

## MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 16 DECEMBER 2010

### BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE

#### AT THE MEETING OF THE SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN, STAINES ON THURSDAY 16 DECEMBER 2010

Amos Mrs P.C.	Crabb T.W.	Nichols L.E.
Ayers F	Davis C.A.	O'Hara E. (The Mayor)
Bain Miss M.M.	Dunn Mrs S.A.	Packman J.D. (Leader)
Beardsmore I.J.	Flurry K.E.	Pinkerton Mrs J.M.
Bell Mrs E.M.	Forsbrey G.E.	Pinkerton Jack D.
Bouquet M.L.	Grant Mrs D.L.	Sider R.W.
Broom Ms P.A.	Hirst A.P.	Smith-Ainsley R.A. (Deputy Leader)
Budd S.E.W. (Deputy Mayor)	Hyams Ms N.A.	Strong C.V.
Chouhan K.	Leighton Mrs V.J.	Thomson H.A.
Colison-Crawford R.B.	Napper Mrs I.	Trussler G.F.

Murray Litvak – Chairman of Standards Committee

Councillor E. O'Hara, The Mayor, in the Chair

#### **369/10 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S. Bhadye, K. Chouhan, H.R. Jaffer, D.L. McShane, Mrs C.E. Nichols, Mrs M.W. Rough, S.J. Rough, M.T. Royer and Mrs C.L. Spencer. Apologies were also received from Ms Sue Faulkner, the Vice Chairman of the Standards Committee.

#### **370/10 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2010 were approved as a correct record.

#### **371/10 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Councillor I.J. Beardsmore declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 17 in relation to the Chairman's report on the special meeting held to consider the proposed Eco Park development at Charlton Lane, Shepperton. He was a member of the Surrey County Planning Committee and would take no part in any discussion or vote on this matter.

#### **372/10 SOUTH EAST EMPLOYERS CHARTER FOR ELECTED MEMBER DEVELOPMENT**

The Mayor announced that Spelthorne Borough Council had been reaccredited with the South East Employers (SEE) Elected Member Development Charter and was honoured that the Chair of South East Employers, Councillor Rory Love had attended the meeting to present the Council with the South East Employers' Certificate to signify the Borough Council's commitment to the principles of the Charter.

Councillor Love commented that he was privileged to be invited to this meeting to present the certificate which celebrated the Council's successful re-assessment against the Charter standard. The Charter was recognition of the investment and value which the Council placed in member development.

Spelthorne Borough Council was just the second council in the south-east to be awarded the Charter the first time around in September 2006. The Charter assessment team were impressed with the profile and importance attached to member development across this Council.

He thanked councillors and officers for their work in securing the re-accreditation and the key role played by the Member Development Steering Group. He looked forward to Spelthorne Borough Council continuing its commitment to member development and sharing its success with other local authorities.

### **373/10 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR**

#### **1) Spelthorne Business Forum - Christmas Cards Competition – Presentation of Certificates to students from The Matthew Arnold School**

The Mayor thanked Moya Zenonos from Matthew Arnold School for all her hard work in organising the School's involvement in the Christmas Cards Competition.

The Mayor presented certificates to the following students from the School who had participated in the successful Christmas Card Competition in partnership with the Spelthorne Business Forum and the Borough Council: Robert Ellis (who designed the Christmas Card chosen for Spelthorne Borough Council), Daisy-Jade Davis (who designed the Christmas Card chosen for Spelthorne Business Forum), Georgia Brakespear (who designed the Christmas Card chosen for Matthew Arnold School), Nina Loginov, Jay Simpson, Ella Smith and Callum Wright.

#### **2) Mayoral Events**

The Mayor reminded Members of the forthcoming Charity Ball to be held at the Runnymede Hotel on 26 February 2011.

### **374/10 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER**

#### **Government Grants settlement**

The Leader, Councillor J.D. Packman, announced the recent details of the grants settlement for local authorities for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Spelthorne faced a cut in grant of 16.5% in 2011-12 and 9.4% in 2012-13. This was worse than the 11% the Council had been predicting for 2011-12 and in effect meant it had suffered roughly a 26% cut in just two years when the Government forecast produced by the Comprehensive Spending Review was an average cut for local authorities of 19% (in cash terms) over four years.

