

Council – 18 July 2019

Item 7 – Public Questions

2. Question from Paul Street

“We notice that Spelthorne BC procure their electricity for their estate and operations from *nPower* via the Kent Council Laser energy buying group. This is electricity from a fuel mix of some of the lowest proportions of renewable energy and highest of fossil fuels. Why is Spelthorne not switching to 100% renewable electricity supplier in the interest of climate change, especially when it appears it would be economically more advantageous to do so? Some other councils within Surrey have already made the switch and others are planning to do so. And secondly, but directly related, do Spelthorne BC plan to declare a meaningful climate emergency with targets and an action plan?”

3. Question from Caroline Nichols

“This is a question about the Council’s forward plan for food and drink carton recycling.

Background:

In 2008 Spelthorne Council introduced large collection containers at five recycling sites in the borough. The containers were supplied with a free collection service by ACE, the umbrella organisation for carton processing in the UK. After a while, they were replaced by small lockable black bins because of contamination at one or more sites, but my understanding is that the collection service remained free (as it does for all the ‘first wave’ councils who took up the five-container offer). In December 2017 Spelthorne discontinued the service.

There is currently no doorstep carton collection and the only bring-site is a separate Surrey County Council facility at Charlton Lane. This, according to ACE statistics, means Spelthorne is one of only 6% of councils that does not make a systematic effort to collect cartons (a scheme which is now being extended to paper coffee cups). According to ACE, currently 66% of local authorities collect beverage cartons at kerbside.

Why did the Council stop the bring-site collection? Are there plans to introduce doorstep recycling, and would the Council consider reintroducing carton collection at all bring sites?”

4. Question from Rachel Batsford

“Why has Richmond Road, Staines, TW182AA been denied Parking Permits although a petition was signed by the qualifying percentage of residents in

favour of a permit scheme? All other roads surrounding the town centre have been granted them (I refer to Zone A, B,C,D,& E)?

Why has the council proposed a 15 storey development on the site of the old BUPA building in Staines when the profile of all surrounding buildings is Staines is much lower? This will set a terrible precedent for further developments overlooking the river, spoiling the skyline of our historic town. Please can the council reconsider the design of this development to be more in keeping with the area?"

5. Question from Shadia Outsa Doerfel

"As a resident and voter within Spelthorne, and in the light of the May 2019 elections where Spelthorne residents voted to change the political make-up of the Council by voting in Greens, Libdems and Labour Councillors into the Council family, and given that the Local Plan intends to directly affect residents of Spelthorne for the next 15yrs, can the Council and Cabinet confirm that:

(a) the Local Plan Working Group will be updated to reflect the residents' votes in and results of the May 2019 elections so that a representative of each democratically party forms part of this group's quorum? If not, why not? (It seems in light of the above that paragraph 8 of the 2018 FAQs is overtaken by the May 2019 elections and now appears undemocratic.) and

(b) given the regard apparently demonstrated towards those who form part of the community or who work in green spaces such as Parks Officer Richard Leppard who was recently celebrated by Daniel Mouawad and Madam Mayor for 50yrs service, will the Council will similarly reach out to Spelthorne residents so that Council including Cabinet members and those who sit on the Local Plan Working Group will hold regular meetings and open forum events on a monthly or 6 weekly basis to engage residents in the development of the Local Plan so residents are not excluded from this crucial conversation?

If not, why not?"