



**Leicester's Climate Emergency
Conversation**

**Citizen Space consultation:
Results report**



Leicester
City Council

Contents

Introduction	3
Headline Findings	4
Respondents	5
Action Ratings	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Responses	6
At Home	6
Travel and Transport.....	9
Consumer Choices	14
Waste	17
At Work	21
Land Use, Green Space and Development	25
Next Steps	28

Introduction

This report details the responses to the online questionnaire survey carried out as part of Leicester's Climate Emergency Conversation via the Council's CitizenSpace website. Leicester's Climate Emergency Conversation ran between 18 November 2019 and 9 February 2020, giving people a chance to have a say on our proposals for tackling the climate emergency.

The online questionnaire asked the public for their views on a series of proposed vision statements and potential actions across the themes of 'At Home', 'Travel & Transport', 'Waste', 'Our Choices as Consumers', 'At Work' and 'Land Use, Green Space & Development'. Respondents were invited to rate each vision statement and action on how much of a priority it was, and to answer four questions for each theme.

Vision Question:

- Do you have any comments on the proposals, or have any alternative suggestions?

Action Questions:

- Do you have any comments on these proposals? (positive or negative)
- Are there any reasons why these proposals might not be possible?
- Is there anything else that could be done to help reduce carbon emissions?

Details of the proposals including the vision and actions for each theme are provided in Appendix 1 – Questionnaire.

We'd like to thank the hundreds of people who completed the survey for the useful suggestions, comments and ideas that they provided. These are now being used to help us develop our plans to tackle the climate emergency.

Contact Details

Aidan Davis, Sustainability Officer, Leicester City Council

Email: sustainability@leicester.gov.uk

Tel: +44 (0)116 454 2110

Twitter: @GreenerLeicester

Headline Findings

The following overarching points came out clearly from the responses:

- The most common response overall was support for the actions. This is evidenced by the high scores given to the actions.
- Many of the actions may have a significant cost attached, which could be a major barrier to carrying them out.
- Funding will be needed, especially from national Government and from the council and other organisations where possible, for grants, subsidies and incentives.
- National Government also needs take a stronger leadership role, establishing national plans, providing support and introducing legislation and regulations where necessary.
- Enforcement and may be needed for many of the proposals if they are implemented.
- Some proposals may have negative impacts for some people and organisations, who will need extra help to ensure they are not disadvantaged. This could include households on a low income and small businesses.
- Action will be required at all levels including central Government, the council, employers and individuals. However, individuals should not be the ones who are made to bear the greatest burden.
- Educating the public and organisations about the impact of their actions, the need to tackle the climate emergency and the actions they can take is vital and is an area the council could lead on.
- Without education and engagement there is concern many people and organisations may be reluctant to make significant changes.
- There are a range of further benefits from many of the actions, for example for health, wellbeing, flood-prevention and biodiversity.
- Many respondents stated that there were no reasons why actions across the themes should not be possible.
- There was also support from many respondents for making the actions stronger and more urgent.

Respondents

In total 374 responses were received. A breakdown of the respondents by the type of respondent and their postcode is provided below, as well as a summary of the number of responses and comments provided for each theme.

Table 1. Respondents by category

Category	Number
Member of the public	319
Representative of an organisation	18
Leicester City Council Employee	30
Local business	5
Other	2

Table 2. Respondents by Postcode

Postcode	Number
LE1	31
LE2	126
LE3	88
LE4	32
LE5	25
Other LE Postcode	57
Non-LE Postcode	15

Table 3. Responses and comments for each theme, and average action ratings.

Theme	Responses	Percentage	Average Rating	Comments
At Home	361	97%	4.30	891
Travel	364	97%	4.29	893
Consumption	349	93%	4.34	729
Waste	341	91%	4.50	642
At Work	330	88%	4.43	491
Land Use	347	93%	4.63	661

The Responses in Detail

The following section covers the most common responses to the open text questions for each of the six themes, and the ratings for the actions in that theme. The visions for each area of the questionnaire that attendees were responding to are included in **Appendix 1 – Questionnaire**.

Across the questionnaire over 4,300 comments were provided, an average of 180 per question, many of which contained multiple different points or suggestions. In order to keep this report to a reasonable length, we have analysed the responses to group similar comments into broader categories. The most common areas of comment for each of the questions is reflected below, and the number of comments shown in brackets.

As a result, respondents won't see their individual comments and ideas reproduced in full in this report. However, all comments and ideas will be considered as part of our work in developing the new Climate Emergency Action Plan, with those categories with the largest number of similar comments being given particular attention. We will also continue to use this information in the future and to investigate the new ideas that have been suggested.

At Home



- There was a high level of support for the proposals.
- The public, landlords and other organisations need educating on why action is needed and what they can do.
- Behaviour change schemes and simple measures could have a big impact.
- The council should provide leadership on making the necessary changes.
- Costs are a main concern, and grants will be needed for measures.
- There could be negative impacts on less well-off people, who will need extra support.
- Tenants could be disadvantaged by rent rises to pay for measures
- National Government will need to provide leadership, funding and legislation to support the changes.
- Homes should have trees and green spaces, and gardens should not be paved over.
- New homes should also be low carbon and have green space.

Summary

Responses to the vision

Do you have any comments on the proposals, or have any alternative suggestions?

This question referred to the vision statements for this theme, which can be found in Appendix 1 – Questionnaire on page 3.

