

A Local Green New Deal for Brighton and Hove

Climate:Change event

Brighthelm Centre

30 November 2023

Simon Maxwell

Good afternoon. I'm Simon Maxwell. It's lovely to see you all. I know it's going to be a great session because I've seen the PowerPoint and also I hope you've all seen Caroline Lucas' blog, which is on our website.

What we're trying to do in Brighton is create an epistemic community around climate action. And you are it! We are the group of people who are going to work together to try and help Brighton and Hove in all its different manifestations and with all the different stakeholders, to make a difference on climate change. So we're really glad you're here. I'm going to say a few things and I'm going to introduce the speakers.

Three things I want to say.

The first is what Climate:Change is and what it is not. It is not a campaigning organization. It is not a forum for activists. It is a place where we come together to look at the data and analyze the issues, to try and build consensus around what might happen on Monday morning. We are a think tank, not a campaigning organization. That distinction is really important because it structures the kind of conversations we want to have. We are independent, We are non-party political, we are nonpartisan, and we provide a forum for discussion and debate.

Second, how are we getting on? We launched in September at the Brighton Centre, with thanks to the Council for their support. We have a whole series of blogs, guest blogs and contributions on the website, including the full transcript and the audio of the launch meeting. And, as I said, the latest blog contribution is by Caroline Lucas. All of the posts are open to comments. We would love to have your contributions and if somebody would like to write something, let me know.

Climate:Change is a very low key operation. We have a group of people helping. I'd like to thank Emelye Peachey over there, who is organizing all the volunteers and helping in other ways. And then we have a group of people leading on different topics. James Joughin is leading on food; Andrew Barnett on energy; Ed on business - and then we are looking for people to help us put together clusters on finance, transport and participation and other issues. So if you would like to help, please either contact one of us, or send us an email via the website. Obviously, this is not something we can build on our own.

We have no money and we are not quite at the stage where we can go for large lottery funding. So, you will find a little slip on your chair, asking for donations. We are a community interest company, so there are no profits, no rewards for any of us. Donations go to help support the website, the organization, and the meetings. This meeting, though, the room here and the tea and coffee, have been very kindly funded by the university and by the project that is launching their report today. We are very grateful.

Third, the rules of engagement today. We are on the record. I'm recording the discussion. Stuart, from the university, will be taking a few photographs.

When we come to the Q&A, I will ask you not to ask questions, but to contribute to the discussion. Please stand up, say who you are, make an interesting point and sit down again.

Let me introduce the speakers today. You have a copy of the report, and I'm grateful to authors for bringing so many copies. Tim Foxton, is a professor of sustainability transitions at the Science Policy Research Unit at the University of Sussex and one of the members of CREDS, the Centre for Research on Energy Demand Solutions. Donal Brown is a colleague and in the same unit as Tim. Christian Jaccarini is at the new Economics Foundation in London who have done amazing work on this topic over many years. And of course, I don't need to introduce Caroline Lucas.

Tim Foxton

Good evening, everyone. We are going to talk for about half an hour, summarizing the research we have done for this report. And I should say this is a team effort. So myself, Donal and Christian Jaccarini from the New Economics Foundation are going to be speaking. But we have our other colleagues here who are coauthors on the report. So thanks to everyone who contributed.

We are going to briefly introduce what we mean by a local Green New Deal and key areas for action. We will show the evidence that these measures are on the whole well supported by members of the public from the survey and focus group we did in the Greater Brighton area. And then Christian is going to talk about the policy recommendations that we are making in relation to what's happening at the moment in Brighton and Hove and the Greater Brighton area.

I'm sure most of you do not need to be reminded about the idea of a Green New Deal. We have one of the originators here, Caroline Lucas, one of the members of the Green New Deal Group, which authored the original report on a Green New Deal. The idea was to bring together environmental priorities and social justice in one package.

