter sought to demonstrate that Middlewick Ranges had been included erroneously in the Local Plan and that the site was not only of local importance, but also of national importance. The site was home to a huge number of invertebrate species, and 167 of those were rare or threatened, and recent studies had shown that Middlewick represented 10% or more of acid grassland in Essex, and was in fact the largest open area of acid grassland in the country. Mr Pugh suggested to the Panel that in relation to the Council's Climate Emergency Action Plan, Middlewick constituted a very valuable carbon store, and the development of the site would release an astronomical amount of carbon into the atmosphere – had any consideration been given to this consequence of including the site in the Local Plan?

Mr Pugh believed that including Middlewick Ranges in the Local Plan set a dangerous precedent for other local authorities and developers by suggesting that wildlife sites were 'fair game' for such use. Local wildlife sites had been devalued and local and national expert opinions on them had been disregarded in favour of commercial consultants. Now that the science which had supported the inclusion of the site in the Local Plan had been debunked, would the Panel lend its support to the local campaign which sought to get Middlewick removed from the Local Plan all together?

Mel Rundle, Head of Sustainability, responded to Mr Pugh and explained that since the previous meeting of the Panel when he had requested an additional ecological report, she had spoken with colleagues in the Council's Planning Team who had advised that the Council had engaged with the Colchester Natural History Society to recommend an independent ecologist to provide a survey. This work would commence in the spring and the ecological report would be publically available if completed.

Mr Pugh welcomed the production of such a report, but remained concerned that the science which had suggested that it was possible to move wildlife from Middlewick to another location had been discredited, and a further delay of another year or so would give developers the opportunity to purchase the site. It was suggested that a desk-based assessment of all the evidence which had already been provided was carried out, as this would allow the use of site to be re-considered much more speedily. The Chair of the Panel would make this suggestion to the Council's Planning Team on Mr Pugh's behalf.

Steven Vince attended the meeting and addressed the Panel in accordance with the Council's Hare Your Say! arrangements. He was visiting the Panel to once again ask that the Council cease its unlawful practices in respect of Village Green 241 in West Mersea. He alleged that Colchester City Councillors had tried to stop him expressing his views, but he would not be silenced. There were 16 illegal parking spaces on the green, which he believed earned the Council up to £1m a year in revenue, which was unlawful. He called on the Panel, Councillors and Officers to take action to stop the unlawful practice of charging for the use of a village green and to restore the good name of the Council. He noted that he had been promised a reply to his request in September 2023, but was still waiting for this.

Responding to Mr Vince, the Chair of the Panel advised him that any concerns which he had about the conduct of Colchester City Councillors should be reported to the Council's Monitoring Officer. She also noted that following Mr Vince's visit to the Panel in September, Councillors and Officers had arranged to meet with him to discuss the concerns which he had raised, and a comprehensive response had been provided at this meeting.

The Head of Sustainability advised Mr Vince that a site visit had been conducted to the village green with him, and that the Council had now instructed a solicitor to provide independent advice in respect of the concerns that he had raised. The income from the car parking in question was shared with Mersea Town Council, which had agreed to share the costs of providing the legal advice to provide clarity on the situation. As soon as the legal advice had been received, this would be

shared with Mr Vince, however, it was difficult to provide a timescale for when the advice may be received. Mr Vince reiterated his statement that the Council was unlawfully taking money from the public every day that the car park remained open, and demanded that this illegal practice be stopped. The Chair of the Panel resolved to follow up on the progress of the advice which had been requested by Officers on behalf of Mr Vince.