As an additional blow and as a consequence of transferring concessionary fares to Surrey County Council by April next year, the Council had also had £649k grant removed from it; this was £149k more than the scheme cost in its entirety, which added further to the budget deficit and the savings that needed to be found to offset this amount by February 2011.

The Leader reminded the Council that prior to the announcement of the settlement grant much work had been done in the Council to find and achieve £1million of savings to ensure it arrived at a balanced budget early in the New Year. As a result of the settlement grant, it was now necessary to go back to the Management Team, Heads of Service and all the staff to ask them to look again for another £500k in order to achieve a balanced budget. The Leader and Chief Executive would be making representations to the government and had a meeting arranged with the MP, Kwasi Kwarteng to discuss the matter.

### **Visit to Mauritius**

Councillor J.D. Packman reported that 25 people from the Borough including representatives from councillors and officers had spent a fantastic week in Mauritius as part of their Twinning celebrations, and were warmly received by their hosts. The Chief Executive, Roberto Tambini, the Mayor, Councillor J.E. O'Hara and the Leader, Councillor Packman had met two Mauritian government ministers to discuss waste and recycling issues. The Chief Executive gave a presentation to another minister to encourage the Mauritians to use Surrey as their base for the 2012 Olympics. The Leader wished to encourage local schools to make contact with their counterparts in Mauritius.

The Mayor added that he intended to write to the Chairman of Grand Port Savanne District Council to express the Council's gratitude for their hospitality.

### **375/10 STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY 2011-2014**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Cabinet on adoption of a Statement of Licensing Policy 2011-14.

**RESOLVED** that the proposed Statement of Licensing Policy 2011-14, be adopted for implementation from 5 January 2011.

### **376/10 REFERRAL FROM THE CABINET**

The Council considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive on parking in Orchard Meadow Car Park and The Avenue, Sunbury following referral of a petition on the matter by Cabinet at its meeting on 23 November 2010.

**RESOLVED** that Council agrees:

- 1) to continue charging in the car park as this will help cover the cost of running the car park;
- 2) to work with Surrey County Council (SCC) on parking at the southern end of the Avenue.

### **377/10 RECOMMENDATION FROM THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

The Council considered the recommendation from the Standards Committee on the revised Planning Code.

**RESOLVED** that the revised Planning Code, in line with the changes shown in Appendix 1 of the report of the Monitoring Officer, be adopted.

**378/10**      **REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor J.D. Packman, presented his report, which outlined some of the important issues the Cabinet had discussed at its meeting on 23 November 2010. Councillor Lawrence Nichols asked the Leader to comment on the adequacy of financial reporting made to members. Councillor John Packman responded that great strides had been made to simplify the reports but he accepted that further improvements could be made and welcomed any ideas Councillor Nichols might have to make them easier to understand. He acknowledged that in view of the future difficult budget situation it was important for all councillors to understand the financial reports and raise any questions about them with the relevant officers.

**379/10**      **REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Vice-Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor M.L. Bouquet, presented the report, which outlined the matters the Committee had considered at its meeting on 9 December 2010.

**380/10**      **REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Ms P.A. Broom, presented her report, which outlined the matters the Committee had decided at its first meeting.

**381/10**      **REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor R.W. Sider, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had decided since the last Council meeting.

**382/10**      **REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Ms P.A. Broom, presented her report, which outlined the matters the Committee had decided since the last Council meeting.

**383/10**      **REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor H.A. Thomson, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had decided since the last Council meeting.

**384/10**      **MOTIONS**

Under Standing Order 16.3, the Council had received Notice of three Motions:

**Councillor Robin Sider proposed and Councillor Kevin Flurry seconded the following motion:**

- 1) That committee room 4 be re-designated and hereafter known as the "Trevor Baker Room" in memory and in recognition of the outstanding service to this council by the late Trevor Laurence Baker.

Councillor Robin Sider paid tribute to Trevor Baker, who he described as “an exceptional employee”. Councillor Ian Beardsmore said his group were delighted to support the Motion as a fitting tribute to a remarkable man.

**The Motion was then voted upon and carried.**

**Councillor Lawrence Nichols, on behalf of Councillor Caroline Nichols, proposed and Councillor Tony Crabb seconded the following motion:**

- 2) Council notes that the quality of scrutiny in Spelthorne Borough Council has decreased, is decreasing and ought to be restored.

The Council debated the Motion.

