

**Appendix A to Council:
Public Questions
2 November 2015**

**London Borough of Sutton
Council: 2 November 2015
Questions under Standing Order 8.7
From Members of the Public**

1. Question asked by Mr Bill Dunster, Zedfactory, 22 Sandmartin Way, Hackbridge to Councillor Wendy Mathys, Chair of the Children, Family and Education Committee

Could Sutton Council clarify why the Felnex development has a very expensive district heating scheme [powered by the incinerator] planned but this important new site has been unable to support the usual policy number of affordable homes, and why a relatively lower cost extension to Hackbridge primary school has been overlooked in favour of spending £7.5 to 10 million pounds on a new primary school on Metropolitan Open Land previously allocated as an ecology park?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy and Business Committee

Thank you Mr Mayor, and thank you Mr Dunster for your question. I'm afraid you've been somewhat ill-informed. For a start the linking up to the planned district heating system is expected actually to bring cost savings to the developer as well as lowering their carbon footprint so that would account for the developers keenness to do so. We haven't overlooked a lower cost extension to Hackbridge Primary School, it was looked into extending on the site and it proved to be unviable, which is why an extension is proposed on a second campus and there's never been any allocation of the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) as an ecology park. Thank you.

Supplementary Question asked by Bill Dunster

Could you please explain how the Felnex development can proceed with a district heating scheme when the incinerator will be many years away from completion? Secondly, it's extremely easy to design the Felnex development around the adjacent primary school, ensuring privacy and duplication of existing resources there is an enormous cost allocated to completely duplicating all the facilities again approximately half a mile away.

And thirdly, the MOL was once designated by Sutton Council as an ecology park. There are whole policy documents relating to this and it formed the basis of a large application to the millennium commission many years ago and to my knowledge the designation has never been withdrawn.

Reply by Councillor McCoy

It's three supplementaries but I will deal with them because it should be quite short. The energy from waste facility is due to be completed in 2018, in the meantime, the decentralised energy network can be run off the landfill gas engines. The school, actually there was a conversation with the developers of the Felnex site to

see if a school could be provided on the site and it just wasn't viable, they weren't prepared to do it, it wasn't viable, we can't force them to do that, so it was looked at. And regarding having two campuses I appreciate it might be more cost efficient perhaps to provide it on the site but if there's no room on the site is has to provide it somewhere else and we have done the same thing with the Bandon Hill school, we've got two campuses which are working very well. So it has been done before in the borough. And as for the site designation, in our site development policies it's MOL is the designation. I know that there was some interest in trying to make it into an ecology park but that's not the same as designation in planning policies but I can always check that. But we wouldn't be proposing to do anything against what it's designated for if we couldn't. Thank you.

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey

Councillor McCoy has said that the scheme is not expensive and it represents value for money. Well, I think that charging people 14p per kilowatt hour when gas is available from 3.5-4p per kilowatt hour is excessively expensive and also the fact that the, it's my understanding. My question is, is how can Councillor McCoy say that it represents value for money to the tenants, I mean to me the tenants are just going to be ripped off. Thank you.

Reply by Councillor McCoy

Thank you Mr Matthey, I know you've raised this a number of times and whatever we say you don't believe us but I will repeat it again for the benefit of the chamber. As the price is currently under negotiation no price has actually been agreed so any comments about what the price is actually going to be is actually pure speculation because it hasn't been agreed yet. So we can't say that we're overcharging if the price hasn't been agreed. Secondly, the articles for the decentralised energy network specifically state that the heat price charge will aim to offer parity or where possible a saving against any alternative heat supply. It's known as the avoided cost methodology and it's seen as industry best practice because it drives efficiency in any energy generation and distribution systems. And finally, no developer is going to sign up to a deal that is going to make it uncompetitive.

2. Question asked by Mr Bill Dunster, Zedfactory, 22 Sandmartin Way, Hackbridge to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy and Business Committee

How can distributing heat from incinerators possibly make sense when electric generating efficiency is reduced by around 25 % , the surrounding existing streets are all low density making distribution uneconomic and new developments have increased mandatory energy efficiency targets that almost eliminate the need for space heating ?

**Appendix A to Council:
Public Questions
2 November 2015**

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy and Business Committee

Thank you again Mr Dunster. And again, you seem to be misinformed because the electricity output from the source will not be reduced. Only the waste heat energy that would be rejected and not used for electricity generation will be used by the decentralised energy network. The reduced heat requirements of modern buildings was factored into the business model which is a very robust business model. But there will always be a need for some heating, it's never going to be zero. But also, the decentralised energy network intends to distribute hot water for domestic use, and I think everyone will agree that there's always going to be a need for hot water. Thank you.

