



**CROYDON COUNCIL MEETING: MONDAY 1 DECEMBER 2014**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**  
**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Welcome to a meeting of Croydon Council. Attached are the questions from the public and the replies which will be taken at this meeting.

IF YOU HAVE ASKED A QUESTION, PLEASE MAKE YOURSELF KNOWN TO THE MEMBER OF STAFF WHO IS PRESENT IN THE PUBLIC GALLERY, THEN READ THE REPLY TO YOUR QUESTION AND INDICATE WHETHER YOU INTEND TO ASK A SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION - a roving microphone will be available for that purpose.

Public Question time is usually towards the beginning of the meeting and the process for this item is as follows:

- “ The questions will be taken in the order in which they were received by the Council;
- “ The question and the reply will be taken as read;
- “ The person who asked the question, if present, will then be invited to ask a supplementary question, (if they wish) to clarify a point related to the reply they have been given in the written answer. The **length and detail of such a question should be brief** and at the discretion of the Mayor, allowing for the time available and the number of other questions which need to be dealt with;
- “ Public question time is limited strictly to **15 minutes** - if all the questions and answers have not been reached at the end of that time, the other replies will be taken as read and there will be no further opportunity for asking supplementary questions at that meeting; and
- “ Questions will not be carried over to the following meeting, but it is of course in order for questioners to ask another question on the same or another topic before the next meeting.

After the public question time you are very welcome to stay for the rest of the meeting

Question Number	Question to Cabinet Member	Question From	Subject
PQ080	Cllr Butler	Mr Crawley	Right to buy
PQ081	Cllr Hall	Mr Cartwright	Parliamentary declaration figure
PQ082	Cllr Butler	Mr Dick	Selective Licensing Scheme
PQ083	Cllr Bee	Ms Bonds	20mph

PQ084	Cllr Butler	Mr Lutha	Selective Licensing Scheme
PQ085	Cllr Butler	Mr Applebee	Selective Licensing Scheme
PQ086	Cllr Butler	Mr Bigglestone	Selective Licensing Scheme
PQ087	Cllr Collins	Mr Khan	Incinerator contract
PQ088	Cllr Bee	Miss Frazer	Norwood Junction station
PQ089	Cllr Butler	Mr Hart	Selective Licensing Scheme
PQ090	Cllr Butler	Mr Baker	Selective Licensing Scheme
PQ091	Cllr Bee	Mr Hickman	Norwood Junction station
PQ092	Cllr Butler	Mrs Onabolu	Planning Procedure
PQ093	Cllr Godfrey	Mrs Arthur	Festival funding
PQ094	Cllr Collins	Mrs Hague	Incinerator
PQ095	Cllr Newman	Mr Creighton	Previous cabinet decisions
PQ096	Cllr Butler	Dr Latham	CPO details
PQ097	Cllr Bee	Mrs Eliatamby	Norwood Junction station
PQ098	Cllr Godfrey	Mr Kennedy	Queens Garden
PQ099	Cllr Collins	Mr Sciberras	Incinerators
PQ100	Cllr Bee	Mrs King	Spicers Yard
PQ101	Cllr Bee	Mr Pettener	Incinerator
PQ103	Cllr Newman	Ms Adu	Ashburton Library
PQ104	Cllr Newman	Pastor Thomas	Ashburton Library

The attached replies are subject to oral amendment by the Cabinet Member or Committee Chair.

---

**From** Mr Alan Crawley

**Councillor** Alison Butler

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ080-14**

Please list the total number, by type, of Council owned, tenanted properties that were sold under the 'Right to buy' in the last 5 years. Was Section 155 of the Housing Act 1985 ever used to restrict discounts on any of the properties sold? What was the total amount of revenue raised from those sales?

**Reply**

1. Right to buy sales in the last five years.

Year	No. sold	Property type	
		Flats	Houses
2010/2011	8	4	4
2011/2012	8	2	6
2012/2013	36	12	24
2013/2014	52	19	33
2014/2015	72	29	43
<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>110</b>

2. Was Section 155 of the Housing Act 1985 ever used to restrict discounts on any of the properties sold?

Yes – applied to 2 properties.