We identified five core features from different versions of the Green New Deal around: financial reforms; investment in green infrastructure; new financing mechanisms; new ownership structure, so more towards more community ownership; and crucially, done in a way which promotes economic, social and climate justice. We have a paper on the history of the Green New Deal.

But we want to really look forward today. We can by 2050 achieve a 50% reduction in UK energy demand in a way which is consistent with maintaining or enhancing people's quality of life. But most of the energy saving activity must be devised and delivered locally. And that needs radical policy reforms and often increased devolution, so more powers down to the local level.

Donal Brown

Hi, everyone. As one of the lead authors of the report, I am going to outline the areas we focused on in the report and some of the numbers that we used to help us articulate the scale of a local Green New Deal. These are not the whole picture. We missed some things out. For example, we are not talking about renewables. Clearly, renewables are hugely important. There are other areas that that we would obviously want to focus on, but we focused on the following partly because of the local implementation potential, and also the fact that they are about reducing demand. So: cheaper, warmer, zero carbon homes, particularly focusing on our existing housing stock; affordable, sustainable public transport; car free city centres and active travel by walking and cycling; and also expanding green spaces and nature restoration.

Cheaper, warmer, zero carbon homes

The first plank of this is based on some work that we did as part of a CREDS-funded project on Cheaper Bills Warmer Homes, which developed a national retrofit strategy for the housing stock to

really move to an accelerated adoption of home energy efficiency and heat pumps, also solar PV by the middle of the next decade to 2035. The high level goal that we had there was almost all homes being EPC energy performance C by 2035 and about a third of households having heat pumps, and then rapidly pursuing the adoption of heat pumps thereafter. That scenario at a national level produced about a 53% reduction in CO₂ emissions from homes, with heat pumps doing much of the rest, as we rolled them out.

We did some fairly simple but representative downscaling work for Greater Brighton. That would mean about 316,000 homes retrofitted, a lot more than we've been doing to date. About 46,000 households in the region would be lifted out fuel poverty by this programme. That would create about 5,000 new jobs in retrofit-related supply chains and bill savings by 2040-45, the lifetime of many of these measures, is almost 5 billion pounds. That's actually quite a lot more than the money we need to spend on the programme. So you can just see how huge the impact could be if we got this right.

We did a little bit of work on the financing. Brighton is a relatively affluent place actually, compared to some of the other places we've looked at. So you see here the distribution of people in income deciles. So basically what we said was people at the bottom end get everything for free. And gradually as you move up the income distribution, you get some grant. But some of this will need to be paid for by private investment unless the state can pay for everything, which we didn't model, but it's still about a £60 billion investment in the housing stock through the scenarios we developed. So in Greater Brighton, actually it's about £286 million would need to come from the public sector in our model. And actually most of the chunk of the £2.5 billion comes from private investment. We can chew the fat over whether we agree with that. But, for example, the other scenario we looked at in North Tyne, the vast majority of people are in those lower income deciles. And so the state is doing more of the work in that scenario.

Affordable, sustainable public transport

On public transport, a huge area which Christian will talk quite a lot about in the policy space, but broadly our scenarios see about a 66% increase in bus journeys, 44% increase in use of trams, trains and metro and in metro services. And over time we get an expansion in capacity that requires also a lot of investment, particularly the electrification and expansion of the bus fleet, although obviously some of that will be replacing the buses that we already have with electric buses. We also, slightly for fun, looked at the option of reintroducing a tram system in Brighton and Hove. We managed to find this map of the old trolley bus, the tram system from the 1910s. Maybe this could be a really, really good thing. Similar cities in the UK like Sheffield and Nottingham spend between £2 million and £400 million on the reintroduction of tram system. It's not beyond the pale if we think big, I think.

Active travel

On active travel, a big part of this is about getting people out of their cars. So we model a 225% increase in walking and cycling. There are lots of ways we can achieve that. We model a 21% reduction in car journeys. That doesn't sound that much, but almost every projection for the UK into the future shows car journeys increasing massively, with more people driving. So we're actually pushing against that.