There were a high number of comments supporting the proposals (49), and many requesting that actions should be stronger or carried out more urgently (11). There was also a focus on homeowners, landlords and other housing owners lacking money for measures (10) and therefore the need for grants (36) or low-cost loans (5). Ensuring people who are less well-off are fairly supported was also raised as a key concern (9).

Work by the council to educate the public on how and why to take action (11), such as a dedicated advice service (10) was requested. Many comments also stated that making new homes low carbon was vital (27), that more work needs to be done on planting and green space near homes (19) and that water butts or grey water systems should be promoted (12). Another popular area of comment was that landlords should be made to improve their properties, potentially through a licensing scheme (12), and that legislation would be needed to implement the proposals (6).

Other common comments included:

- The council should do more to improve council houses (7).
- Concerns that smart systems may not be safe or reliable (6).
- Heritage buildings will need special consideration (6).

Responses to the Actions

People were asked to rate each action between 1 (not a priority) and 5 (top priority). The table below gives the average rating for each action, with the highest at the top.

Action	Rating
The government could make a national plan for fitting insulation and low carbon heating in homes (including helping house-owners and occupiers during the changeover).	4.66
Private landlords could increase property insulation.	4.50
The council could improve insulation in council houses, prioritising uninsulated solid-walled properties.	4.45
Housing associations could look at similar actions for their properties.	4.41
Heating installers could prepare for the phase-out of gas by moving into low carbon systems (including heat pumps and renewables).	4.34
Homeowners could install more insulation.	4.34
Tenants could ask their landlord to make improvements if they live in a poorly insulated or heated home.	4.32
The council could install solar PV panels on suitable council houses.	4.28

Private landlords could install low or zero-carbon heating and solar panels (where applicable).	4.28
Homeowners could fit solar PV panels if they have a suitable roof area, and a battery to store the electricity they generate.	4.21
Homeowners could choose water-saving fittings and appliances when replacing these items.	4.15
Gardeners could install water butts to collect rainwater instead of using mains water.	4.14
The council could replace gas boilers with heat pumps in suitably insulated council houses.	4.13
Homeowners could replace their gas boiler with a heat pump or other low-carbon heating system.	4.01

Do you have any comments on these proposals? (positive or negative)

Many of the comments were similar to the previous question, including support for the proposals (48) and requests for more urgency (15). The need for grants and incentives was even more widely stated (42), alongside concerns about costs (31) and impacts on the less well-off (18). Other similar areas included educating the public on what they can do (20) and why they need to take action (12), making new homes low carbon (14) and enforcing changes by landlords (17). The need for legislation (10) and Government support and funding (6) were also stated.

New issues raised included that the focus should be on council leadership and responsibility (15), and that the council to provide a list of trusted installers for the measures to give people more security (6). A specific need for a subsidy for solar PV panels was also raised (11). Some concerns about the impacts of action were also expressed, including the wastefulness of replacing working equipment like heating with new measures (11) and the potential negative impacts on tenants of requesting their landlords make changes to their properties (10).

Other common themes included:

- The council should offer residents free water butts (6).
- A worry that landlords might raise rents to pay for measures, making people homeless (5).
- The council should prioritise improving its council housing (5).

Are there any reasons why these proposals might not be possible?

By far the most common barrier identified was the cost of the actions (86), as well as a lack of funds to carry them out (26), and the lack of subsidies or incentives (26). Specifically, a lack of money for the council (14) and the cost to landlords (8) were highlighted. A lack of engagement by national Government (25) and the need for legislation to enforce the actions (22) were also seen as important. It should also be noted that many respondents stated that there were no reasons why the actions were or should not be possible (21).

Another area of concern was a lack of public awareness of the issues (18) and the need to provide advice to all homeowners and occupants on measures and how to install them (10). There were also concerns about public reluctance to change (12) especially among landlords (12), for whom changes may need to be enforced (7). There was also a worry that existing homes are too poor quality (7) and hard to improve (7), especially heritage buildings (6). There may also be a lack of skilled installers (7) and untrustworthy installers and previous scams could make many homeowners wary of installing measures (5).

Other barriers identified included:

- Tenants could be made vulnerable by asking landlords for changes (6).
- Tenants could be at risk from rents being raised to pay for the measures (5).
- Some measures such as solar PV would not work for all homes (6).

Is there anything else that could be done to help reduce household carbon emissions?

The most common suggestion by far was for the council to educate people on how to reduce their energy use through behaviour or home measures (49), particularly through simple changes like turning down their heating (20). Other home measures that could be installed and promoted included efficient appliances (6), smart meters (5), LED lights (4), electric ovens (4), double glazing (4) and switching to renewable energy tariffs (4).

Finding ways to provide national or local grants (10) or incentives (5) for installing measures was also popular. Other suggestions included planting trees and increasing green space near homes (15), banning paved-over gardens (4) and a food waste or composting collection service (14).

Other suggestions included:

- Making all new buildings low carbon (10).
- Banning solid fuel fires in homes (6).
- Encouraging communal and co-operative living models and developments (6).
- Changing attitudes on consumerism in the home (5).

Travel and Transport



- There was a high level of support for the proposals.
- One of the main concerns was the cost of public transport.
- Buses need to be more frequent and reliable, run later and go across and around the city centre.
- Public ownership of public transport was widely suggested.
- Having a single card allowing travel on all buses would increase use.
- Improving cycling was seen as important, through having more cycle lanes which are safer, better connected and segregated from other traffic.
- The less-well off and people with disabilities will need support to ensure changes are fair.
- The cost of the measures was a concern, with funding needed to pay for them.
- The national Government need to lead on changes and provide funding and legislation.
- There are concerns about electric vehicles including cost, lack of charging points, congestion and the environmental impacts of manufacture.
- Reducing car use by limiting access, having a congestion zone and reducing speed limits were popular suggestions.
- Other suggestions included supporting car sharing, promoting electric bikes and pedestrianizing more of the city.