3. What was the total amount of revenue raised from those sales?

Year	Gross valuation	Discount granted	Net sale price	Council's retained share of net receipt
2010/2011	£1,415,500	£128,000	£1,287,500	£1,478,800
2011/2012	£1,426,000	£128,000	£1,298,000	£819,304
2012/2013	£6,242,000	£2,628,550	£3,613,450	£1,931,167
2013/2014	£9,017,500	£4,561,875	£4,455,625	£3,515,999
2014/2015	£12,937,500	£6,315,810	£6,621,690	£3,240,198*
<b>Total</b>	<b>£31,038,500</b>	<b>£13,762,235</b>	<b>£17,276,265</b>	<b>£10,985,468</b>

\*Quarters 1 and 2 only

---

**From Mr John Cartwright**

**Councillor Simon Hall**

**Cabinet Member Finance and Treasury**

**Question No.**

**PQ081-14**

Why does the Croydon Council website

[http://www.croydon.gov.uk/contents/departments/democracy/pdf/599154/935931/Parliamentary Election Results - 2010/central.pdf](http://www.croydon.gov.uk/contents/departments/democracy/pdf/599154/935931/Parliamentary%20Election%20Results%20-%202010/central.pdf)

incorrectly say that Gavin Barwell got 19,567 votes in 2010, when the number he actually got (told to the candidates, declared and published at the time) was 19,657?

**Reply**

I thank Mr Cartwright for his question and for pointing out the error as listed on the Croydon Council website.

I can confirm that Gavin Barwell polled 19,657 votes and this was the number of votes as published on the official declaration of result. I will ensure that the web site information is corrected to show the precise number of votes.

---

**From Mr Gavin Dick**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ082-14**

One of the dangers of the proposed Selective Licensing scheme could be the costs are passed through to tenants, thus increasing cost for those who rent in an area, along with the cost of the council. Thus increasing costs to Croydon residents especially the most vulnerable. How does the Council propose to counter this?

**Reply**

We are currently in the public consultation period regarding our proposal to implement a selective licensing scheme, and the final decision will not be made until the results of the consultation have been collected and analysed.

The current proposed licence fee, details of which are contained within the consultation document, is £750 per licence, or £350 if landlords choose to apply early, i.e. prior to the full implementation of the scheme, should such a scheme be adopted.

This equates £1.34 per week or 20p per day for landlords who choose to apply early and would therefore be eligible for the reduced fee.

In addition, landlords would be able to apply for tax relief on the licence fee, which would lower the cost to themselves further.

Given the rise in rents across the borough, there would be no reason for any landlord to pass on this fee to their tenants and there are no indication this has happened elsewhere.

This administration believes that those who live in the private rented sector are entitled to live in decent homes and we are committed to raising standards for families and children

---

**From Ms Kathryn Bonds**

**Councillor Kathy Bee**

**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**

**Question No.**

**PQ083-14**

With reference to the proposed 20mph limits within Croydon, please state what enforcement will be undertaken to ensure that it is successful?

Will there be cctv, police initiatives or just signage?

what will be the initial costs and also year on year costs of these proposals?

**Reply**

The Metropolitan Police have indicated that they are prepared to provide enforcement for the proposed area wide 20mph limits in much the same way as they currently enforce the London wide 30mph limit.

These 20mph speed limits will be clearly signed at all entry and exit points with repeater signs and markings proposed within the areas. There are no proposals to introduce cameras and the enforcement of the speed limit will remain the responsibility of the Metropolitan Police as the enforcement agency in London.

The Council is looking to introduce the area wide 20mph speed limits over a number of years and has allocated £300,000 from next year's programme to start this process. It is expected to take up to 5 years to complete the project across the Borough and a similar level of funding is expected to be required each year.

---

**From Mr Tony Luthra**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ084-14**

Why has the council not used its existing powers to combat rogue landlord's and unsociable tenants instead of penalising good landlord's by trying to bring in selective licencing causing increased costs and burden.

**Reply**

For many years the number of issues relating to privately rented properties reported to the council have increased year on year. In the year 2013/14, the housing enforcement section received almost 1,400 complaints about privately rented properties. The Council has used its existing powers throughout this time to deal with these issues on a case by case basis, but although this has resolved problems for those tenants who approached the council for assistance our actions have had no effect on the overall number of landlords who are failing to maintain their properties or deal with poor behaviour from their tenants.