Supplementary Question asked by Bill Dunster

Well this must be the first incinerator in the UK that's been constructed that doesn't have a reduction in the electrical generation efficiency when district heating's been added. So this is wonderful news and great innovation on the part of Sutton Council but I somehow doubt it. So if you could check your facts on that? And have you published your business plan because I haven't seen it, I don't believe it's available for anyone to make any judgements. And surely you've based very serious planning policy objectives around the viability of a plan that has not been published.

Reply by Councillor McCoy

Thank you. Well, I mean the proof is in the pudding. We have negotiated to only take the electricity source that is going to be waste so, if we're the only people that are doing it then that's fantastic and I'm not surprised that Sutton's leading the way. Regarding the business model, there are commercial sensitivities in the business plan so not all of it will have been published in its entirety but obviously the members making the decision would have seen the business plan. There is a business plan, and the decision was based on that. Thank you.

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Neil Garratt

I promise I do have a question and it's short. When people move into Felnax or any other development that is covered by the energy network, will they have a choice of energy supplier or will they be forced to take their heat via the council's district heating scheme, whatever the price?

Reply by Councillor McCoy

As with any centralised heating system in any of these developments which are quite common now, they will be tied into that supply. But obviously as I said before no developer is going to sign up to a scheme that's not going to be commercially competitive for their tenants. And in our statement we've said that it's going to be competitive. Thank you.

5. Question asked by Mr Alan Trickey, 9 Chiltern Road, Sutton to Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

Why did the Council commit to buying the land at the Sutton Hospital site before knowing whether or not it was suitable for a school (despite it being pretty obvious to most observers that it was totally unsuitable) and yet without a clear plan B if the school were not to go ahead? Why on earth did the Council not secure a six month option to acquire the land pending completion of the feasibility study thereby saving it £8 million of our money? In a plc of similar size to Sutton Council, the CEO would have been fired for such crass incompetence, potentially losing £8 million of our money. Should not this apply to the leader of Sutton Council?

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

Good evening Mr Trickey. The answer to your question, locating a school at the Sutton Hospital site had always been a key part of the Council's proposals for developing the hospital site as a Life Sciences Cluster. And this was reported and agreed by Members on the Housing, Environment and Business Committee as early as 1st July 2014.

With the Council's pupil's place planning showing that a new secondary school was required to open in the borough, it was a perfectly logical decision for the Council to acquire the plot at the Sutton Hospital site declared surplus by the Epsom & St Helier University Hospitals Trust (ESTUH). The choice of the Council acquiring an option, as you suggest, instead of outright purchase was not open to the Council as the Council could only have been identified as a Priority Purchaser for the site if it was prepared to purchase the site outright. If acquiring an option had been the offer from the Council, the hospital trust would have been obligated to put the site out for sale on the open market.

As it stands, the school site remains one of a few potential sites in the borough on which a new secondary school could be built, and you'll have heard my statement, making it clear that it remains the Council's intention for a new secondary school to be built at the Sutton Hospital site that would fit with the emerging master plan for the whole site.

In the extremely unlikely event of a new secondary school not being built on the site, you'll be pleased to hear we do have a plan B. The Council's options for the land it has purchased remain as set out in the report considered by the Strategy & Resources committee on the 3rd December 2014 when the decision was taken to authorise officers to conclude negotiations to acquire the site. These are that the site could be used as part of the wider proposals for the London cancer hub that would still have a commercial and residential value that would be beneficial to the Council.

**Appendix A to Council:
Public Questions
2 November 2015**

I can reassure Mr Trickey that the council has spent this money wisely. We have a plan B, we actually also have a plan C. In the extremely unlikely event of the school not being built and the equally unlikely event of the London cancer hub not proceeding, you'll be delighted to know that the land can be used to build the affordable and social housing that this borough so desperately needs.

Supplementary Question asked by Alan Trickey

My calculations and some of my colleagues is that the value of the site is more near to £4 million than £8 million. Therefore, if it had gone on the open market the council would have been able to purchase the land for still a lesser amount. The topography of the site, the trees on the site and the famous bat roost will make any development a bit difficult. So does Councillor Dombey not realise, does she not feel that the council committed itself to spending rather more money than was necessary on it?