Councillor L.E. Nichols requested under Standing Order 21.4 that the vote on the motion be recorded. The voting was as follows:

AGAINST: (21)	Councillors Mrs P.C. Amos, F. Ayers, Miss M.M. Bain, M.L. Bouquet, Ms P.A. Broom, C.A. Davis, K.E. Flurry, G.E. Forsbrey, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.P. Hirst, Ms N.A. Hyams, Mrs V.J. Leighton, Mrs I. Napper, E. O’Hara, J.D. Packman, Jack D. Pinkerton, Mrs J. M. Pinkerton, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, H.A. Thomson and G.F. Trussler.
FOR: (8)	Councillors I.J. Beardsmore, Mrs E.M. Bell, S.E.W. Budd, R.B. Colison-Crawford, T.W. Crabb, Mrs S.A. Dunn, L.E. Nichols and C.V. Strong

**The Motion was lost.**

**Councillor Ian Beardsmore, on behalf of Councillor Caroline Nichols, proposed and Councillor Lawrence Nichols seconded the following motion:**

- 3) As a matter of urgency this Council resolves to produce an SPD which reduces the annual housing target 2011-2026 from 166 to 120 dwellings per annum.

**The Motion was debated, voted upon and lost.**

### **385/10 QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES**

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. However under Standing Order 14.5 supplementary questions would be permitted but that in the interest of fairness gave a direction that the answers would be provided in writing in order to ensure that a properly considered response was provided.

#### **1. 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. However

under Standing Order 14.5 supplementary questions would be permitted but that in the interest of fairness gave a direction that the answers would be provided in writing in order to ensure that a properly considered response was provided.

**1. Question from Councillor Robin Sider**

“In view of the recent inclement weather, will the Leader join me in thanking our team of dedicated staff who continued to provide key front line services such as refuse, community centres and Meals on Wheels in what can only be described as atrocious conditions.”

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

Thank you Councillor Sider for your question, I can indeed support your request. Staff in our frontline services have always been most willing to respond to such problems with flexibility and keenness to help others. I have already expressed my thanks to them as have many councillors and equally important, I have been impressed by the number of residents who have also expressed their thanks.

Mindful of the current forecast I hope we are not tempting providence.

**2. Question from Councillor Elizabeth Bell**

“In the media recently we have been advised that the Council are considering changing the name of Staines to Staines-on-Thames. Please can the Portfolio Holder advise us if this is indeed a consideration and if they believe this is good use of public money during the present economic climate?”

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

You make mention of the present economic climate which we are all very conscious of but we must continue to review or consider any such proposals that come before us. It is our intention to arrange to contact the residents of Staines to seek their views on the proposal in early summer. The cost of this will be minimal. Speaking personally I think the idea has merit and should not be dismissed out of hand until the full facts have been outlined.

**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 (re-titled 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

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.”

#### **5. Question from Councillor Caroline Nichols**

“Surrey has stated that it has a target for recycling of domestic waste of 70%. What steps is Spelthorne taking to meet this target? When does Spelthorne expect this target to be achieved?”

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

The 70% recycling rate is an aspirational target which it is intended by Surrey as a whole to try and achieve. Surrey CC expect their household recycling sites to achieve well in excess of 70% recycling rates giving the districts a lower recycling rate of 64% to try and aspire to.

Spelthorne would like to achieve this target and is looking at ways of doing so. For example, in the short to medium term we are looking to see if Grundon’s material recovery plant can take mixed plastics. We are also closely examining the feasibility of a food waste collection for the Borough, whilst being very mindful of the potential extra costs this may involve for us.

Surrey, and all district and boroughs, are collectively looking at opportunities to prevent and minimise waste. Hence the recent “love food hate waste” campaign. Spelthorne is also looking to actively participate in other similar schemes as well as promoting reuse (for example, furniture) and composting, wherever possible.

Spelthorne also works closely with Surrey County Council on the provision of recycling facilities at Charlton Lane where an increasing number of items can be recycled including electrical items and batteries. Spelthorne also encourages recycling of tetrapaks through provision at 5 bring sites of tetrapak banks, as well as recycling for paper, cardboard, cans, plastic bottles and glass.

With respect, I do feel you need to understand the full implications of what we want to achieve and this can only be done working in close partnership with the County in all aspects of recycling.

#### **387/10 SEASON’S GREETINGS**

The Mayor, Councillor John O’Hara wished all the councillors, officers and members of the public present a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.