We are aware that many residents do not approach the council for assistance for a variety of reasons, including the fear of reprisals from landlords or from unruly neighbours. We currently operate a reactive service, due to governments cuts to this council we only have limited resources to assist residents who do approach us in the full knowledge that there are many more residents suffering from the effects of poorly managed privately rented properties (and tenants) who we are not aware of.

The information which selective licensing would enable us to collect would mean that we could develop a data base of properties and landlords. All properties would be inspected during the licence period, and this would give us the means to take action to address any issues with properties or tenants that we encounter. A scheme of this nature is the only sure way of collecting this full data and of raising the standard of the private rented sector.

---

**From Mr Richard Applebee**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ085-14**

Why are the council pursuing a policy of registering all private sector rented properties in the borough rather than restricting this to the areas where there is a high level of anti-social behaviour?

**Reply**

The Council are at the moment out to public consultation on the proposal to adopt a selective licensing scheme for the borough, the consultation includes four options:

- Implement a borough wide scheme
- Implement a partial scheme
- Implement the voluntary London Rental Standard
- Do nothing

A final decision on whether or not to implement selective licensing, and if so whether it would be borough wide or cover part of the borough, will not be made until the consultation ends and the data collected has been analysed.

The option of introducing a borough wide scheme is included because we have data which indicates anti-social behaviour occurs in all parts of the borough. We have concerns that, should a partial scheme be introduced, this would lead to a two-tier system within the borough with landlords, tenants and neighbouring residents being treated differently according to where their properties are, which would not be equitable. In addition, having a partial scheme could lead to the displacement of poor landlords and tenants to areas of the borough not covered by the scheme, thus shifting the problems around instead of tackling them.



---

**From Mr Derek Bigglestone**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ086-14**

My property was licensed in September 2006 for which I paid the council £410. Why do I need to pay again when the council cancelled this scheme after 15 months & I am still awaiting my requested credit?

**Reply**

Without the property address it is not possible to answer this question specifically. If you would be prepared to give me the address and your contact details I will arrange for enquiries to be made, and a full answer sent to you.

In general terms, in 2006 the only licensing scheme operated by the Council related to houses in multiple occupation (HMO). Selective licensing relates to single family dwellings, therefore the current proposal is not the same.

---

**From Mr Shasha Khan**

**Councillor Stuart Collins**

**Cabinet Member for Clean, Green Croydon**

**Question No.**

**PQ087-14**

Who in the council has access to the unredacted version of the incinerator contract to determine the cost of pulling out will cost tens of millions and is the council aware that when Norfolk council terminated their incinerator contract, they found the precise compensation to be considerably lower than expected?

**Reply**

I would like to thank Mr Khan for his question and his interest in this matter which he has demonstrated over a number of years through his vigorous campaigning]. Access to the unredacted version of the contract between the Council and Viridor in respect of the proposed incinerator (Energy Recovery Facility – ERF) plant at Beddington Lane is restricted to certain officers and Members within the Council which includes officers from the Council's Waste management services, legal and finance. The estimated exposure to the Council in the event of contract termination was based on those officers' professional opinion and advice. They are clear that it could reach tens of millions of pounds of compensation owed. Obviously we are not going to give a precise figure because it can only ever be an estimate and putting the detail in the public domain could prejudice the Council's interests.

It is not for this Council to comment on commercial issues between Norfolk Council and Cory Wheelabrator but as far as this Council understands it those discussions around compensation between Norfolk and Cory are not in fact concluded and the final outcome is not yet known. In any event, in these matters no two set of circumstances are identical and each case is going to depend on their specific circumstances and the detail of the contract. So whatever happens in Norfolk is not a precedent for what would happen in the South London Waste Partnership.

At recent SLWP meetings I have made it clear we would have preferred an alternative technology, I will continue raise questions around safety issues and will take up your point. I will also argue that the meetings should be more open to the public.