Summary

Responses to the vision

Do you have any comments on the proposals, or have any alternative suggestions?

This question referred to the vision statements for this theme, which can be found in Appendix 1 – Questionnaire on page 10.

The cost of public transport (44) and its lack of reliability and convenience (32) were the most frequent comments. Buses generally not being good enough (10), especially in the county (7) and not running in the evenings (10) were also concerns. Solutions proposed for this included public ownership of public transport (17), having an ‘Oystercard’ style system allowing travel on all services (10) and having more bus lanes (10). Other suggestions included free bus travel for children (7) and developing a city tram system (10).

Many respondents approved of the proposals (28), with some requesting more urgent and stronger action (7). Some concerns were also raised, including the need to support those who are less well-off (9) and those with disabilities (8). There was also support for a focus on walking, cycling and public transport more generally (20). There were requests for an increase in cycle lanes (11), and for them to be

segregated from road traffic (19). It was also stated that cycling in the city needs to be safer (10) and that the cycle network needs to connect up better (10).

Comments around private vehicles included that a congestion charge or low emissions zone (23), bans from some city centre streets (12) or reduced speed limits (15) are needed. Banning or restricting cars for school drop-offs (11), more enforcement of speed and parking restrictions (11) and concerns about air quality (9) were also shared. There were also concerns that electric vehicles would not cut congestion (10) and that they are too expensive (7).

Other common themes included:

- Supporting and promoting car clubs and car sharing (11).
- Working with local sports clubs to address matchday travel (9).
- Promoting electric bikes, and an electric bike hire scheme (7).

Responses to the Actions

People were asked to rate each action between 1 (not a priority) and 5 (top priority). The table below gives the average rating for each action, with the highest at the top.

Action	Rating
The council could continue to invest in improved public transport.	4.64
The government could increase the funding available to the local government to make improvements to walking, cycling, public transport and electric charging infrastructure	4.56
Public transport providers could replace their fleet with 'ultra-low emission' vehicles.	4.55
Individuals could switch to walking, cycling or public transport instead of using a car for journeys whenever possible.	4.35
The council could continue to invest in infrastructure for walking and cycling. It could also expand existing programmes to encourage people to walk and cycle.	4.33
Public transport providers could invest in new and improved services with smart ticketing and real-time information.	4.30
The government could continue and increase the grants provided to individuals and businesses for ultra-low emission vehicles and charging points.	4.29
More could be invested in replacing the council's own vehicles with ultra-low emission vehicles.	4.26
Employers could replace their existing vehicles with 'ultra-low emission' alternatives and install charging points for fleet and staff electric vehicles.	4.24
Employers could encourage staff to commute to work on foot, by bike or by using public transport.	4.24

Employers could set a policy to reduce carbon emissions from business travel and deliveries.	4.23
The government could end sales of new petrol and diesel cars earlier than 2040, as is currently planned.	4.22
More publicly accessible electric vehicle charging points could be installed by the council.	4.09
The council could look at further ways to reduce demand for private vehicle journeys (this could mean changing vehicle access to areas, changing parking, and supporting shared transport services).	4.08
It could consider an increase in the number of Park and Ride sites and convert more of the existing ones to use electric buses.	4.03
Local companies could grow and create jobs by designing and building components for ultra-low emissions vehicles.	4.00
Instead of a petrol or diesel vehicle, individuals could buy an ultra-low emission vehicle.	3.85
Those with an electric vehicle and photovoltaic (PV) panels could buy 'vehicle to grid' equipment to store and trade their renewable electricity via the vehicle battery.	3.79
Individuals could join car sharing schemes and car clubs in preference to owning private vehicles.	3.78

Do you have any comments on these proposals? (positive or negative)

As elsewhere, many of the comments were similar to the previous question, including approval of the proposals (34) and calls for more urgency on actions (12). Many comments also covered the need to reduce the number of cars and journeys in the city (26) and focus on sustainable travel (15), including by restricting car access (11) and reducing speed limits (10). Issues with public transport were again raised, including cost (19), frequency and reliability (18) and lack of evening and night buses (7) and routes across the city (6). The cost of electric vehicles (15) and their contribution to congestion (8) also came up again, as well as a lack of charging points (8) and environmental impacts of manufacture (8).

There were calls for more consideration and promotion of the wider benefits of walking and cycling, including for health (10) and air pollution (7). Wider education on the need for action (7) and what can be done (7) were also seen as necessary, alongside a wider culture shift on travel (9), to overcome many people's reluctance to change (7). However, there were concerns that the proposals were impractical or too expensive (6) and could impact unfairly on people who are less well-off (10) or who are unable to walk or cycle (6). Incentives for sustainable travel (8) and more work to learn from successes in other cities (8) were given as potential solutions.

Cycling was again a key issue, including the need for more cycle lanes (6) which are segregated from traffic (6), safer (9) and better connected up (6). The need to

increase the amount of secure and accessible bike storage across Leicester was also raised (6).

Other comments given included:

- The council should focus on the actions it has the most control over (5).
- Walking routes need to be safer and more pleasant (5).
- All public transport should be free (5).

Are there any reasons why these proposals might not be possible?