There are some specific statistics about what that would mean in Greater Brighton and also the investment in things like cycling infrastructure that £600 million also including things like e-bikes.

Just briefly about the modal shifts. So this is the split of train transport journeys today in 2023. When we look to 2040, we do see an increase, but you see that massive increase in walking and

cycling as a key component of that change. And we do see more travel, but it's healthy, active travel and a reduction in car usage.

If you're interested in some of these numbers, please get in touch with us.

Green spaces and nature restoration

The last piece is around green spaces and nature restoration. This is an afforestation/rewilding agenda. You see some stats over the whole of the UK and large support to move up to about 800 hectares being brought back in this case into sort of native woodland or other forms of kind of rewilding space. And we looked at some of the costs of doing that through carbon credits, about 11 million pounds, which isn't a huge amount of money actually for the benefit that this would create. Christian will talk more about some of the mechanisms for doing that, but you can see some of the spaces here where there is obviously more opportunity for expansion, things like native woodland, whereas city centres, less so. Those spaces are really valued where they are created in city centres.

Simon Maxwell

Have you added up how much in total all these measures for Brighton and Hove might cost?

Donal Brown

I don't have it in my head right now, but yes.

The last slide is just our primary research with members of the community. We did a survey with about 350 Brighton residents. We asked them about the popularity and approval of different measures. And you can see almost all of the measures were extremely popular with citizens. I think the only ones that were slightly more controversial were plant-based diets and things like car sharing, but still actually a fairly high share of people thinking positively about those. We also did focus groups, more detailed work with citizens, using multiple criteria mapping as the methodology, including asking for more qualitative answers. And we asked people to rank their preferences for different measures. You can see again, people were pretty positive about these solutions, once they learned more about them and understood the constraints and policy approaches.

Christian Jaccarini

Thank you so much. It's great to be here. And it's really exciting to talk about this because I think Greater Brighton is a really interesting case study to look at.

I'm really interested in the Net Zero agenda, but also specifically in how through the net zero agenda we can generate community wealth and deepen devolution, because I think really that's crucial.

Cheaper, warmer, zero carbon homes

On our first pillar, Greater Brighton set up a task force in 2021, a retrofit taskforce to make all council owned housing stock zero carbon by 2030. But it is my understanding that they have come up against the financial constraints and supply side constraints, so that's looking unlikely at the moment. In addition, there are community organizations doing great work already, for example BHESco, many of you I'm sure will know about. Within the wider region, Eastbourne and Lewes are working with AECOM and Robertson Projects. My understanding is that they're doing research

into programme delivery and bulk purchasing, in view of trialing an approach. The project is called Clear Futures.

That is quite important to think about because it is worth remembering that AECOM is multi-national organization, listed on the New York Stock Exchange and headquartered in Dallas Texas. If we are to solely deliver many of these measures through big organizations like that, we will miss out on many of the upsides that come with the Net zero agenda.

One of our key recommendations is to put in place a ten year local retrofit delivery framework, and this would support regional authorities to deliver on one stop shops and put in place local retrofit taskforce forces that are well resourced across the country. Central government should be supporting this with expertise in how to best deliver on retrofit. It's also really key that we put in place a nationwide system and engagement campaign so that everyone understands that retrofit is a well-funded national priority. And in addition, we will need new training courses and apprenticeships that should again be run and delivered locally but funded centrally. It is also important to think about the role of community organizations in this. And government should be enabling local government to support social enterprises and co-ops to, for example, join BHESco, so they are actually able to deliver on the retrofit agenda.

In addition to that, I'm interested in direct labor organizations as a potentially fruitful way of delivering on some of this. Brighton has one, as I understand it, but it is not delivering on retrofit.