Alan Short attended the meeting and addressed the Panel in accordance with the Council's Have Your Say! procedures. He noted that in December 2023 the Panel had decided that consideration of the ecology and biodiversity of Middlewick Ranges was appropriate to it. In the light of this, why had the Panel not commissioned the external review of the site, and set out the terms of reference for this before reporting its findings directly to the Local Plan Committee? The second issue which Mr Short wished to raise, was the provision of information to Councillors. He stated that before the decision to adopt the Local Plan had been taken in 2022 a letter had been received from Natural England, who were a statutory body, which made adverse comments on the inclusion of Middlewick Ranges in the Local Plan. According to a local newspaper, this letter had been received by Councillor Goss, who had decided in conjunction with Councillor Tim Young, that it would not be circulated to all other Councillors before the vote on the Local Plan. The Chair of the Panel resolved to raise Mr Short's concerns with Cabinet and the relevant Portfolio Holder, and considered that enhanced powers for both the Panel and the Council's Policy Panel would be appropriate, however, at the current time the Panel could only make recommendations to Cabinet. Mr Short considered that it was the remit of the Local Plan Committee to identify areas for potential housing, which was desperately needed in Colchester, however it was also necessary to ensure that the Council did not regret building on land which had a significant ecological value.

Kemal Cufoglu attended the meeting and addressed the Panel in accordance with the Council's Have Your Say! arrangements. He was speaking as the Policy Development Officer of the Colchester Green Party. He congratulated the Council's Trees for Years scheme which allowed residents to obtain free trees and shrubs, however, he asked what contribution the Panel had made to this scheme, and what contributions had the Panel made to the Council's Woodland and Biodiversity project? On the Trees for Years webpage, it was claimed that 10,000 native trees would be distributed, however, none of the shrubs being offered were native, and they did not have the benefits to wildlife that he would expect. The forsythia x intermedia plant in particular which was being offered had no known value to wildlife in the United Kingdom according to the BBC's Gardeners World. This was in contrast to information provided by the Council in respect of this shrub which claimed that it attracted bees, beneficial insects, birds and moths. The dogwood shrubs which were also being offered by the Council were also non-native, and while attractive, did not attract beneficial insects. He urged the Council to reconsider its scheme and replace non-native trees and plants with little to no value for wildlife with more appropriate native species. What action had the Panel taken to review woodland and sustainability project? It had been noted that a number of the Council's webpages concerning tree planting and related Council projects appeared to be out of date, having not been updated for a number of years. Mr Cufoglu questioned the number trees which had been planted and which had survived, noting that he had registered

to be a tree guardian in 2019, but had only received a single email since this date advising him of proposed tree planting.

The Chair of the Panel confirmed that the Panel had the power to make recommendations to Cabinet, but did not have the power to interfere in decisions which had already been taken. The level of detail which Mr Cufoglu had provided when addressing the Panel was appreciated, and he was requested to email Officers the points that he had made in order to enable the concerns that he had raised to be addressed.

A Panel member had been involved with some tree planting and believed that work had already been undertaken by the Council to review the number of trees which had survived. It was noted that the inclusion of forsythia in the Council's Trees for Years scheme had been questioned by a Panel member in the past, who had been assured that the plants were of value in the spring.

## **116. Housing Stock and sustainability**

The Panel considered a report which outlined key initiatives, improvements, and future plans to enhance sustainability, and improvements in Colchester City Council's housing stock energy performance.

Mark Wicks, Interim Director of Assets for Colchester Borough Homes (CBH) attended the meeting to introduce the report and assist the Panel with its enquiries. The Panel was invited to consider the progress which had been made by CBH with regard to Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) and Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) ratings. Since 2021, the average SAP rating had increased across the housing estate from 75.2 to 75.71, and the housing stock was in a very good position with 86.3% of properties with a current EPC rating of C or above compared to the benchmark standard of 72%. CO2 emissions had been reduced by an average of 55 kilograms per property and further improvements were planned through the current capital programme. Use of the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund would lead to an upgrade of 105 properties by the summer of 2025, and an additional 25 properties would receive retrofits during 2024/2025.

Work was being undertaken to monitor the performance of properties and the improvements which had been made to them, and this monitoring was primarily through a device called a Switchee which was a smart thermostat which had the capacity to reduce energy consumption in the home by up to 15%. Monitoring how the home performed allowed any issues to be identified and addressed swiftly, and it was intended that 600 properties would receive the device.

Three wildflower areas had been created on Housing Revenue Account (HRA) land, and these areas were having a positive impact on local wildlife. 30 trees had been planted, and it was planned to plant an additional 50 trees through future schemes.