Reply by Councillor Dombey

No I don't Mr Trickey. As far as the value of the site is concerned I'll make sure that our land valuers send you a detailed answer so you can understand why we got the proper price for the site. I can also reassure you on the bats. I'm told that the impact on bats has been considered as part of the prior approval demolition application. The applicant submitted results of an initial bat emergence survey, who knows such things existed? And a bat presence likely absence survey, again I'm learning, to support the application. The application identified that some buildings may indicate the presence of bats. The submitted phase one habitat and scoping bat survey, this is a new world for me, recommended that further survey works be carried out. A further bat survey was submitted which identified that a total of three bats were recorded emerging from Cheviot House and that there's likely, possibly a bat roost in the house. A number of mitigation measures are proposed which include the provision of bat boxes. The council's biodiversity officer concluded that the roost is likely to be small, probably utilised on a temporary basis at the start and end of the season. The biodiversity officer raised no objection to the proposal and considers that the applicant should be able to secure a licence based on the surveys undertaken and mitigation proposed. Therefore, the council's statutory duty regarding this protected species is met. No objection was raised on this basis, subject to a condition to ensure that the applicant demonstrates that a licence has been granted by Natural England prior to the demolition of Cheviot House, and that the mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with the details submitted. If this sounds complicated, I can only agree with you and I would suggest that you lobby the minister responsible for planning to remove some of this bureaucracy. In short there are three bats, and there is no problem.

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor David Hicks

I noted Councillor Dombey's statement about the school and the innovative approach to development which is very welcome. I hope the innovation won't stretch as far as putting 1,250 pupils per hectare on the site and will take a more

reasonable approach to the use of the school land and the residents around it. Will that be the case?

Reply by Councillor Dombey

Of course we will ensure that the residents that live in the local area will have every opportunity to have their say but as Councillor Hicks knows very well, it's not like five years ago or so when the council could actually make a decision about the site and the size of the school. So the people, the organisations who are interested in sponsoring this school will be discussing with the education funding agency the appropriate size for the school. We are confident that that will happen.

6. Question asked by Mr Alan Trickey, 9 Chiltern Road, Sutton to Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

Can we, the residents, have a health centre on the Sutton Hospital site as since the closure of Sutton Hospital, such facilities are non-existent in this part of the borough?

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

Thank you Mr Trickey. Again, the answer is going to be technical, but in a nutshell I'm afraid the council has no powers to ensure if a health centre can be built on the Sutton Hospital site.

I'm surprised your local ward councillors haven't explained the complicated world of the NHS to you in more detail. The Department of Health transferred the responsibility for the commissioning of healthcare services to groups of GPs, known as "clinical commissioning groups" and NHS England. It's therefore the Sutton CCG and NHS England South West London who will assess whether a new health centre is required on the Sutton Hospital site. You should be lobbying them, not us.

Sutton CCG under the co-commissioning agreement from NHS England from April this year has the remit to comment on and support any applications for premises developments in the Borough of Sutton. There are currently no plans for a primary care health facility on the Sutton Hospital site. Sutton CCG are working, we are told, with NHS England to develop a high level Sutton Estates Strategy for primary, community and out of hospital services for the next five years. So for any further enquiries please do contact Sutton CCG and I can provide their details if you need them.

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor David Hicks

Thank you for the answer to the question. I had an email from Councillor Brendan Hudson today about the health centre and, ex-councillor, sorry, I miss old friends, ex-Councillor Hudson has explained that the NHS hasn't made its mind up about

**Appendix A to Council:
Public Questions
2 November 2015**

the Henderson Hospital site yet and there is still, as far as I'm concerned the opportunity of it being placed somewhere else.

If that were possible, would Councillor Dombey and the members opposite support that centre being located in an alternative location?

Reply by Councillor Dombey

Councillor Hicks, are you talking about the proposed medical centre on the ex Henderson Hospital site? I'll repeat what I said before to Mr Trickey, it is not in our gift.

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor David Hicks

No, the question was would you support it, not would you action it?

Reply by Councillor Dombey

Without knowing more of the detail, if you're saying would I support enhanced health facilities in the south of the borough, of course I would but I'd like to see the detail.

7. Question asked by Bill Main-Ian, 29 The Warren, Carshalton Beeches, to Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

What is the council going to do to stop companies like Viridor who have given £100,000 to Sutton Council to "help" the council's energy supply business carry out research and other contractors such as Smith & Byford among others who donate money to Sutton Liberal Democrats and carry out work for Sutton Council influencing the council in the award of contracts?