The most widely identified barrier was the cost of measures (31) and the lack of funding available to implement them (20), especially the costs of public transport (13) and purchasing electric vehicles (12). The risk of disadvantaging the less well-off (5) and people with disabilities or who can't walk, cycle or use public transport (6) were again raised. A lack of Government engagement (18) and wider political will (8) on the necessary actions was identified, with more Government funding (10) and legislation required (8). It was also stated that the council needs to do more to lead on transport issues (5).

There were concerns that many people and organisations would be resistant to change (23), particularly to giving up private vehicles (22), and that there were not enough incentives (8). However, many respondents also said that there were no reasons the proposals were not possible (17). Issues with public transport were again identified, including that buses are not good enough (12) and unreliable (6). Public transport providers not engaging (4) and the difficulty for the council in influencing both them (6) and individuals and employers (6) were also concerns. To combat this, it was suggested that more education on both the impacts of travel (9) and how to travel more sustainably (9) would be needed.

Other barriers identified included:

- That cycling routes and infrastructure are not good enough (5).
- That car-sharing is not a practical option for many people (4).
- The negative impact on city businesses of reducing traffic (4).

Is there anything else that could be done to help reduce household carbon emissions?

The most common suggestion was reducing the cost of public transport (23), including by taking public ownership (7). Other ideas included making buses more reliable (6), cleaner and more appealing (5) and providing better travel around and across the city (5). Bringing in a scheme to allow travel on all buses (5) and using electric buses (7) were also suggested. Reducing the cost and improving the quality of train travel (9) and developing a tram system (8) were also given as public transport solutions. Providing more cycle lanes and infrastructure (10) which are segregated from road traffic (5) and finding other ways to make cycling safer (5) were also again supported.

Ways to reduce the impact of cars were shared, including a ban or restriction on access in parts of the city (17) and a congestion charge or low emissions zone (14).

Reducing speed limits across the city (8), discouraging car use for school drop-offs (7) and reducing parking and increasing prices in the city were also suggested. The council and other organisations could also promote working from home (11) and flexible working patterns (5) to reduce congestion. Travel emissions from employers could also be tackled by introducing a Workplace Parking Levy (5) and using bicycles and electric vehicles for deliveries (5).

Other ideas included:

- Supporting and funding car-sharing and car clubs (8).
- Making sure planning delivers homes and employment sites accessible by walking, cycling and public transport (7).
- Pedestrianising more of the city centre (6).
- Residents parking schemes in all neighbourhoods (5).

Consumer Choices



- There was a high level of support for the proposals overall.
- Educating people on the impacts of their consumption and how to reduce them was seen as very important.
- It can be expensive and difficult to make the most sustainable choices, and people need more information.
- People and organisations may be resistant to making changes.
- Attitudes to consumerism will be a barrier and should be addressed.
- The national Government will need to provide leadership, funding and legislation.
- Individuals shouldn't be expected to bear the biggest burden of making changes.
- Local shops should be supported, especially sustainable businesses.
- Reducing plastic is important, and businesses should be particularly responsible.
- Food growing is popular, but many people lack space for it.
- Local groups that offer repair, reuse and sharing schemes and community food growing should be supported.

Summary

Responses to the vision

Do you have any comments on the proposals, or have any alternative suggestions?

This question referred to the vision statements for this theme, which can be found in Appendix 1 – Questionnaire on page 18.

The most common response was support for the proposals overall (33), although some did not approve of them (6). Educating the public on why action is needed (19), and what actions can be taken (11) was also widely highlighted. Support was expressed for businesses (8), the council (8) and the Government (5) to lead on the actions, and concern that focusing on action by individuals would not be fair (6).

Suggested actions included supporting local repair businesses (9) and local shops and shopping (8), providing item libraries (6) and using business rates to encourage actions (6). Work to ban or reduce plastic use was seen as important, including in schools and at council events (10). Some barriers were also raised; that people may be resistant to changes in their personal lives (6), that consumer demand will not be enough to make significant changes (6) and that the current focus on economic growth will need to change to enable the necessary changes (6).

Other common themes included:

- Ensuring schools educate pupils on consumption and it's impacts (6).
- Schools should be encouraged to reduce meat and dairy provision (5).
- Sustainable products are currently too expensive for many people (5).
- The council should host local farmers markets, including vegan food (5).

Responses to the Actions

People were asked to rate each action between 1 (not a priority) and 5 (top priority). The table below gives the average rating for each action, with the highest at the top.

Action	Rating
Schools could teach pupils about climate change and how this is affected by what we buy.	4.60
Individuals could choose long-lasting products / get things repaired / create customer demand for climate-friendly products.	4.60
The council could lead by example with what it buys. It could see if its 'sustainable procurement guidance' for staff and suppliers needs changing in light of the climate emergency.	4.55
The government could look how it could encourage the supply of longer-lasting consumer goods.	4.49
The council could keep supporting local food growing in the new Food Plan through allotments and the Get Growing scheme.	4.43
The government could introduce mandatory labelling schemes for the carbon footprint of products.	4.40
Individuals could reduce food miles by buying less air-freighted food, choosing local and seasonal ingredients instead.	4.40
The council could look at how we could help raise awareness amongst the public about consumer choices they could make to reduce their carbon footprint.	4.36
Shops and businesses could provide more information to customers	4.34

about the climate impact of their products.	
The council could ask its school meals service to reduce food miles even further.	4.30
Individuals could choose to fly less.	4.28
Individuals could find out more about the climate impacts of goods and services. They could use this knowledge to reduce the carbon footprint of what they buy.	4.26
The council could ask its school meals service to offer additional options for pupils wanting to reduce or avoid meat, eggs or dairy products.	4.26
Food businesses could offer a healthy range of options for customers wanting to reduce or avoid meat, eggs and/or dairy products.	4.21
Individuals could reduce their dietary impact by eating less meat, eggs and/or dairy produce.	4.17
Groups of people / communities could set up community schemes such as 'tool banks' to share items that are only needed occasionally.	4.16
Individuals could grow some of their own food.	4.05