The Panel was pleased to note the higher than national average of properties with an EPC rating of C or above, and requested that the number of properties in each

EPC band be circulated to it to provide context for this figure. The Interim Director of Assets would provide this information after the meeting.

In response to an enquiry from a Panel member, the Interim Director of Assets confirmed that HRA land was generally defined as where CBH properties were situated, and would include any area, including outside areas, which was maintained as part of this portfolio of properties. The Interim Director of Assets would liaise with the Grounds Maintenance Officer of CBH, but was certain that suggestions from Councillors on the location of future wildflower sites would be most welcome.

A Panel member welcomed the fact that CBH had stopped using glyphosate herbicides to control weeds, however, sought assurance on the quality control which was implemented to stop borders becoming overrun with weeds. It was also noted that fewer visits were being paid to hard standings managed by CBH, had the loss of staff been the cause of this reduction? The Interim Director of Assets resolved to refer these questions to the Grounds Maintenance Officer of CBH and provide answers to the Panel after the meeting.

In discussion, the Panel sought further information on the operation of the Switchee devices in tenants homes, and expressed some concern that the devices could be controlled in a manner that would enable coercive control to be exerted over tenants through withholding heat in the property. The Interim Director of Assets confirmed to the Panel that generally control of the Switchee system was via the device itself which was mounted inside the CBH property, however, there was the opportunity to control the devices via an app. CBH were aware of the potential for misuse of this facility, and remote access to the device would be removed whenever a tenant left a property. With regard to the potential for the device being used for coercive control, the use of the systems was monitored via a portal which would enable any unusual or unexpected use of the devices to be flagged, enabling a quick response.

A Panel member sought clarification on the position with the maintenance of outside hard surfaces which were managed by CBH, and whether or not glyphosate herbicides were still being used, or whether their use had stopped entirely. Did CBH only carry out benchmarking against other Arms Length Management Organisations (ALMOs), or did it include other registered providers in this exercise? The Interim Director of Assets conceded that the Officer's report had been misleading and that in fact the use of glyphosate herbicides had been completely stopped. CBH did only carry out benchmarking work against other ALMOs, however, benchmarking against registered providers could be considered in the future.

Further information was provided to the Panel about the Switchee devices, and it was confirmed that they were slightly different from other smart thermostats in that they combined with sensors in the home to monitor conditions, and that this was helpful in preventing the spread of mould and damp. Although no personal data was collected by these sensors, it was possible to interact with tenants through the device through simple questionnaires. Funding had been obtained to fit 600 devices, and the installation of these had been determined based on geographical area where it was considered that people were most at risk from fuel poverty. It was felt that the devices were very useful, and it was hoped to introduce them as widely as possible.

A Panel member considered that the increase in the SAP score which had been noted in the Officer's report did not appear to be very significant. Where additional methods available to CBH to drive the figure even higher? The Interim Director of Assets explained that the SAP score was calculated across more than 6,000 properties, and the initial SAP score had already been higher than the average expected. Although the rise in SAP score did appear to be slight, when considered across the whole housing stock, the increase gained some more significance. It was the overall intention to raise all properties to a SAP score of 69, which was considered to represent a reasonable level of energy efficiency. The numbers of houses associated with each level of SAP score would be provided to the Panel.

*RESOLVED* that: the contents of the report be noted.

### **117. Colchester City Council Fleet Transition Strategy**

The Panel considered a report which set out the new Colchester City Council Fleet Transition Strategy, outlining a pathway for Colchester to transition to a zero-tailpipe emission fleet. It showed the requirements needed including infrastructure, personnel, and capital investment.

Rosa Tanfield, Head of Neighbourhood Services, attended the meeting to present the report and assist the Panel with its enquiries. A detailed strategy document had been presented to the Panel, which proposed a revised Colchester City Council Strategy to transition the Council's fleet to carbon neutral status by 2030. This aligned with the Council's commitment to address the climate emergency by replacing diesel and petrol vehicles with low emission vehicles in the future. The Council recognised that its fleet accounted for approximately 25% of its total emissions, and the Panel was asked to recommend to Cabinet that the proposed Strategy was approved and adopted by the Council.