---

**From Miss Elfie Frazer**

**Councillor Kathy Bee**

**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**

**Question No.**

**PQ088-14**

Does the council not agree that tens, if not hundreds of thousands of pounds it would cost to change the name of Norwood junction station to South Norwood would be better spent entirely on achieving equal, step free access for all?

**Reply**

I agree that it is vital that Norwood Junction Station be made fully accessible. The task is not an easy one. If it were it would have been done already. The difficulty means that the cost of making the station accessible will be beyond hundreds of thousands of pounds. Thus it is not a question of either/or, and we will continue to press for a solution to the station's access problems to be devised and implemented.

---

**From Mr Glen Hart**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ089-14**

Will you organise local public meetings chaired by a local ward Councillors on the private landlord licensing scheme in those parts of the Borough with a high percentage of private landlords to enable tenants to be involved in shaping the proposed scheme?

**Reply**

There are no plans to organise public meetings on a ward by ward basis, however ward councillors may of course do this if they wish. I am aware that a number of councillors are talking to many of their residents about this issue, particularly those who approach them for advice and assistance. The consultation does include a public forum which has been arranged for 27<sup>th</sup> November from 6pm at Croydon Conference Centre. This will allow members of the public (including tenants) to make comments and suggestions on the scheme.

In addition, there will be a series of face to face interviews conducted by our research & analysis organisation M.E.L Research Ltd, which tenants can take part in if they wish. To arrange this, please contact David Chong-Ping at M.E.L on 0121 604 4664.

As an alternative to face-to-face meetings, the on-line survey is currently live and will remain available on both the Council's and M.E.L's websites until 12 December 2014. All residents of Croydon, and people who work in the borough, can fill in the on-line questionnaire.

Data collected from all branches of the consultation will be retained and analysed, and used to assist in the decision making process.

---

**From Mr Ken Baker**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ090-14**

If Croydon Council adopts "Selective Licensing", how does it justify a proposed charge on private landlords of approximately double the average fee in the other fifteen authorities quoted in the Cabinet Report of 30/06/14 (para:4.2) - and exactly double the amount considered adequate by the much-referenced borough of Newham?

**Reply**

The proposed charge for licence applications has been amended following initial consultations on the proposal with landlords. We are now in the process of conducting full public consultation, and the proposed fees indicated within the consultation document, should the proposal go ahead, are £750 full fee and £350 'early bird' discount fee for landlords who apply before the scheme would be fully implemented.

This level of fee reflects the estimated cost of administering the scheme. Should the scheme be implemented, landlords can take advantage of the 'early bird' discounted fee period, which, at £350, is the same as the second lowest fee which is included in the table of fifteen authorities referred to above.

---

**From Mr John Hickman**

**Councillor Kathy Bee**

**Cabinet Member Transport and Environment**

**Question No.**

**PQ091-14**

How much will the council continue to spend on a feasibility study to determine the desirability of changing the name of Norwood Junction to South Norwood?

**Reply**

The Council is spending very little. London Overground Rail Operations Limited manage the station as part of operating London Overground on behalf of TfL. The station is also used by Southern Services. TfL is currently undertaking an exercise to determine the cost to its Overground and bus operations potentially arising from a name change. A small amount of council officer time is being spent seeking similar cost estimates from Southern and Network Rail.

---

**From Mrs Lolade Onabolu**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ092-14**

The Foxley Residents Association of which I am Chair would like to know the Cabinet Member's view on Section 43 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the conditions that would make the Council exercise the power under this Act and thereby safeguard tax payer's money.

**Reply**

Section 43 gives Local Planning Authorities (LPA) the power to turn away repeat applications. The power is limited by statute to repeat applications where within the previous two years the LPA have refused more than one similar application or a similar application has been dismissed on appeal by the Secretary of State. An application for planning permission is similar to a previous application if (and only if) the LPA think that the development and the land to which the applications relate are the same or substantially the same.

These powers are not intended to be used in the circumstances where applicant's amend their applications with a view to addressing previous reasons for refusal.

---

**From Mrs Anna Arthur**

**Councillor Timothy Godfrey**

**Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and Sport**

**Question No.**

**PQ093-14**

What Council funding and other support is available for local Festivals in 2015 in additional to the £100,000 budget for the Croydon Town Festival in July?

