

(ENVIROS REPORT: A Report key to selection of Charlton as the best site for the incinerator. Various questions were raised about how reliable it was but these were brushed aside.)

Especially important the very last (supplementary ) question from Cllr Dunn

COUNCIL, 16 December 2010

**Question from Councillor Lawrence Nichols**

Does Spelthorne Borough Council believe that the Enviro report for Surrey County Council gave adequate weight to the poor local air quality and the transport issues facing the site

**The response circulated at the meeting is set out below:**

The development of an Eco Park at Charlton Lane is a planning matter which is the responsibility of the County Council as the Local Planning Authority for matters of waste disposal. Our own Council is a statutory consultee for applications of this nature and, under our constitution, all such matters are delegated to the Planning Committee. It is important to note that the Planning Committee's decision in this regard does not have to be ratified by Council and so they have the final word as far as this Council goes. Once our Planning Committee has made its views known, these will go to the County Council as relevant considerations for its own Planning Committee. I can assure you that our committee report will consider all the relevant material planning considerations, including the issues raised in these questions in respect of the Eco Park application. It would, therefore, be totally inappropriate to answer this question at Council in advance of the planning committee.

**Under Standing Order 14.2 Councillor Lawrence Nichols asked the following supplementary question:**

"When did the Council first receive the Enviro report and can the Council confirm that no response whatsoever was made to this report?" The response provided subsequently in writing is set out below:

"The Enviro report was published in November 2009. The Council received a copy in April 2010, some time after the report had been finalised. The Council were not party to any consultation from SCC during the drafting of the document, and as such were not able to comment on its content. We have not given any formal response to the report since we received it."

**Question from Councillor Sandra Dunn**

"Does Spelthorne Borough Council consider the sum of £75,000 offered by SITA for local environmental projects to be adequate compensation for the environmental impact of the proposed gasification plant and anaerobic digester at Charlton Lane? What efforts have SBC made to influence the level of this proposed payment?"

The response circulated at the meeting is set out below:

As stated in my previous answer to Councillor Lawrence Nichols, this issue will be considered by the planning committee when it makes its views on the County consultation on the Eco Park. I cannot, therefore, comment on the sum offered. However, I am able to confirm that no discussions took place between Surrey County and ourselves about the sum or the environmental projects it could be spent on, before the sum was offered.

**386/10**

### **GENERAL QUESTIONS**

Five general questions had been submitted under Standing Order 14. The Mayor, Councillor E. O'Hara, had reported at the beginning of the meeting that questions together with the answers would not be read out but had been circulated

#### **3.Question from Councillor Lawrence Nichols**

“Does Spelthorne Borough Council endorse the scores and conclusions of the site evaluation in the Enviros report (November 2009) which was used to justify the choice of Charlton for a gasification plant? Does SBC agree that Charlton is “ideal” for the proposed facility? If not what aspects of the development are regarded as giving cause for concern? Did SBC at any stage attempt to advise Surrey that any aspect of the Enviros report was inappropriate or inaccurate? If so, what representations were made?”

The response circulated at the meeting is set out below:

As stated in my earlier response to your ward question Cllr Nichols, this issue will be considered by the planning committee when it makes its recommendations on the County consultation on the Eco Park. However, I can confirm that Surrey County did not give us the opportunity to review a draft, or make any comments or representations. We only saw a copy of the document once it had been formally adopted and published.

#### **4. Question from Councillor Sandra Dunn**

“Did Spelthorne Borough Council at any stage during the formulation of the Surrey Waste Plan object to the inclusion of Charlton Lane as a site suitable for incineration?”

The response circulated at the meeting is set out below:

Surrey County Council, in developing the Surrey Waste Plan (2008) identified 5 sites with the potential for thermal treatment this included Charlton Lane. Surrey County Council first announced its proposals for Charlton Lane in November 2009 under the banner “World class waste solutions”. This announcement also covered other aspects of waste management, including reduction in household waste by at least

15,000 tonnes annually, increasing recycling rates to 70%, production of renewable energy from residual waste which cannot be recycled and achievement of zero waste to landfill. To produce renewable energy from waste that cannot be recycled and help achieve zero waste to landfill, Surrey proposed the building of an Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton. This initial announcement by Surrey was supported by a report to the Surrey County Council Environment and Economic Select committee on 12 January 2010 and a Surrey County Council Cabinet report on 2 February 2010. The Surrey Waste Partnership recognised that, with the change in approach proposed by Surrey (combined with changes in EU legislation), it was necessary to update the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2006 to take account of these changes. Therefore, collectively, the Surrey Waste Partnership amended the strategy (retitled to A Plan for Waste Management). This went through a formal consultation process across Surrey. A report was taken to Spelthorne Cabinet in July on the draft strategy and consultation process. This was followed by a final version submitted to Cabinet on 23 November 2010. I trust you will pass this message on in its entirety to residents who continue to ask the question.

**Under Standing Order 14.2 Councillor Sandra Dunn asked the following supplementary question:**

“The answer provided doesn’t cover the question. Please may I have further clarification?”

The response provided subsequently in writing is set out below: “In 2007 Spelthorne Borough Council did object to policy WD5 in the Surrey Waste Plan but at that point in time it was objected to because of the “large scale” facility being suggested i.e. 270,000 tonne energy from waste plant. Also at that stage there was less known about the advanced thermal treatment technologies of pyrolysis and COUNCIL, 16 December 2010 gasification and therefore no comment could be made in terms of an objection or not back in 2007. In the last 3 years considerable effort has been made to further reduce the size of final disposal facilities required in Surrey as well as a focus on looking at advanced thermal technologies which are considered more appropriate than large energy from waste plants as they can be developed on a smaller scale and are more sustainable. Hence for Charlton lane a 60,000t/year gasification plant is now proposed, which is a more modest development than “large scale” energy from waste plant. In the report back in 2007 the Council did acknowledge that the Charlton Lane site has a role to play in providing future facilities for the treatment of waste, which suggests that more modest facilities such as currently proposed are of a more appropriate scale.