The proposed Strategy established 4 key objectives:

1. Ensuring assets were fit for purpose.
2. Promoting safety
3. Optimising asset usage.
4. Prioritising sustainability.

The Strategy set out aspirations to transition the Council's current fleet to greener lower emission vehicles by 2030, and specific objectives had been established by the Strategy to support achieving this goal. It was important to make effective and robust informed decisions on the composition of the fleet to ensure efficient and effective fleet management, future proof service delivery and enhance fleet performance. The proposed Strategy supported the Council's commitment to a systematic and data-driven approach, emphasising the importance of informed decision making, financial prudence and expert guidance.

The Officer's report recognised that the market for alternative fuel source vehicles was constantly changing and developing, and there was a need for infrastructure development to support any future move towards the use of more electric vehicles

(EVs), and the transitioning of the Council's entire fleet, including refuse trucks, to EVs would require particularly careful evaluation, with different options for charging vehicles being considered. The Strategy also considered the use of alternative fuels such as hydrotreated vegetable oil (HVO) which had the potential to significantly reduce tailpipe gas emissions, however, it was recognised that there were concerns about the use of HVO and the potential origin of used cooking oil used in its production. In terms of hydrogen fuelled vehicles, information had been provided by the Energy Savings Trust and the Officer's report addressed the suitability of these vehicles when used for refuse collection. The Officers' report outlined potential costs of refuse collection vehicles and vans dependent on the different fuel types.

The proposed Strategy set out 3 main options for the Council to consider when at the point of adding to its fleet or replacing existing vehicles:

1. The full transition to EV which would align with the Council's Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP) but would require significant capital investment.
2. The use of HVO as an interim measure until the Council had reached zero full tailpipe emissions.
3. To continue as running the current fleet and replacing vehicles with the latest diesel engines on renewal. Although this would be cost effective in the short term, this action would not align with the Council's CEAP.

The Panel were not being asked to confirm the option to be taken in the future, as the options were contained within the proposed Strategy and were to be considered in the future at the point when vehicle replacements were being considered, and decisions which were taken at this point would be supported by a business case before any commitment was made. The proposed Strategy emphasised the Council's commitment to reducing its carbon emissions and transitioning to a lower emission fleet, while acknowledging the ongoing development in green technology and the necessity of a measured approach being taken in the light of funding challenges. The Panel was asked to recommend the Strategy to Cabinet for approval and adoption, subject to any changes which it considered necessary.

In discussion, the Panel wondered why the phrase less 'tailpipe emissions' was not being used? A Panel member was very concerned that there was nothing in the Officer's report relating to the production and disposal of vehicles and batteries or the methods used to mine materials for batteries. A full picture was needed of the whole life cycle of vehicles. With regard to charging of EVs, how much cost to build a substation at the Council's Shrub End depot, and what was the volume of EV ownership which would require such works to be carried out?

The Head of Neighbourhood Services explained to the Panel that the Strategy which it was being asked to consider did not commit the Council to investing in an EV fleet, but was simply setting out a framework which would guide and inform future decision making when options for replacement vehicles were being considered. It was accepted that the marketplace was evolving at a rapid pace, and any future purchases would be supported by a very detailed business case, prepared using the Strategy as a guide to ensure that the Council made an informed decision about the most appropriate way forward at that time. EVs, potentially supported by a new

substation, were not the only options being considered, and other fuel types, or different methods of connecting to EV infrastructure would also have a bearing on future decisions.

Peter Eggeman of the Energy Savings Trust, attended the meeting remotely and advised the Panel that in respect of concerns about the production and recycling of batteries used in EVs. He stated that a number of years ago there had been significant concerns around the production of rare trace minerals used in the production of batteries, particular those coming from the Democratic Republic of Congo. At the current time, however, such trace minerals were now being produced in other locations such as Chile and Australia, and motor manufacturers had taken steps to ensure that materials used in the production of their batteries were being sourced responsibly. Materials like cadmium and lithium were used in other areas, such as catalytic reduction equipment found in internal combustion engine vehicles as well as the 12 volt batteries used in cars. In terms of recycling batteries from EVs which had reached the end of their useful life, the Panel heard that these could be repurposed as storage and were generally becoming more widely recyclable.

