Reading FoE response to questions in 'Stakeholder Review' of 'Reading Climate Emergency Strategy 2025-30'.

Submitted 28th July 2025 by John Booth.

Note this preceded the 'Formal Review' stage August to October 2025.

Strategy:

To what extent do you consider that the strategy has captured all the significant issues relating to reducing carbon emissions in Reading? Score 1-5 Score 4.

If not, what would you suggest needs to be added?

- 1/. Acknowledge that for Reading to be anywhere near net zero on Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by 2030 requires much more rapid reduction in emissions than is likely to be achieved. This is illustrated by the significant emissions in 2040 shown by applying the CCC targets and the 'Remainder' and 'Gap' shown in the relevant graphs. And that both behavioural change and technology change will be required to address the need for local, national and global decarbonisation in coming decades including tackling Scope 3 emissions.
- 2/. Acknowledge that emissions reductions so far are very significantly due to decarbonisation of electricity supply which is unlikely to continue at the same rate. UK target for electricity supply is net zero by 2035. Emissions reduction in other sectors will probably be slower.
- 3/. Acknowledge that UK decarbonisation faces rising opposition from some opposition parties largely based on short-term financial arguments and that local and national governments and RCCP must counter this by long-term communication campaigns to explain why it is necessary, how it can be achieved, and how it can be financed. Friends of the Earth's proposals in their 'Fairness Test Report' give some guidance. Executive summary:

https://friendsoftheearth.uk/climate/executive-summary-fairness-test Web-page: https://friendsoftheearth.uk/climate/fairness-test-mandate-bold-climate-policy

- 4/. Acknowledge that Planning rules and Financing are not under control of RBC or RCCP and set out strategies to influence central government to address this.
- 5/. Under 'Adaptation' need assessment of likely peak local impacts to plan for heat, cold, drought, flood, road and rail disruption, interruption of supply chains, interruption of energy supplies. How serious can it be?

Have you noticed any errors in the strategy, especially where we have mentioned an organisation or initiative that involves you? (Y,N,-K)

If so, what would you like us to change?

To what extent do you agree with the **strategic priorities** Score 1-5 for each

- Planning and development Score 3
- Training and capacity building Score 4
- Health and personal resilience Score 4
- Adaptation Score 3
- Encouraging behaviour change Score 4
- Campaigns and communication Score 5
- Innovation Score 4
- Funding and resourcing Score 5

Would you suggest any additions or amendments to the strategic priorities?

Reducing impacts from transport should be mentioned – if not as a theme on its own then within the section on Planning and development.

Planning and development theme does not acknowledge that local planning rules must be approved by central government, and it can override local planning decisions either on appeal or by national infrastructure policies.

Do you have any additional comments about the strategy document?

It is very useful and very welcome – but it would be good if it can be improved and implemented!

Action Plan:

For the action plan, please feed back individually on each of the 6 action themes.

For each theme:

To what extent do you agree with the theme's vision statement? 1-5

Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Don't
disagree				agree	know

- Energy and heat Score 5
- Travel and transport Score 5
- Water Score 5
- Beyond waste Score 3
- Nature and green spaces Score 5
- Food Score 4

To what extent do you believe that the actions support the theme's vision? 1-5

Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Don't
disagree				agree	know

- Energy and heat Score 3
- Travel and transport Score 2
- Water Score 4
- Beyond waste Score 5
- Nature and green spaces Score 5
- Food Score 4

Please let us know of any significant errors or omissions in the actions:

Communications and Finance (as discussed above) are Strategic Priorities of prime and cross-cutting importance which require separate Action Themes (or planned and dedicated overarching co-ordination) so that vision and actions can be progressed. There is great risk they may not get required attention under the current structure despite being identified in individual action plans.

Adaptation and health don't get enough consideration.

Strategic Planning and demographics – with implications for transport and utility supplies - don't get enough attention.

Omission of Planning theme means that 'embodied carbon' in new and retrofit development is not addressed. While this is likely to be largely 'Scope 3' emissions so outside Reading's 'net zero' target it should be included in the strategy. Also 'planning' or 'energy' should include action to improve compliance with regulations in new and retro-fit development.

Energy and heat does not propose significant action to ensure adequate electricity supplies to all consumers at all times. It should identify the need to address cooling.

Travel and Transport does not propose (or even mention as a potential 'enabler') road pricing to raise funds for local changes and reduce emissions and congestion.

Beyond Waste: good to want to promote a circular economy but people should be made aware of 'Scope 3' environmental impact of their choices.

Food: Would like more communication on environmental impacts of food choices.

Are you, or the organisation you represent, able to offer support to deliver any of the theme's actions? If so, which ones and how?

Do you have any additional comments about the Action Plan?

It is very useful and very welcome – but it would be good if it can be improved and implemented!

'Final' version - 28th July 2025