

CABINET MEETING – 29 JULY 2020

1. Public Question from Susan Chapman

I'd like to ask this question please of the Cabinet Meeting 29.7.20. It relates to Item 6 on the Agenda, the Budget Reset Paper.

80.000, including Greta and climate scientists, are attacking EU failures to safeguard their future. The planetary cooling system is failing. The 5 degrees of warming now predicted by 2100 means mass extinction. The 2030s anticipated Blue Ocean event as the Arctic melts- accelerating irreversible overheating-threatens all life.

The carbon budget is spent. 7.6% must be cut annually. Lies continue. Harvest, water and soil failures, migrations and wars will follow as resources vanish. How does this anachronistic document address the need for Salvage, Collaborate and Survive policies and decarbonisation at speed and scale to avoid dysbiosis, the unravelling of ecosystems?

Response by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change

My understanding of this question is that the resident does not gain confidence that the Reset For All paper truly acknowledges the seriousness of the climate emergency that we are in.

I can confirm that I also find discrepancies that concern me. For example, a commitment to the Air Show for a further 4 years suggests it is ok to use up valuable carbon for pleasure. And the continued emphasis on road building, which would cost £10's of millions of tax payers money, which in this paper is the Christchurch relief road, but in previous full council meetings has been the A338 flyover by Bournemouth Hospital, seriously concerns me that there is a deep lack of professionalism and understanding about how to manage transportation in an urban environment, let alone focusing on how to reduce the carbon footprint of transport. It makes me angry and it confuses me to think that the authors of the report are not actually taking an evidenced-based approach to climate change seriously. I propose, that going forwards, the authors of this report join in with the climate action working group on transportation, so that they are reassured and comfortable with the business, health and economic benefits of moving towards sustainable travel, rather than continuing to publicly support such risky behaviour that will cause enormous damage to local businesses, residents and future generations.