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

Thank you, good evening. Viridor has not given £100,000 to Sutton Council. The legal agreement associated with the approved ERF facility at Beddington Farmlands included a sum of £100,000 to be used by the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Working Group to support its activities and initiatives. The Working Group is to be established by Viridor which will undertake feasibility reviews including the identification of opportunities for CHP and district heating arising from the development and which will address matters including the technical, economic and commercial feasibility of CHP.

The contractor mentioned was awarded a contract by Sutton Housing Partnership, not Sutton Council, in 2008. The donation from this company took place in 2014, many years after the award of any of the contracts that exist. There is no evidence of any improper influence on the award of these contracts by the Council.

Mr Main-Ian, I'm sure you realise as an ex-policeman that you are making very serious allegations. In the Electoral Commission information, there are no

donations from these companies to the Sutton Liberal Democrats at or anywhere near the point at which they were successful in gaining contacts with the Council. Given the size and length of the contracts they would have required a member decision at some point in the procurement process, but these contracts began in 2008, 2009 and 2011, up to six years earlier than the donations made in 2014.

The council's contract standing orders have a Corrupt Practices provision. I'm told it's paragraph 51.16 of the contract Standing Orders. That enables the council to declare null and void any contract where it is shown that there have been attempts to give gifts or inducements to secure the award of contracts. I do not believe that a donation made six years after the contract award seems very likely to be classed as such.

The member code of conduct and register of interests apply to members' individual interests not to their party. It is a disclosable pecuniary interest if anyone makes a contribution to members' personal election costs but these donations were to Sutton Liberal Democrats as a party not to individual councillors. At the time when decisions would have come to committee those donations had not yet been made to the party and so there was no interest of any kind for those members to declare.

Supplementary Question asked by Bill Main-Ian

As an ex-police officer if questions don't get asked by police officers and compliance officers, how do you expect to get an answer to the question? So then it relies upon people like myself that are looking at council websites and other websites to find out the information. We can only pose the questions councillor. What is patently obvious to me in this process through my investigations is that there is an absolute huge gap in the council constitution and the perception of corruption is as bad as actual corruption itself. If I had the evidence obviously the police would investigate but failing the police investigating anything then we're reliant of questions being asked of councillors. So my question is, will the council review the constitution so that the perception of corrupt donations to political parties actually protect the contractors as well as the political parties and the councillors themselves.

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey

I think I can only reply by repeating the words that you used. If you had the evidence, obviously the police would investigate. You do not have the evidence, there is no investigation. If you produce the evidence, there will be an investigation.

Supplementary Question asked by Bill Main-Ian

Sorry, my question was about reviewing the constitution of the council to get rid of this perception of corruption.

**Appendix A to Council:
Public Questions
2 November 2015**

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey

And I will take that question. If you believe that there are clauses in the constitution which could be improved I'd be glad to hear from you.

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Neil Garratt

I agree the issues raised by Mr Main-Ian are serious and obviously I read through his very long and slightly confusing email that I'm sure we all received. I think the point is that it's important not just to be clean, but to be seen to be clean, and so to that end I wonder if a political donation did come into the local Sutton Liberal Democrats from a company that was involved in contract negotiations, would they accept that donation or refuse it on the basis of wanting to be seen to be very clean and not influenced?

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey

So you're asking if we are in full election campaign and there is a donation from a local company, could you repeat the question then?

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Neil Garratt

If, not during an election period because obviously donations are declarable at any point, above a certain level. So if there is a company which is negotiating for a contact with this council, if they make a donation to the Sutton Liberal Democrats, or they offer a donation during that period, let's say a company that had no particular history previously of donating money to the Sutton Liberal Democrats, would that donation be accepted or refused?

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey

I think actually this is a question for the monitoring officer.

Reply by the Monitoring Officer, Jessica Crowe

Matters of donations to political parties are regulated by the Electoral Commission and so the council cannot comment on what donations go in to the party, and are reported to the Electoral Commission and that is a matter for the party and the Commission. There are obligations on companies to declare that they have complied with the Council's provisions around the award of contracts and I guess it would be a matter for members whether they knew of the donations and considered them to have played a role in affecting their judgement of what's in the public interest and that matter of deciding on what's in the public interest is an individual responsibility on members based on the information that they have at the time. And so, it is a bit difficult to answer in the abstract, it would depend on the information available.