The case study of Glasgow City building is quite illustrative in this instance. They employ people on direct contracts and have developed an expertise in sustainable building, with a much more diverse workforce as a result of this than the general construction sector. And through this, they are able to retain a lot of the wealth within the local area and go out to the open market as well, bidding for new developments as well as just maintaining the existing building stock.

Affordable, sustainable public transport

For affordable sustainable transport, as things are at the moment, major funding is determined by the Department for Transport in relation to the local transport plans, and the local transport plans are put in place by the transport authorities. And in Greater Brighton, you've got three transport authorities, West Sussex, East Sussex and then Brighton and Hove Unitary. What that means is that you do not have a transport plan that considers the whole functional geography of the area.

Also, when we look at buses and how they operate, we know that buses are run by private operators on a for profit basis. I think there was a municipally owned bus operator in Brighton called Brighton Transport, but that was purchased by the Go Ahead group, which is one of the big five bus companies. And again, I think it's owned by 51% by an Australian company and 49% by a Spanish infrastructure company. So we're not exactly keeping it local on that front.

It's worth remembering that the commercial basis of these for-profit operators means that they can't be seen to be colluding on anything or acting in an anti-competitive way. And so that means that they can't be planning routes or coordinating routes, which means that the transport network isn't as joined up as it could be.

And now we're moving towards what the government calls enhanced partnerships, where there's an enhanced partnership between the transport authorities and the bus operators in exchange for improved infrastructure offered by the travel authorities. The bus operators promise to sign up to some additional features, which could include multi operator ticketing and joined up timetables. But this funding again was cut nationally from £3bn to £1bn. I think in Greater Brighton each of

the transport authorities has received funding, but only 31 of 79 Transport Authorities nationwide has. So there is a definite need that is not being met.

The other key recommendations are: to review the functional geography of the transport authorities, so that we are sure that it is representative of the functional geography; to make sure to integrate rail and regional transport planning, because currently responsible authorities have very little oversight of the rail network and are not able to integrate it properly. In addition, we would like to see control over buses given to transport authorities once the functional geography is sorted out. Local authorities are banned from owning bus companies, so we say that we should lift the ban and ultimately move towards a not for profit system, because much of the innovation in buses comes from the planning of the system, which in a municipally controlled system would be done by transport authorities.

And then yes, we were also thinking about trams, and it was really interesting reading about how the French system works and how they have achieved such wide coverage. I think there are trials in over 30 cities across France, and one way in which they've achieved this has been primarily through devolution of the powers required and the ability to fundraise for those systems. So that is what we are advocating, devolve power to local governments and allow local government to levy a tax on large employers in those cities. So I think we need to ultimately move towards that as well.

Active travel

Onto car free cities and active travel. Again, action is happening in Brighton, but like we said, it is still very top down. West Sussex and East Sussex have responsibility for highways, and then we've got the district councils responsible for planning and parking. And in Brighton Hove, it's all linked up under the unitary authority. But you can see there are already issues that arise in the system as a whole because of the split.

Now local government has the power to restrict vehicle traffic and create pedestrian and cycling friendly areas. This is through something called a Traffic Regulation Order, a TRO. This is being used to create low traffic neighborhoods such as the one in Hanover and Turner, which I understand is contested, though I don't profess to know all the details on that one.

It's also really worth mentioning that the budget for active travel is being cut this year by two thirds by central government. A cut of £200 million. The decision is now in the courts, who are reviewing whether the government is failing in its statutory duties.

What we are calling for is that central government lays out a clear vision for LTNs and low traffic towns and city centres. Implementing pedestrian friendly and cycle friendly areas is very difficult on a small scale because even if they're just doing a street corner, they still have to go through a full consultation. So, what we're calling for is that some of that needs to change, but we also need to address the way in which communities are consulted with, so the planning happens before we get to full blown project, if you like.

We also want to require that national highways work with local government to tackle emissions, an area that is currently is very segmented. It means local government has very little oversight of the emissions that come from big arterial roads.