Simon Davison, Sustainability and Climate Change Manager, attended the meeting remotely and supported the comments which had been made by Peter Eggeman, noting that trace metals were commonly used in the production of a wide variety of batteries used commonly in everyday life. He explained that the use of the term tailpipe emissions served to differentiate vehicle emissions from carbon emissions, as tailpipe emissions contained harmful elements and microscopic pollutant particles. Switching to vehicles with alternate power sources would significantly reduce these emissions as well as improving local air quality.

A Panel member wondered whether consideration had been given to the carbon footprint involved in producing and disposing of vehicles used in the Council's fleet, and would vehicles only be replaced once they had reached the end of their useful life? The Head of Neighbourhood Services confirmed that the Council was in the fortunate position of owning, and not leasing, the majority of its fleet and this enabled a pragmatic approach to be taken to the lifespan of a vehicle and when it should be replaced. When considering whether or not to replace a Council vehicle, the Sustainability and Climate Change Manager considered that it would be useful to start taking whole life cycle analysis into account, noting that the lifespan of diesel road sweepers was 3 or 4 years, whereas the lifespan of a similar EV may be much longer.

In response to a question from the Panel, the Head of Neighbourhood Services confirmed that a Fleet Transition Plan had already been adopted by the Council, and it would therefore cause no issues if the Panel wished to defer a decision on the proposed Strategy until its next meeting to enable some additional information to be provided.

In discussion, the Panel offered support for the proposed Strategy, however, noted the difference between smaller and larger EVs in terms of their development and efficiency. The improvements in range and affordability of smaller vehicles had been significant over recent years, while larger heavy goods vehicles were only just entering the market and were significantly more expensive than their diesel



counterparts. A Panel member questioned whether the Council's Shrub End depot would remain suitable for the location of an all EV fleet, given the infrastructure changes which may be necessary to support this. It was noted that the report contained information about the fuel consumption of diesel and HVO vehicles, but did not contain this information for EVs, could this information be provided in terms of miles per kilowatt hour? It was also suggested that many EVs being marketed by European or American companies were actually being built in China, was this something that the Council should be aware of and give consideration to? What was the price per litre of HVO compared to normal diesel, and how was the 90% tailpipe reduction in emissions which had been mentioned actually measured?

The Head of Neighbourhood Services confirmed that the 90 reduction in tailpipe emissions was in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>, but care had to be taken when sourcing HVO to ensure that it had the correct certification. Lots of other local authorities had been utilising HVO, and it was possible to mix this fuel with diesel in a fuel tank. There were 2 fuel tanks at the Shrub End depot, and one had been filled with HVO as part of a trial to assess the impact on the fleet of using this fuel type, and the Council did monitor the costs of both diesel and HVO. The Council was actively considering working with other authorities in Essex to see if the costs of HVO could be brought down by a potential procurement framework. In terms of residual value of vehicles which had reached the end of their life, the Council used its vehicles for as long as possible, and so any residual value was likely to be very small.

A Panel member requested that further consideration be given to the equality and diversity and human rights implications of the Officer's report, considering that more detail was required. He understood that the Council had a number of social value indicators and wished to see more information provided on what could, or could not be done to support these. The Head of Neighbourhood Services would contact colleagues in the Council's Procurement Team to see if further detail could be provided to the Panel.

The Panel noted the significant emission savings that were achievable through the use of HVO, and wondered whether there was an opportunity to sell HVO to the general public, if the Council was procuring this in bulk. Was the Council aware of the emissions associated with generating or procuring HVO or electricity consumed by the fleet?

A Panel member acknowledged the discussion which had taken place in respect of the proposed strategy. Although she appreciated the questions which had been asked, she reminded the Panel that 25% of the Council's overall emissions were generated by its fleet, and it was therefore of paramount importance to address this at the earliest opportunity. She suggested that the Panel recommend the proposed Strategy which was before it to Cabinet, with the suggestion that Cabinet seek the additional information which had been referenced by the Panel.