8. Question asked by Bill Main-Ian, 29 The Warren, Carshalton Beeches, to Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

Also given the huge public concern that surrounds Liberal Democrat interactions around Viridor Ltd, Viridor Environmental Credits Ltd and the Holy Trinity Church, now the misleading information to the Electoral Commission, the lack of response from council officers and indeed from the Leader of the Council too, I would like to know if these highlighted issues are anti democratic and whether there is a culture of abuse of process, arrogance of acceptance of money from limited companies in exchange for council contracts and actually a total failure of governance and compliance when it comes to ensuring the observance of the councils constitution to avoid breaching the terms of the Bribery Act 2011?

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey, Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee

Thank you Mr Mayor. No they are not and no there isn't.

Supplementary Question asked by Bill Main-Ian

What I would like to know, Councillor, is when are the very good and honest Councillors whom I know and respect actually in the Liberal Democrats, going to start holding their own leadership to account and stop leaving it to members of the public to come out and try and hold you to account?

Reply by Councillor Dombey

I would have thought the very fact that you're here this evening, Mr Main-Ian would be a demonstration of the fact that we are being held to account. I'm not sure exactly what you refer to, I know there have been various discussions held at the Standards Committee, and if you're referring to that can I just remind you that there are independent members of the Standards Committee, not councillors, not council officers but independent members who stated quite clearly that there is no evidence of council wrongdoing and to recommend an enquiry there would need to be something more concrete than allegations. I'm quoting the independent member, not a councillor.

Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley

Thank you Councillor Dombey. I was just wondering whether or not Councillor Dombey would agree with me that there is an inequity in the way that the Standards Committee is set up at the moment in the sense that you have independent members that you have referred to, but those independent members are not allowed to vote. The only people who can vote are the members of this council on that committee, which as you know is made up politically proportionately, which actually means there is no real independence within that standards board whatsoever. And I was wondering whether the Leader of the Council would maybe look at the Standards Committee again to see whether or not

**Appendix A to Council:
Public Questions
2 November 2015**

we can change that somewhat, to give more public confidence in the Standards Committee.

Reply by Councillor Dombey

I'm not sure what the constitution arrangements are but I'm more than happy to look at it. As you and I both know the standards Committee has an independent chair, as well as two independent members. And if I read out again the statement that was recorded from the independent member, I would have thought it was quite a strong statement even if that person didn't have a vote. He stated that the petitions raised allegations against the council which had to be taken seriously however no evidence of council wrongdoing had been presented and in order to recommend an enquiry there needed to be something more concrete than allegations, you know his words. He added that as complaints had since been received regarding individual councillor conduct, they should be followed up through the appropriate process rather than commission an enquiry, the second member echoed this view. So it seems to me that the standards process is working properly and the independent members expressed a view which was upheld by the committee but we can certainly have a look into the idea that you've raised.

At this point the time for member question time concluded. The following written responses were circulated to members following the meeting.

3. Question asked by Roy Bennet, Flat 6, 25 Foxglove way, Hackbridge to Councillor Jill Whitehead, Chair of the Environment and Neighbourhood Committee

The Dispersal plumes for the Hackbridge incinerator stacks have not been modelled with zero wind and fog conditions. In these still air conditions downdraft can easily occur and with no wind a 95 m high stack will have almost no effect. Can the Council confirm that the air pollution produced on these still days will meet the latest and best European air quality indicators as would be fitting for a flagship One Planet administration?

Written response from Councillor Jayne McCoy

The impact of a proposed development on air quality is a material planning decision. As part of the planning application assessment for the Energy Recovery Facility, a full environmental statement was produced to assess all impacts and the Council commissioned an environmental compliance expert to review technical information submitted. In addition, the Environment Agency assessed the Energy Recovery Facilities emissions against National and European limits and was satisfied that it would be in compliance. As a result the Environment Agency granted the facility a permit to operate and will monitor emissions to ensure they remain within safe limits. The Council is satisfied that the emissions from the Energy Recovery Facility will be within safe limits.

4. Question asked by Roy Bennet, Flat 6, 25 Foxglove way, Hackbridge to Councillor Jill Whitehead, Chair of the Environment and Neighbourhood Committee

Can the Council confirm that the BioRegional Development Group has produced an independent audit audited of the permitted incinerator plans and that the proposal meets Sutton Council's stated One Planet Objectives in full ? Could this be published asap? Could all carbon footprint metrics and data used for this audit be made public?

Written response from Councillor Jill Whitehead, Chair of the Environment and Neighbourhood Committee

Bioregional have not produced an audit of the planned energy from waste facility therefore there is no audit for publication.