Do you have any comments on these proposals? (positive or negative)

Similar to the first question many approved of the proposals (29), with some requests for stronger actions and more urgency (7). Public education was again identified as a priority, both on why action is needed (8) and what can be done (14), particularly as making sustainable choices is currently difficult (6). There were also requests for the council to lead by example (6), although it may be difficult for the council to influence individuals (7). The need for Government to provide leadership (7), bring in legislation (6) and ban single-use plastics (6) were also raised.

Other issues pointed out included a lack of allotments in the city (8) and that new products are either not repairable or are more expensive if they are (8). Solutions suggested included supporting community and school food growing schemes (7) home food growing (6) and tool banks (6). There was also support for mandatory carbon footprint labelling (7) and serving more vegetarian food in schools (9). Not making individuals responsible for making changes was also raised again (6).

Other comments included:

- That repair schemes and groups should receive support (5).
- Actions for individuals need to be easy and affordable.
- The need for the council to lead by example on sustainable procurement (5).

Are there any reasons why these proposals might not be possible?

The most significant barrier identified was that people and organisations may be resistant to making large changes (31), particularly due to attitudes to consumerism and waste (11). The need for better public education on why action is needed was

also highlighted (20). However, many respondents also felt that there were no reasons why the proposals were not possible (21).

A lack of leadership and engagement by national Government (16), and specifically a lack of legislation (7) were also seen as barriers, alongside a need for the council to take more action (5). The high cost (12) and lack of availability of low carbon products (9) and the need to support those on lower incomes (7) were also raised. A lack of funding for measures (7) and the need for businesses to make profits (7) could make some actions impractical. A lack of space for home food growing was another a major concern (15).

Other barriers identified included:

- Resistance to reducing meat consumption (5).
- Long lasting products being less profitable (5).
- Lobbying against changes by vested interests (5).

Is there anything else that could be done to help reduce household carbon emissions?

The most popular idea was for the council and others to do more to educate people on the impacts of their consumption and the need to take action (18). Educating people on what action to take (5), specifically though training on food growing (6) and self-repair (5) were suggested. Similarly providing venues, funding and support to groups that provide repair, reuse and sharing services, (11), community food growing projects (10) and other community groups and initiatives (6) were supported.

A number of ways to reduce the impacts of consumption were also shared, including working to reduce consumption overall (11). Other ideas included reducing business rates for sustainable businesses (7), encouraging the production and purchase of sustainable clothing (7) and providing carbon footprint labelling on all products (6).

Other ideas included:

- Enforcing long-lasting repairable products through legislation (5).
- Providing other incentives for sustainable businesses and promoting them (4).
- Encouraging people to shop locally and promoting local shops (4).

Waste



- There was a high level of support for the proposals overall.
- Educating people on how to waste less and recycle more was seen as vital.
- Reducing waste overall should be a priority, then reuse and repair, followed by recycling.
- Food waste and compost collections should be available for homes.
- There are concerns that the recycling system is too complicated, and that recycling is not processed correctly.
- Reluctance to change is likely to be a barrier, and wider attitudes to consumption and waste should be challenged.
- Businesses may also be resistant to changes, particularly if they increase costs.
- The cost of some measures was also seen as a potential barrier.
- The national Government should provide more support and funding and set a national recycling standard.
- Reducing plastic packaging is a popular issue, with support for businesses taking responsibility.

Summary

Responses to the vision

Do you have any comments on the proposals, or have any alternative suggestions?

This question referred to the vision statements for this theme, which can be found in Appendix 1 – Questionnaire on page 25.

Many respondents approved of the proposals (30), with some supporting stronger and more urgent action (4). Educating individuals and employers on how to recycle more (15) and focusing on reducing waste in the first place (11) were requested, for example through education on how waste and recycling is processed, including through tours and videos of facilities (5). A reduction in waste could be supported by removing existing charges for the green bin service (5) or at waste centres (4). Food waste was also a major concern, with requests for home food waste collections (12) and compost bins and collections (12).

Action by employers was also covered, with suggestions that businesses should take responsibility for recycling their products (5) and that plastic packing needs to be reduced (5). Supporting and promoting small repair businesses (8) and providing opportunities for people to be trained in repair skills were also suggested (5).

Other common themes included:

- More waste should be burned in Energy from Waste schemes (5).
- Fines for littering and fly tipping should be raised and enforced more (4).

- The council should collect a wider range of recyclable items, including for existing schemes that take types of waste that are hard to recycle (4).

Responses to the Actions

People were asked to rate each action between 1 (not a priority) and 5 (top priority). The table below gives the average rating for each action, with the highest at the top.