In the light of the discussions which had taken place on the item, the Panel voted on whether to commend the proposed Strategy to Cabinet, or defer the final decision until the next meeting of the Panel.

*RESOLVED* that: the decision on whether or not to recommend the proposed Fleet Transition Strategy be deferred until the next meeting of the Panel in order to allow additional information to be presented to it.

### **118. Climate Emergency Action Plan Update.**

The Panel considered a report which detailed key progress and updates from actions in the Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP) and other relevant updates since its last meeting in December 2023.

Ben Plummer, Climate Emergency Project Officer, attended the meeting to present the report and assist the Panel with its enquiries. The attention of the Panel was drawn to a scheme managed by Essex County Council called Solar Together, which provided cheaper access to solar panels or battery storage for residents. The deadline for registering for the scheme was 23 February 2024, and this simply constituted a register of interest and did not commit the resident to any future purchase.

A Panel member noted the intention to consider the removal of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in Colchester, and expressed some reservations about this proposal. Although significant work had been carried out which had been very successful in improving air quality in Colchester, it was felt that the problem had been so serious that very careful consideration had to be given to the removal of any AQMA. The Climate Emergency Project Officer could not comment on the reasoning behind the consideration of the removal of AQMAs, but advised the Panel that it would receive an update on air quality at its next meeting which would provide further data in relation to this.

In discussion, the Panel considered the Green Events Code which had been referenced in the Officer's report, and was noted that damage had been caused to Castle Park following an event on October 2023. Although it was desirable to hold events in the Council's parks, care had to be taken to ensure that the space remained fit for use by others following them. Mel Rundle, Head of Sustainability, advised the Panel that concerns had been raised about the condition that Castle Park had been left in following some events, and the Parks and Countryside Team were working closely with the Events Team to mitigate against any future issues. The time of year in which events were held, together with the weather, was an important factor in determining the potential extent of any damage, and this would be considered in the future.

The Climate Emergency Project Officer was asked whether there was a rationale for selecting items from the CEAP to update the Panel on, noting that the action plan had been written to end in 2023. Given the importance of the Plan, was it intended to update the CEAP, and could full updates from the Plan be provided as part of the next update report at the next Panel meeting? The Head of Sustainability advised the Panel that a very wide range of Officers worked on different areas of the CEAP,

and it may well not be possible to obtain updates from them all, however, any updates which were available could be brought back to the Panel.

Panel members were interested in the Vision 2025 project, designed to make outdoor events more environmentally friendly. It was accepted that this constituted a very wide piece of work, but was it possible to provide the Panel with an overview of this? The Panel were advised that the Colchester City Council Events Policy had been adopted in 2020 and contained no references to sustainability. It was proposed that the Events Policy would be re-considered with the support of sustainability experts from Vision 2025 to explore what it was realistic to mandate to outdoor events promoters. Officers were keen to work with the Council's Events Team, and were considering introducing an environmental impact assessment element to the Policy. It was not anticipated that any changes would be made in the forthcoming year, but work would be ongoing.

The Panel expressed its admiration for the climate communications email which the Climate Emergency Project Officer circulated to all Councillors, which it considered was excellent, and of real benefit when raising awareness of funding which was available. Was it possible to disseminate the information contained in the email to a much wider audience so that everyone in Colchester could benefit? The Climate Emergency Project Officer explained that his update email was also circulated to all Parish Councils, and had recently been sent to the Council's Communities Team who also circulated their own newsletter which drew on information contained in the update. Consideration would be given to locating the information contained in the climate communications email on the Council's website.

*RESOLVED* that: the contents of the report be noted.

#### **119. Work Programme 2023/2024**

The Panel considered a report outlining its work programme for the current municipal year.

Mathew Evans, Democratic Services Officer, attended the meeting to present the report and assist the Panel with its enquiries.

The Panel noted the deferment of the Fleet Transition Strategy to its next meeting in March 2023, and the removal of the item presenting the Carbon Management Plan which would be presented to the Panel in the new municipal year.

*RESOLVED* that: the contents of the report be noted.