We also really need to reform the appraisal tools for large capital projects. What you see at the moment is that a lot of the government guidance is based on economic modeling that uses quite a simplistic methodology for assessing the benefits of the scheme. And it's not very well suited to a paradigm shift. For example, introducing a big cycle highway on a road where there is currently no cycling is very difficult. It is very difficult to make the benefit cost ratios in the modeling actually stack up because it is based on a percentage uplift. So, if you only had five cyclists on that road

already because it was a very hostile environment, then applying a percentage to that isn't going to get you very far in terms of total benefits.

And then lastly, this one is a whole policy paper in itself, what you see with LTNs is the pain that comes with retrofitting places to be active travel friendly and not be car centric. What we need to make sure we're doing is that when we're developing new housing and new places is that we have a more proactive planning system. We see a role for local development corporations that have funding to assemble land and the capacity to develop a transport led housing and places.

Next to expanding green spaces and restoration.

Again, there is some action happening. Councillors have agreed to plant thousands of young trees in Brighton. I believe a total of 19,500 tree in woodlands, with a further 419 trees planted in parks, around housing and on highways. Unfortunately, most of these 19,500 trees were direct replacements for trees that have died as a result of ash dieback, which is a fungal infection in the trees, which has got worse because of climate change. There is also an ash dieback plan in place and there are some other initiatives taking place in the region, such as the Trees for the Cities programme.

Now, much of the government's approach to managing rural land is very incentive led, with subsidies provided. What we are saying is we want to keep that, but we also want to move beyond it. For example, one proposal is to amend property rights, so that a landowner must comply with agreed uses for agricultural and rural land. And these agreed leases would be democratically determined through a planning process. My understanding is that Labour is on board with that, but I think the detail is still up for grabs.

It is also really important to think about food systems and how they affect our natural environment. What we need to see is a shift of power away from the supermarkets, so that farmers are less squeezed and they are actually able to care for their environments and for people who work on their land.

And then lastly, we are also calling for making the land register free to access for all. Because currently, it costs 3 pounds a pop to find out who owns a piece of land and then another 3 pounds to find out the plot size and so on. That just gets in the way of a lot of planning, because frankly, the only people who can afford to access it are developers who are able to pay for expensive annual subscriptions to amalgamation services.

Thank you very much.

Simon Maxwell

Just while Caroline is coming up, I've read a lot of different Green New Deal documents from different countries. The observation I have is that they are ideologically very different. One exercise I did was to compare a Labor Party proposal from the last conference in Brighton with a Green New Deal proposal in the US Congress by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. If you put those two side by side and compare them, you find very different kinds of analysis and recommendations. The Labour Party example is very strong on nationalization of all public services. This was from a different Labor Party and that might or might not still be the case today. Whereas of course you do not find any mention of nationalisation in the US example.

When I listen to you three talk about this, I can see different ideological strands coming through the reports. There must have been a point at which you thought about what was the ideological

stance you were taking in relation to all these different proposals. I'm sure you will want to come back to me on that.

But, Caroline, you were in at the beginning of this and you must have seen these different kinds of threads running over the last 15 years since the original report and you have your own take on it. I'd love you to respond to what you've heard so far.

Caroline Lucas

Thanks so much, Simon. And thank you so much to all of the authors of this fantastic report. It's been really exciting to be catching up with it all and seeing how all of the ideas are developing and also seeing what some of the obstacles are to being able to scale them up and really allow them to flourish.

The context in which we're discussing this is really important. We are one of the most centralized countries in the whole of the Western world, and that really has big implications, in terms of the amount that we can do to enable these local green new deals to flourish without national government either getting out of the way or at least facilitating and devolving the power to enable this flourishing.