Action	Rating
The government could look at how to support an increase in UK reprocessing capacity for recyclable waste materials and create stronger end markets for recyclable materials.	4.64
People could make sure that as much of their household waste as possible is recycled through the council's household waste service.	4.63
The government will need to publish the final version of the Waste and Resources Strategy. It could also make sure local councils have the resource and funding they need to improve their recycling, composting and waste reduction services.	4.59
Things that people no longer want could be sold or donated, instead of thrown away. Gadgets, appliances, clothes and other things could be repaired instead of buying new things.	4.57
People could change buying habits to produce less waste. This could mean buying items that will last longer, have less packaging and can be easily re-used or recycled.	4.54
Waste generated by businesses and organisations could be re-used or redistributed to other organisations which can use it.	4.50
Businesses and organisations could reduce the waste generated by their manufacturing, distribution and service delivery processes.	4.49
Businesses and organisations could ensure that the provider of their waste services is correctly processing their waste and recycling as much as possible.	4.49
The council will need to produce a new Waste Strategy. This will need to follow the publication of the UK Government's Waste and Resources Strategy.	4.49
The council's existing household recycling and garden waste services could be promoted more, to encourage greater use.	4.44
More work could be done by the council to promote the existing trade waste facility to more businesses and organisations.	4.35
The opportunity to develop a second reuse shop, to resell items that would otherwise be thrown away could be investigated by the council.	4.30

Do you have any comments on these proposals? (positive or negative)

As in the previous question, many respondents expressed approval (27) with some requesting stronger actions (7). The need to educate people on how to waste less and recycle more was also highlighted again (17), with concerns that existing recycling is processed incorrectly or sent to landfill (10) and that the current recycling system is too difficult for many to understand (5). To increase recycling rates it was stated that a standardised system for waste is required nationally (7).

There was also support for prioritising reduce, reusing and repairing over recycling (10) and challenging the wider culture of consumption (8). The role of government in providing legislation and enforcement to ensure businesses act (10) and to provide support and funding (4) was also emphasised. Reducing plastic packaging was another concern (10), with suggestions that single-use plastics should be banned (5), although there was concern about availability of unpackaged food (4).

Other comments included:

- More waste should be sent to Energy from Waste plants (5).
- Provide better data on existing council waste scheme performance (4).
- Incentives for recycling should be provided (4).
- Recycling should be separated by type before it's collected (4).

Are there any reasons why these proposals might not be possible?

The most common response was that there were no reasons why these proposals should not be possible (22). Among the potential barriers, the reluctance of people and organisations to change was viewed as the largest (16), linked to attitudes to consumerism and waste (12). There was also seen to be a need to educate the public on what impacts their waste has (11) and how to increase recycling (6), and a current lack of incentives for them to take action (6). Another major issue is the cost of some measures (10) and the absence of funding to implement them (5).

A lack of Government support on waste issues (11) was also identified, alongside a need for them to provide more legislation (6) and funding (4). It was also stated that more council action and leadership is required (4). Making businesses comply with changes may be difficult (7) due to the need for them to be profitable (6), reluctance to change more generally (5) and potential negative impacts and costs of actions (5).

Other barriers identified included:

- Products are currently not repairable (4).
- There is a lack of existing re-use and repair services (4).
- Sustainable choices are too expensive or are unavailable (4).

Is there anything else that could be done to help reduce household carbon emissions?

The most popular ideas were around the introduction of a household food waste collection service (14), and work to increase home composting through advice, free compost bins or collections (11). Bringing in a bottle or can return scheme was also popular (5). A focus on reducing consumption and waste overall was requested (8),

which could be supported by educating households on how to reduce waste and recycle more (7) and explaining the environmental impacts of waste (5).

There was also support for making sure retailers and manufacturers reduce packaging (9), potentially through tax incentives (5). Support for local sharing, repair and reuse events (6) and for small second hand and repair businesses was also expressed (5). Ideas for council waste sites included on-street collections for items to be taken to them (4) and having repair and re-use shops at all waste sites (4).

Other ideas included:

- Installing recycling bins in public areas across the city (4).
- The council supporting and setting up surplus food redistribution schemes (4).
- Training people to provide repair services (4).

At Work



- The proposals received a high level of support.
- The greatest concern was the cost of measures, and the impact on small businesses especially.
- There was also concern that early replacement of machinery and equipment could be wasteful.
- Grants and incentives for making changes will be needed.
- The long-term savings and benefits of actions should be demonstrated.
- The national Government will need to provide help, including funding, guidance and legislation.
- Businesses may be reluctant to make changes, due to a focus on profit.
- The council should work with local businesses, share knowledge and ideas and celebrate sustainable organisations.
- Employers could educate their employees on behaviour change and provide incentives for walking and cycling to work.
- Allowing flexible working and remote working could reduce travel and congestion.
- Smart systems and efficient appliance should also be promoted as energy saving measures.

Summary

Responses to the vision

Do you have any comments on the proposals, or have any alternative suggestions?

This question referred to the vision statements for this theme, which can be found in Appendix 1 – Questionnaire on page 32.

Many respondents approved of the proposals (26), and some called for actions to be stronger and more urgent (6), although some respondents did not approve (4). There were suggestions on how to encourage employers to carry out the proposals, including grants and incentives (7), a dedicated support service (5) and a need to focus on helping small businesses in particular (5). There was also concern that businesses will need to be made to take action (4) including through legislation.

Some actions suggested included promoting solar PV panels to employers (4), encouraging use of LED lighting (3) and for businesses to allow more flexible working patterns and working from home (6). There was concern that proposals may raise costs for businesses in a difficult trading environment (4).

Other common themes included:

- The NHS will need extra help to make these changes (4).
- That employers should provide incentives for walking and cycling to work (3).
- That more should be done to stop pension funds investing in fossil fuels (3).