**Reply**

The council is delighted to have been able to provide funding for a summer festival to be held in the heart of the town centre in 2015. The festival will be designed to attract a broad spectrum of residents and communities in the borough.

Alongside this the council sets great store by the value of the many community-run festivals and carnivals which take place in Croydon every year. Their continued success is important to us all and we are in the process of talking to their organisers, as well as to anyone proposing new events, to find what assistance the council can give which will help them to thrive. This may include things such as help with advertising and marketing. Whilst we will have to operate within existing resources we will seek creative and imaginative ways of offering whatever support we can.

In addition if they meet the qualifying criteria, financial support may also be available through the Council's Active Communities Fund. Council officers are able to provide signposting support to groups/people interested in pursuing this opportunity.

Should anyone want to discuss their event with the council they should talk to our new festivals manager, John Bownas in the first instance.



---

**From Mrs Tracey Hague**

**Councillor Stuart Collins**

**Cabinet Member Clean, Green Croydon**

**Question No.**

**PQ094-14**

If the Beddington incinerator Judicial Review appeal fails, will this council withdraw from South London Waste Partnership, conduct a boroughwide public consultation into incineration, examine whether this council can afford this incinerator, and seriously explore other options which are environmentally sustainable, have low health impacts and boost local employment?

**Reply**

I would like to thank Mrs Hague for her question and interest in this matter.

The South London Waste Partnership has entered into a number of contracts to which Croydon is either directly or indirectly a party and only one of those relates to the proposed incinerator Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) at Beddington Lane. It is not appropriate for the Council to comment on what may or may not happen in relation to the proposed ERF plant whilst judicial proceedings are still ongoing (which they are as an application for leave to appeal has been made to the Court of Appeal). At present the matter is effectively sub-judice.

At recent SLWP meetings I have made it clear we would have preferred, and we actually previously lobbied for (when in opposition), an alternative technology, I will continue to raise questions around safety issues and will argue that the meetings should be more open to the public.

This is a contract that was signed before we were elected and for that reason we are obliged to work with it but I can assure you that we are fully committed to environmental sustainability throughout the borough and that we will continue to argue for stringent air pollution testing on the facility should it be built. This Council is fully committed to the highest standards of air quality throughout the borough and to tackling the problems caused by diesel engines vehicles and other pollutants.

---

**From Mr Sean Creighton**

**Councillor Tony Newman**

**Leader of the Council**

**Question No.  
PQ095-14**

When do you propose to submit to the Cabinet a series of resolutions designed to put a stop to officers continuing to work on decisions by the previous administration, which you opposed when in opposition?

**Reply**

Officers are working hard on the delivery of Labour's Ambitious for Croydon manifesto. I am delighted to tell you that we are already delivering or will soon deliver many of our commitments including:

- Clean and Green Croydon – Don't Mess with Croydon: Take Pride
- London Living Wage
- Fairness Commission
- Fair share of funding for the people of Croydon
- Prioritising domestic violence
  - White ribbon status
- Private landlord licensing scheme – protecting and being on the side of our private tenants
- Tackling the housing shortage
  - Delivering 10,000 new homes
  - Increasing the provision of affordable housing in new developments from 15% to 30%
- Empty property strategy – pushing harder on penalties & incentives
- Growth plan & district centre investment
  - London Road improvement
  - £3m for improvements to Thornton Heath District Centre
- Improving transparency – open & transparent Council for the people of Croydon
- Public health report – focus on inequalities
- Cultural Quarter – rejuvenating Fairfield

This administration's priority is to deliver Value for Money services that meet the needs and aspirations of the people of Croydon and we will not be deflected from that.

---

**From Dr Peter Latham**

**Councillor Alison Butler**

**Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration**

**Question No.**

**PQ096-14**

Please list the names and registered office addresses of all those individuals and organisations which have submitted objections to the CPO for the Westfield/ Hammerson development and indicate whether they are freeholds, leaseholders or tenants.