The point Simon makes about different kind of ideological approaches is really important. The biggest distinction I see is in some of the Labour approaches, which has been to see this much more as a green industrial strategy. It feels as if, for some in Labour, if this can just be presented all in terms of technology and jobs and more economic growth, then they're on familiar territory and everything's fine. I think the Green New Deal is far more transformational than that, which is what excites me about it. And I think a real Green New Deal is absolutely about social justice as well as about environmental justice. It is fundamentally about ownership. It's about power, wealth, who has it, how we might move it. It's not, to be very stereotypical, just about men in hard hats on building sites. I would argue quite strongly that social care should be part of our Green New Deal. Social care is pretty much a low carbon activity and is certainly an essential activity, and I would like to see a definition of a Green New Deal that goes far beyond the industrial strategy definition and that has a much more holistic approach.

In terms of the recent experience that I am bringing to this, one was as the co-chair of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Green New Deal, which I co-chair that with Clive Lewis, the Labour MP for Norwich South. We have recently done our own inquiry called Local Edge, trying to get as much evidence as we could from a whole range of different local authorities, but also from people like Andy Burnham in Manchester, to understand what some of the barriers are to enabling local new deals to flourish.

I also was one of the co-chairs of the IPPR Environmental Justice Commission, a two year process between 2019 and 2021, which put fairness and justice at the heart of the environmental transition. And the conclusion was the fairly obvious one, but nonetheless was very, very fully evidenced, which was that unless you have fairness and social justice at the heart of this transition, you're not going to bring people with you and it is not going to work. But it was quite helpful to get that reinforced.

Everything that I've heard this evening reinforces the conclusions of both the local report and from the IPPR report.

How a Green New Deal is implemented is as important as the content of the Green New Deal. Absolutely, bringing people with you, and understanding what consultation really looks like. When

does that start? How do you really engage people at the very beginning of processes so that a Green New Deal is something that is done by and with people, not to people?

And so the whole issue of the *how* is massively important, with fairness, as I say, being at the heart and being seen to be fair as well, to really demonstrate that it is not the case, as Rishi Sunak has claimed, that Green policy is about penalizing the poor. To the contrary, it is the reverse of that. It is absolutely about really being able to ensure that those people who are on the front line of the climate crisis and the cost of living crisis are the ones who benefit most from this transition. And how should we absolutely screen every single policy from the perspective of its distributional aspects to make sure that social justice is embedded right at its heart.

The transition is also absolutely about the decentralization of power, making sure that local authorities have the powers they need to be able to pursue some of these measures, and making sure that there are sufficient resources for the transition.

I feel relatively confident about some of the solutions, but I think it would be useful to chat about that. But then also - and it didn't come out so much of what you have just presented, but it certainly came out in the report - it's really good news that this stuff is really popular, that people do want to engage with it. Again, contrary to what you might hear from government, there is a real groundswell of people wanting to move in this direction. If we could just enable them to do so and make that transition simpler.

When it comes to sector specific recommendations you make, I was delighted to see energy efficiency front and centre, because it is so often overlooked and yet it is so obvious. In politics, there are not that many win-win-wins. But certainly, insulating and retrofitting every single home is pretty much one of those in the sense that it gets your emissions down, it gets your fuel bills down, and it increases public health. There is less strain on the NHS, you create hundreds of thousands of jobs. And yet it is quite shocking that in the Autumn Statement just a few weeks ago, there was zilch, zero, nothing, about how we were going to be able to support that. I was just tweeting today about the fact that the government has issued its figures for how many homes have been insulated under the great Great British insulation scheme. There are 15 million homes in the UK that have poor energy efficiency and you will be pleased to know that in the first six months, 1026 of them have been done and E3G has calculated that it would take 146 years at the current rate of progress for the UK Government insulation scheme to meet its 2026 target. There is a problem here, Houston, and it's not been helped by the lack of funding. So we absolutely need to roll that out.