Responses to the Actions

People were asked to rate each action between 1 (not a priority) and 5 (top priority). The table below gives the average rating for each action, with the highest at the top.

Action	Rating
More could be invested in improving the energy efficiency of the council and other public sector organisations' own buildings. This could include investment in more renewable energy systems.	4.61
The council could improve the energy efficiency of the business premises they own and rent out.	4.58
The Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP) could integrate the climate emergency into their strategies, direct national funding to the climate emergency, and lobby government for more support.	4.58
The government could make a national plan for moving to low or zero-carbon heating and provide funding and support to employers.	4.55
More solar PV panels or other renewable energy systems could be installed by employers. Where appropriate they could also install battery storage systems to make full use of energy generated on-site.	4.53
Organisations could design, manufacture and sell products that use sustainable materials, and are designed to be re-used and repaired.	4.51
The council could apply for more funding to support local businesses and organisations (particularly SMEs) to help them increase the energy efficiency of their premises.	4.49
Support and funding could also be provided by the government to improve other aspects of energy efficiency in businesses and organisations premises.	4.44

Employers could replace gas heating with low carbon alternatives such as heat pumps or by connecting to district heating networks. They could also improve building insulation.	4.42
Employers with high electricity demand could sign up to demand-response programmes where they are available.	4.38
The council could educate tenants about energy savings and carbon reduction.	4.37
Individual staff could encourage their employers to take action on the climate emergency (for example through staff incentive schemes and behaviour change programmes).	4.24
Employers could replace machinery using gas or other fossil fuels with electric alternatives.	4.18
Existing machinery and equipment could be replaced with more efficient alternatives by employers.	4.10

Do you have any comments on these proposals? (positive or negative)

As in the previous question, many respondents approved of the proposals (15), with some requesting a more urgent response (8). Ways to encourage employers to take action were again a key concern, with incentives and grant suggested (14), as well as help for small businesses (5). Similarly, the need for more Government and council support on funding (5) and legislation (5) was raised.

Some concerns about the impacts of the actions were also raised, including that early replacement of working machinery may be wasteful (8), as well as very expensive (4). There were also worries about the wider cost of measures (5) and the impacts on businesses (5). The need for businesses to make a profit was seen as a barrier (5), although some further solutions were suggested including employers educating their staff on behaviour change (7), installing switch-off procedures and technology (5) and ensuring solar PV is used on all premises, especially those with large roofs such as warehouses (5).

Other comments included:

- The Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP) should make sustainability a priority in plans and business advice (5).
- Existing sustainable businesses should be celebrated (4).
- Schools need to be more energy efficient, which will require assistance (4).

Are there any reasons why these proposals might not be possible?

The most common barrier identified was the high cost of many of the actions (44), increasing ongoing business costs (5) and impacting on small businesses especially (7). A lack of Government engagement on these issues (10) and the need for Government incentives (12) funding (7) and legislation (4) were also stated. Some respondents stated that there were no reasons the proposals were not possible (14).

Some also suggested that employers would not see these issues as a priority (14), and that resistance to change (5), the need to remain profitable (4) and a lack of time to research issues and measures (4) would limit action. As such a need to educate employers and employees (6) was identified, including demonstrating the actual savings and benefits of taking action (6).

Other barriers identified included:

- The wastefulness of replacing existing working equipment and systems (3).
- The high cost of new machinery, especially in specialised businesses (3).
- The difficulty of engaging with employees on behaviour change (3).

Is there anything else that could be done to help reduce household carbon emissions?

A number of ideas were suggested to reduce carbon emissions from premises, including reducing heating levels (8), installing smart systems and appliances (5), and planting trees (8) or installing green roofs or walls (3). It was also stated that new premises should be all designed and built to be low or zero carbon (4). Other ideas included supporting employees to work remotely or from home (8) and providing education on behaviour change (6), supported by incentives for walking and cycling to work (8) or reducing energy use (5). Reducing the working week (5) and encouraging flexible working patterns (3) were also seen as potential solutions.

A need for support for employers from the council and Government was also identified, including grants and incentives (8) and more information and advice on how to reduce emissions (7). The role of the council in lobbying government for change (3) and for the LLEP to integrate the climate emergency into their plans (3) were also highlighted. Specific measures suggested included support for a Workplace Parking Levy (4) and business rates reductions (3) or tax incentives (3) for sustainable businesses.

Other ideas included:

- Supporting divestment from fossil fuels (4).
- Bringing in annual carbon reporting for employers (4).
- Fitting solar PV panels on all public buildings (4).



- There was a high level of support for the proposals.
- Planting more trees was a main priority, as well as increasing the amount of green space in the city and ensuring existing trees are not cut down.
- Trees could be planted along streets, in private gardens and business premises and in public spaces.
- The other benefits of trees and green spaces should also be considered, including health and wellbeing, flood risk reduction and biodiversity.
- Cost was seen as a major barrier, and developers and construction companies may be resistant to changes.
- There was concern that costs could be passed on and raise house prices.
- Incentives and education are needed to encourage low carbon development.
- New development should all be low or zero carbon, especially on council land
- New developments should also have public transport, cycling and pedestrian access and quality green space.
- Brownfield sites should be used for development, instead of greenfield.
- National Government needs to set stricter planning regulations which require low carbon buildings and are enforced more strictly.
- Other ideas included more green roofs and walls and reducing grass cutting and pesticide use on council land.

Summary

Responses to the vision

Do you have any comments on the proposals, or have any alternative suggestions?