**Reply**

The National Planning Casework Unit (NPCU) has written to all Objectors to notify them of the conjoined Inquiry (Compulsory Purchase Order and Dingwall Stopping Up Order) to be held from the 3rd February to the 11th March 2015. The Inquiry will be held in the council's Community Space. The Pre Inquiry Meeting will be held on 9th December 2014. Efforts to resolve objections to the CPO and Stopping up Order are continuing with an even greater emphasis on active joint working. Efforts to acquire interests in the Whitgift Centre via negotiation are also continuing apace.

A hard copy of the requested list of objectors has been supplied directly to Dr Latham.

---

**From Mrs Karen Eliatamby**

**Councillor Kathy Bee**

**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**

**Question No.**

**PQ097-14**

With reference to the suggested renaming of Norwood Junction Station, is there any documentary evidence that Coulsdon Town is economically better off two years after changing the station's name from Smitham Bottom?

**Reply**

Two years is perhaps too short period a period in which to assess the benefits arising from a station name change. Forest Hill, a little up the line from Norwood Junction is probably still reaping the benefit of its station name being changed from 'Dartmouth Arms' in 1845. The suggestion of changing 'Norwood Junction' to 'South Norwood' has been made to emphasise the importance of South Norwood as a place and help people locate that place, rather than put the emphasis on a piece of railway infrastructure to aid through travel and interchange. TfL is currently researching the cost implications of changing the name and no decision will be made before the cost information is available.

---

**From Mr Andrew Kennedy**

**Councillor Timothy Godfrey**

**Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and Sport**

**Question No.**

**PQ098-14**

In light of the Council's role as a cultural enabler (PQ033-14), would it not be better that the Queen's Garden be enhanced in its present role as adopted by the public as a place of relaxation and wedding photo venue rather than become a children's play area? What opportunities are being explored?

**Reply**

Queens Gardens has evolved with the Town Centre. The main wall onto Katharine Street was originally part of the Croydon Railway Station. The wider site included the Town Police Station and other buildings. I have no doubt that it can continue to evolve and serve a wide range of uses. This summer it will be hosting part of the new Summer Festival.

The Queens Gardens sits within the Croydon Opportunity Area. The adopted Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) sets out that approximately 7300 new homes will be delivered in this area over the next 20 years. These proposed new homes will be of mixed types and will include homes for families with children.

With this significant growth in the Opportunity Area's residential population over the coming years, as well as its role as a destination for visitors coming to work, shop and visit cultural, leisure and educational facilities, the public realm in central Croydon, including important green spaces like Queens Gardens, will need to adapt and evolve to provide facilities that cater for the needs of the community. This will include the important provision of formal play spaces and more informal play opportunities alongside facilities to enable other activities such as cultural and community events.

The OAPF and the adopted Mid Croydon Masterplan identify Queens Gardens as an area that could accommodate informal and formal play opportunities and to deliver off-site play space associated with schemes that might be developed within close proximity. There is also a requirement through the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance to provide a sizable play and informal recreation area to meet the needs of the children and young people who will occupy the 420 flats planned as part of the proposed development of the Taberner House site.

The current proposals for the gardens are to retain and enhance many of the existing features – including its role as a place of relaxation and a wedding photo venue - and to improve access, as well as to introduce new facilities that will help the Gardens

serve Croydon's community for years to come. The current proposals do include a play facility, however the design intent is to carefully incorporate this within the existing slope of the gardens to reduce its overall impact and to maximise the parks potential for other important activities.

Draft

---

**From Mr Chris Sciberras**

**Councillor Stuart Collins**

**Cabinet Member for Clean, Green Croydon**

**Question No.**

**PQ099-14**

John McDonnell, MP, has sent a letter to the Environmental Audit Committee calling for meaningful action to be taken to stop the thousands of deaths from air pollution each year. What representations has the Council made to Sutton Council to halt the two incinerators planned next to the Croydon border?

**Reply**

The Incinerator (Energy Recovery Facility – ‘ERF’) proposed by Viridor and any other similar facilities in that area were agreed by Sutton Planning Authority, which included representations made by Croydon as well as other parties. The approval for the Viridor facility was subject to judicial review and currently that challenge has been dismissed although an application for leave to appeal the dismissal has been made.