In terms of what's in the report, there's an interesting question about grants and loans for individual homeowners. I definitely think we need those grants. We do need to make it possible for people to do this. But I just wonder how that sits potentially against or at least alongside the issue of local authority-led street by street programmes, because there is a lot of evidence that actually what gets people to do this is when the neighbours are doing it, when they see the street parallel to them doing it. You need that momentum. And we know that because we know that it's a hassle for people to get their lofts clear or whatever else. And by just picking out which homes are the ones where the grant is needed, I just think that there's potentially a trade off between doing that and a more systematic approach of building the momentum of street by street and just doing it that way. I'd be really interested to unpack that a little bit more to see how that works

Training for the workforce is going to be key. You absolutely touch on that. And a citizen's engagement campaign I think is absolutely key in terms of building momentum. Again, maybe that is easier when you have that sense of a local authority led street by street program. Where you've got that geographical sense of something happening.

Your sections on public transport and active travel was all music to my ears. I think the issue of ownership is at the heart of this issue, as you say. If you see what Andy Burnham has been able to do when he has been given the powers for buses in Manchester, it feels to me that that is exactly what we need to be learning from here and getting some powers back. The duty and the powers to deliver integrated public transport services I think absolutely should be returned to local authorities.

I imagine it was well outside the scope of this report, but bringing rail back into public ownership feels like a fairly important thing to do as well. And when I say that, I don't just simply mean going back to British Rail, I do mean something that would be much more engaged with by the community. So you could imagine boards of new rail delivery groups having local community stakeholders, including disabled people. So the railway is much more of something that is driven for and by the local community.

I love the map of the of the trams and I have a genuinely ignorant question about how much more efficient are trams than electric buses, if they were all electric? But I like the idea of it very much.

And food, again, massively important. I'm very glad that you've got land and food in here because it feels to me again, so often in all of these debates, land is a bit of an afterthought. We have some fantastic examples here in Brighton and Hove, the Brighton Hove Food Partnership and so on, and they're doing fantastic work and just showing how you can make sustainable food part of the planning system right from the start and at its heart. I would love to see a Green New Deal for food.

To wrap up with a couple of conclusions.

Overall, I really welcome the focus in the report on demand reduction, because the Green New Deal is often associated with a big expansion of renewables and other green industries. But we can only meet our climate and nature goals if we address the overproduction that is driving environmental destruction. We are going to have a whole load more growth around renewable infrastructure and so forth. So, I do think we need to have a debate about whether having rather less growth in other sectors is necessary to make the space for this essential growth. We might start, for example, with not expanding airports.

The Government's recent energy bill was focused entirely on supply. It did not have a word about demand. So I tabled an amendment calling for a demand reduction plan. I think it is really important to challenge the narrative that we often hear that more is always better. Research by, for example, Julia Steinberger and others has shown that above a certain threshold, satisfying human need doesn't necessarily require increased energy consumption and could be achieved globally using less than half of current energy consumption. As you said earlier on, that is really quite a remarkable figure. Provision of good public services is key to achieving a high quality of life with low energy consumption. That is obvious in the case of transport, where poor land-use planning, the decline of buses and the focus on private rather than public wealth has led the number of cars on our roads to double since 1990.

I think a Green New Deal demands that we expand the public realm and provide good quality public services more efficiently.

Fairness I've already touched on. But absolutely those distributional questions are key. Democratic ownership is key. Enabling more workers to have more control over the processes which are affecting them. And unless we address deep seated inequalities of wealth and power, then I think the major programme of investment required for the green transition will simply put money and assets in the hands of those already who already have them.

So, what next? I would just stress devolution, getting more powers down to the local level and really pushing governments on that. Devolution has to be about also improving democratic participation and accountability. There are issues around metro mayors and just how accountable they are. It is interesting that in Bristol, for example, they've now had a referendum and decided not to have a mayoral system. So questions about how we get the power back down to a local level, but not just simply put it into the hands of one person.

And finally, I would just say make the Green New Deal an election issue.

Thank you.