

Stoke St Gregory FSG Climate Action

Minutes of Virtual Meeting Monday, February 22nd at 7.00pm

Present: Graham Gleed, Charlotte Sundquist, Janice Pearce, Paul Parmenter
Trevor Williams, Peter House. Laura Jensen, Sara Sollis, Alex Lawrie

Apologies:

1. Welcome: GG welcomed participants to the meeting including new member Alex Lawrie
2. The minutes of the last meeting held on **January 25th** were approved.
3. **Matter Arising from Previous Minutes**
 1. The possible collaboration between Climate Action and the school was discussed with the headmistress. How to put a local layer into the existing curriculum using some of the data from the carbon footprint calculator will be the starting point for this discussion. JP volunteered to lead this effort.
 2. Following a suggestion made at the last meeting the PC adopted a motion to take a more active position with regard to planning applications and climate change. This was executed immediately when the PC raised objections to the replacement of the railway bridge at Athelney.
 3. The community shop has a policy of wherever possible reducing the amount of packaging associated with the goods it sells.
4. **Parish Carbon Footprint Calculator.** While the carbon footprint calculator in broad terms gives an insight into CO2 equivalent emissions at an average household or location level in the Parish, it does not permit recording of local activity mitigating climate change. GG described a possibility to incorporate basic level detail which is used to generate averages in the calculator into a tool called Parish On-line. A short demonstration was offered showing some of the local level detail available. At the next PC meeting a proposal will be made to subscribe. The cost is £70.
5. **How to Motivate Change.**
 1. Communication. How do we engage with the community to let them know about this initiative? An article that has been prepared for the Newsletter was share. What other forms of media should we use? In the absence of face to face contact it would be beneficial to create a form where Ideas could be exchanged. Nextdoor is a possible option but it is difficult to manage historical information. There is a Climate Action Athelney Facebook page

Clarification was requested around the relationship between Farming and Household contributions, in particular the maintenance of footpaths and the flailing of hedges. Flaying of hedges in particular is not necessary particularly field hedges. This practice removes a carbon sink and contributes unnecessary CO2. Farmers are part of the community and as such should be invited to contribute to this effort. Education applies equally to informing the community about the implications of hedge trimming such that perceptions around the practice are modified. There should be a process of dialogue with the farming community to reconcile a practice which better serves ecological considerations. Hedge laying is a long-lost skill for which there are few practitioners versus the existing hedges. The method of engagement with all members of the community should be on the basis that we are all looking to achieve the same objective; how can we help one another? By identifying the problem and inviting people to contribute a more sustainable end result will be achieved. The site www.climateoutreach.org was recommended.

- 2. Household Contribution** It was suggested that a list should be produced of the little things that everybody can do such as loose package good, walking or cycling versus use of the car. CS, LJ and AL were suggested as a brainstorming group to come up with a succinct list of opportunities ready to be discussed at the next meeting for publication to the community. This could also be linked to cost savings to add emphasis A light hearted visual approach would be an advantage. The use of the village web site, Nextdoor and the two village Facebook pages was suggested.
- 6. How to Identify Projects.** Via participation in the levels Climate Forum, It was noted in many other Parishes in Somerset have made a formal effort to identify projects contributing to CO2 reduction. Should SSG follow a similar approach? These ideas should be affordable, feasible and not least make a difference. Support was expressed for a survey which could largely be conducted on social media, with a back-up of paper copies. It could also be used to gauge what people are interested in and what they would support. Survey should
 - 1.** Strong support was expressed for a community meadow that was open to all in order to generate interest in ecology and to be used as a space for all to appreciate, but in particular children. Would it be possible to approach landowners in the community to explore this possibility? PP offered to open his wildflower meadow to all who may be interested with the possibility of teaching hedge laying

to a village group. The possibility to employ young people via the government Kick-Start programme is being pursued.

2. The possibility to provide support when dredging drainage channels was also suggested to recover and return freshwater mussels and to collect litter.
 3. A community allotment and food growing project could be considered.
 4. LJ indicated that small grants could be available from CAA to support the implementation of the survey.
 5. GG to draft a survey for the next meeting.
7. **Comments on Note Circulated on Agricultural Practice from PS** GG introduced the context of the note and commented favourably on the thought and presentation of the note but describing the work as erudite expressed some uncertainty as to its ultimate purpose other than to initiate a discussion. AL supported this view describing the work as erudite and prompting questions which would provoke discussion. PH stated that the report addresses only SSG but its relationship with North Curry as a result of planning policy, strongly suggested the two should be considered together. TW commented that red diesel as used in agriculture is a fossil fuel, and as such is equally polluting with less cost reduction incentive. This situation (along with fishing) arises from support for food production at the time it was implemented did not take account of long on-road tractor journeys. TW also commented on the loss of verges as a refuge for wildlife. AL comments that the agricultural machinery supply chain is very slow to adopt EV technology.
8. **Bibliography.** GG will look to establish a bibliography such that it can be published for the interest of all.
9. **Next Meeting.** The Next Meeting will be held on Monday, March 22nd at 19:00