This question referred to the vision statements for this theme, which can be found in Appendix 1 – Questionnaire on page 39.

The most common comment was that more trees need to be planted in the city (39), with calls for tree planting along streets (7), encouraging tree planting and rewilding of private land (12) and for the council to stop cutting down existing trees (11). Increasing awareness of the other benefits of trees and green space including flood risk reduction, emotional wellbeing and biodiversity was also widely suggested (16). There was also a high level of support for the proposals (38) and requests for stronger, more urgent actions (8).

Building on brownfield (previously developed) instead of greenfield sites (14), setting stronger planning regulations (5) and better enforcement of existing and future regulations and conditions (7) were also requested. More comments around green spaces included that they should be required in new developments (14), that existing

green space should be prevented from being paved over (13) and that more work on green roofs and walls is needed (12). There were also requests for more focus on biodiversity (6), including for the council not to use pesticides (8) and to reduce verge-cutting (5).

Other common themes included:

- More focus needed on retrofitting existing buildings (7).
- Reviewing and revising the local Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) to take the climate emergency into account (6).
- More work to bring empty buildings back into use (6).

Land Use, Green Space and Development – Action Ratings

Action	Rating
When selling land for development, the council could seek an agreement with the developer for the new buildings to be as low-carbon as possible.	4.75
The council could make sure that the new Local Plan addresses the climate emergency.	4.72
The council and other owners of green spaces could plant more trees to help keep the city cooler during heatwaves and safer from flooding as the climate changes. More trees would result in more carbon emissions being absorbed.	4.71
The government needs to make sure that its proposed Future Homes Standard and changes to the Building Regulations will raise carbon-saving standards quickly enough.	4.68
Businesses commissioning new premises could specify high standards of energy efficiency, low carbon emissions, renewable energy and facilities for cycles and electric vehicles.	4.65
The council, NHS, schools and other public service providers could lead by example in their own building projects. They could allocate money to make them as close as possible to being carbon neutral.	4.61
Construction companies could train more of their workforce to build to very low carbon standards.	4.54
Developers could do more to promote the advantages of low-carbon homes and offices (for example, low running costs).	4.52
Those looking to buy a new-build home could ask developers for details of the energy efficiency and reduced carbon emissions of their properties for sale, to show that there is customer demand for higher standards.	4.44

Do you have any comments on these proposals? (positive or negative)

Many respondents again approved of the proposals (37), with many stating that they should be stronger and more urgent (13). The need for legislation and changes to planning law were also highlighted (27), alongside the need for better enforcement of

planning regulations (13). It was stated that all new development should be made to be low or zero carbon (9), and that the council should do more to require this locally (9), especially on the land it owns (8). Preventing building on greenfield sites (13) and floodplains (4) were also mentioned.

Increased tree planting was also again seen as a priority (20), along with using brownfield sites to provide new green space (6), protecting and expanding existing green space (4) and preventing trees being cut down (5). Some concerns were also raised that developers need to make a profit was a barrier (5) and that there is too much development taking place altogether (4).

Other comments included:

- More education is needed on the benefits of low carbon development (6).
- The Strategic Growth Plan and Local plan need reviewing and rewriting to ensure local development is low carbon (5).
- Developers should lead by example, and sustainable projects celebrated (5).

Are there any reasons why these proposals might not be possible?

The most common comment was that there no reasons the proposals should not be possible (27). The most widely identified barrier was the need for stronger planning rules, and for buildings regulations to require low carbon buildings (26), which will also need enforcing (5). There were concerns that developers and construction companies would resist the changes (11), due to their need to make profits (9) and the lack of financial incentives (8) and they may lobby the government to prevent the proposals being enacted (6).

The cost of many proposals was also viewed as a barrier (23), coupled with a lack of funding (7) and concerns that measures may raise construction costs and therefore house prices (6). A lack of government support and engagement was also seen as a barrier (10), including the need for Government funding (5). A lack of knowledge and education on the necessary actions was also noted (12).

Other barriers identified included:

- A lack of council influence and control over developers and builders (7).
- A lack of leadership and action by the council on these issues so far (6).
- The lack of space in the city for new homes and other buildings (4)

Is there anything else that could be done to help reduce household carbon emissions?

Tree planting was again a priority (31), including using existing public spaces (10) and streets (5) and encouraging homes and businesses to plant trees on their land (6). Planting food trees (4) ensuring that existing trees and not cut down (5) and using the most suitable trees, including native species (4) were also suggested. There was also support for ensuring green spaces are not paved over (10), creating new green spaces in the city (7), and promoting green roofs and walls (9).

Ideas around new development again included use brownfield sites instead of greenfield (14) and for all new development should be zero carbon (9). Ensuring that new developments have walking, cycling and public transport access (10), quality green space (9) and local services and amenities (4) were also given as ideas. Allowing higher-density housing in the city (6) and not selling council-owned land (5) were also suggested. Food growing was also a popular area, with suggestions of providing more allotments in the city (6), creating and supporting community gardens (5) and encouraging home food growing (4).

Other ideas included:

- For the council to install solar farms on land it owns (4).
- More work to bring unused buildings back into use (4).
- Promoting and supporting self-built low carbon homes (4).

Next Steps

During the spring of 2020 the responses will be used to help develop our Climate Emergency Strategy and Action Plan, which will be published in June 2020, and will be available on our webpages at: <https://www.leicester.gov.uk/your-council/policies-plans-and-strategies/environment-and-sustainability/climate-emergency/>