The facility plans were reviewed through the Environment Agency's Environmental Permitting Process to ensure compliance with all policy and legislation. Progress against One Planet Sutton targets are reviewed annually by Bioregional as part of the One Planet Sutton reaccreditation process. A summary of Bioregional's findings can be found at the following link

https://www.sutton.gov.uk/downloads/file/1946/one_planet_living_sutton_annual_review_20132014

9. Question asked by Maeve Tomlinson, 83 Onslow Gardens, Wallington, to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy and Business Committee

At the full council meeting on 13th July 2015, I asked about a comparison in waste and ash going to Beddington landfill and the Beddington ERF and LRRE combined and was informed that 40,000 tonnes of waste would be going to the LRRE, when the document for the LRRE 'Delivery and Servicing Plan for Proposed Waste Management Facility at 79-85 Beddington Lane CR0 4TH Prepared December 2013 This version: Revision B: 23rd January 2013 Prepared by Phillip Pitman Herbert Stumpp Projects' which on page 5 states 'It is estimated that the site will have an annual throughput of approximately 150,000 tonnes, which is approximately 58% less than the scheme for which planning permission has been given'. Please could you explain and provide me with documents to show where your figures for 'The LRRE advanced thermal treatment facility is expected to have a capacity of 40,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste per year.' have come from, including the figure for the 130,000 tonnes of topsoil mentioned.

Written response from Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy and Business Committee

- When you ask questions about planning applications considered by this council the information you will receive will be taken directly from the information

**Appendix A to Council:
Public Questions
2 November 2015**

supplied by the applicants themselves to support the application. All this information is publically available online for you to access for yourself.

- If you want more detailed information about the applicants' operations then I suggest you direct your questions to them, and make sure that you provide the context of your question, because the answer you get is only as good as the question you ask.
- Your question at the last council meeting asked about throughput and tonnage at the LRRE plant, which is 40,000 tpa according to the documents provided by LRRE to support their most recent application to increase chimney size to serve an Advanced Thermal Treatment Plant. Here is the link to the relevant document:
http://5.150.92.212/fastweb/fastweb_upload/Support/Linkdocs/2014/SPPTD201469227D17PL110042014%20PLANNING%20STATEMENT.pdf. The information is in paragraph 4.20.
- This ATT plant will only process some of the waste going to the site. You have confused the waste to be processed by the plant with the total waste predicted by LRRE that will going onto the site, which at 150,000 tpa is significantly less than the permission originally given.
- The topsoil figure was provided by Viridor.

10. Question asked by Maeve Tomlinson, 83 Onslow Gardens, Wallington, to Councillor Jill Whitehead, Chair of the Environment and Neighbourhood Committee

As I heard at the last South London Waste Partnership meeting on 15th September 2015 in Croydon, Viridor are very concerned about their revenue. During the time between when the landfill will be closed and before the Beddington ERF will be built our waste will go elsewhere (clearly indicating there's not even a need to have the incinerator) and so they've decided the most lucrative method for shareholders and expensive for residents and the council is to have all our waste sent to be burnt at the Lakeside ERF (Colnbrook Incinerator). At a time when Sutton's Future is at stake due to funding, what are your reasons for going ahead with the Beddington ERF and LRRE, when cancelling the contract, even with fines would save the council money and enable Sutton to Recycle More?

Written response from Councillor Jill Whitehead, Chair of the Environment and Neighbourhood Committee

The South London Waste Partnership residual waste treatment contract will divert residual waste produced by households in the South London Waste Partnership area from landfill to an Energy Recovery Facility in Beddington. This will save the South London Waste Partnership £200m over 25 years in comparison to continuing to send residual waste to landfill. Sutton's portion of this saving equates to £49m over 25 years. The money saved will help us to protect other vital frontline services.

In comparison, to landfill, sending the Partnership's waste to energy recovery is expected to save 128,000 tonnes of CO₂eq- each year. This will reduce the carbon footprint of managing waste. The residual waste contract does not alter the

Councils commitment to delivering on our One Planet Sutton Zero Waste targets. The contract with Viridor intentionally encourages continued waste reduction and recycling by allowing for declining tonnages of waste to be put through the facility in future years by the Partnership.

The residual waste treatment contract will therefore help Sutton to deliver significant financial savings, reduce our carbon footprint and Sutton to recycle more.

LRRE does not have a contract with the South London Waste Partnership and as such will not be treating any waste that the Partnership manages.