

CABINET – 23 JULY 2013

ITEM 4(a) - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members' Questions

Question (1) from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)

Please confirm the evidence base for the statement, "exposes SCC to the risk of price increase as they seek to peg their prices to landfill increases (at least in the medium term)" in paragraph 10.

Reply:

This statement is based on the professional judgement of council officers and the council's technical and independent financial advisors and knowledge obtained through historic and current market prices for merchant energy from waste capacity for dealing with Surrey's waste.

John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013

Question (2) from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)

Please confirm if the changes proposed impact upon the total tonnage of waste envisaged to be disposed of using EfW by SCC?

Reply:

The changes proposed do not impact on the total tonnage of waste envisaged to be disposed of by the Surrey County Council. After achieving levels of 70% recycling, there remains about 160,000 tonnes of residual waste to be disposed of and the Eco Park will deal with a proportion of this.

John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013

Question (3) from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)

Please provide a breakdown of the CO2 emissions noted in paragraph 46 and energy generated noted in paragraph 47, and set out how this compares to the current approved Eco Park waste management process.

Reply:

Given the detailed numerical nature of the Mr Essex's question, my officers have produced a breakdown of the net reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the energy generation projections that have been modelled. Furthermore, officers would be willing to brief Mr Essex in more detail if that would be helpful.

John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013