

Public Questions to Full Council on 25th June 2026

1) Question from Cliff Goodman

The motion to consider replacing the Climate Emergency Declaration, scheduled to be considered at this meeting, prompts me to focus on this welcome declaration and the probable negative impact of replacing the declaration. The current declaration appears to commit to reducing CO2 emissions as well as other initiatives aimed at playing a part in tackling climate and nature emergency issues locally.

Last November MPs and members of the House of Lords attended an event at Westminster Hall where briefings were presented by scientists who are experts on various aspects relating to climate change and nature crisis. A film featuring experts from these briefings was recently screened at the Majestic Cinema and the Corn Exchange. and is currently being screened nationwide. The message from the briefings is clear and stark. Science backed evidence overwhelmingly shows that rising temperatures resulting in some of the medical emergencies, deaths, infrastructure damage and travel delays is significantly influenced by human activity. The warning messages state that it's not certain doom, it's still not too late to stop temperature rise spiralling out of control but it's vital this council ensures meaningful actions to feed into combined efforts to tackle climate and nature crisis. It's important that this council's actions take account of fairness and do not put additional financial burden on people, especially those who can least afford extra living costs.

My question is:

How does the current Climate Emergency Declaration and associated strategy take account of reporting measured progress on delivering objectives, including reducing CO2? Do the strategies include aims to get overall medium to long term cost saving or at least not incur heavy extra spending?