I can confirm that the ERF must be designed and must meet emission limits specified within the Waste Incineration Directive (WID). This enforces high standards in order to minimise the impact of negative environmental effects including but not limited to human health resulting from emissions to air, soil, surface and groundwater. In addition a continuous emissions monitoring system will be in place to measure the emission concentrations in the stacks.

Any new energy recovery facility must meet the requirements of the (WID) and the Environment Agency (EA) will only issue a permit if they are satisfied the plant will be designed, built, operated and maintained in such a way that the requirements of the Directive are met and human health and the environment are protected. As the regulator the EA will continually assess the plant operations and its environmental performance. This will include the continuous and periodic monitoring of emissions by the operator, check monitoring by the EA and frequent plant inspections.

The current thinking around health impacts and pollution relate to ‘particulate matter’ which should not be an issue with the ERF but falls in the transport realm.

Croydon has an Air Quality Action Plan available:

[http://www.croydon.gov.uk/contents/departments/environment/pdf/airquality/airquality\\_action-summary.pdf](http://www.croydon.gov.uk/contents/departments/environment/pdf/airquality/airquality_action-summary.pdf) which outlines the steps we are taking to tackle air quality and there are a number of larger regional questions around traffic and boiler emissions that are of more pressing need.

---

**From Mrs Holly King**

**Councillor Kathy Bee**

**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**

**Question No.**

**PQ100-14**

Connected Croydon states Spices Yard remains. Can the cabinet member therefore explain the confusion about the proposed renaming of the car park there, by the previous administration on 17 December 2013? Is it actually 'Restaurant Quarter' or what and at which meeting of the current council was this ever changed back?

**Reply**

In 2013 there was a proposed renaming of Spices Yard Car park (South End, South Croydon CR9 1LT) to Restaurant Quarter. Council officers, have gained committee approval, and are completing the legal process so that we are in the position to change the name. Currently the car park is still known as "Spices Yard Car park"



---

**From Mr Dave Pettener**

**Councillor Stuart Collins**

**Cabinet Member for Clean, Green Croydon**

**Question No.**

**PQ101-14**

The council agreed to the Beddington lane incinerator because it's a CHP facility. Viridor's legal team confirmed at the Judicial Review that no heat will be provided to end users. Now that it has been shown the plan was agreed on misinformation will the council reconsider their decision?

**Reply**

The London Borough of Sutton is the Local Planning Authority in respect of the Planning permission granted to Viridor to build an Incinerator Energy Recovery Facility ('ERF'), and any planning issues would need to be brought to Sutton's attention although it is my understanding that Viridor are still exploring potential outlets for the heat produced by the ERF

At recent SLWP meetings I have made it clear we would have preferred an alternative technology, I will continue raise questions around safety issues and will take up your point. I will also argue that the meetings should be more open to the public.

---

**From Ms Amanda Adu**

**Councillor Tony Newman**

**Leader of the Council**

**Question No.**

**PQ103-14**

Based on Croydon Council's New Equality and Fairness policy could the Leader of the Council explain his rationale for not granting to His Grace Evangelical Outreach an alternative building considering the amount of work the Christian Charity have carried out on the dilapidated Former Ashburton Library after 8 years of neglect from the Council.

**Reply**

The new administration has a duty to protect the public purse and is therefore required to obtain best value from the Council's assets. The building was initially advertised at a guide price of between £300,000 and £500,000. The previous Conservative administration believed that a price of £85,000 (significantly below the price advertised) was a reasonable price. We do not share this view and believe that your bid of £85,000 for the building did not represent value for money for Croydon's Council Tax payers.

I have corresponded extensively with representatives of His Grace Evangelical Outreach to clarify the Council's position regarding disposal of the building. I hope that you appreciate the Council's responsibility to ensure value for money in all aspects of its operations.

---

**From Pastor Bola Thomas**

**Councillor Tony Newman**

**Leader of the Council**

**Question No.**

**PQ104-14**

Considering the fact that Croydon Council is refusing to honour their offer made to His Grace Evangelical Outreach in December 2013 regarding The 125 years Lease of the Former Ashburton Library could the Leader of the Council explain his new time scale and actions to put the building back to community use.

**Reply**

I would refer Pastor Thomas to my response to PQ103/14.

Draft