

**Report to:** South London Waste Partnership (SLWP)  
Joint Waste Committee

**Date:** 10<sup>th</sup> December 2015

**Report of:** SLWP Management Group

**Author(s):**

Matt Clubb – Executive Head of Environment Commissioning ( LB Sutton)

**Chair of the Meeting:**

Councillor Stuart Collins, Chair SLWP Joint Waste Committee

<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Outcome of Sutton's Standards Committee</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	This report provides Joint Waste Committee with an update of the outcome of Sutton's Standards Committee held on 16 <sup>th</sup> September 2015, which considered a petition received from Councillor Matthey at Sutton's Full Council on 13 <sup>th</sup> July 2015.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	Joint Waste Committee is asked to note the contents of this report.
<b>Appendices:</b>	Report to Sutton's Standards Committee and addendum report.

## 1. Background

- 1.1 At the Joint Waste Committee (JWC) meeting on the 15th September 2015 a public question was submitted regarding the content of a petition due to be considered by Sutton's Standards Committee on 16th September 2015. As a result, there was a request that a report on the outcome of the Standards Committee be presented at this meeting.

## 2. Issues

- 2.1 A petition relating to the Energy Recovery Facility at Beddington was submitted by Councillor Matthey to Sutton's Full Council meeting on 13 July 2015, with the following prayer.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens

(1) demand a full enquiry by an independent body into the activities of Viridor Credits, Viridor Limited and their relationship with Sutton Council members.

(2) We want to know why the Council described the incinerator as an Energy Recovery Facility and hid its true purpose. We want the Viridor incinerator stopped as vital information about its purpose and environmental impact of the incinerator has been withheld or the information was delivered in a misleading fashion. We believe

that the London Borough of Sutton has acted contrary to the Nolan principles of ethical standards in public life and has acted against the best interests of residents of Hackbridge and Beddington.

- 2.2 Given the nature of the allegations, the matter was referred to Sutton's Standards Committee, which is chaired independently and consists of Members from both the administration and opposition. The petition was considered on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2015.
- 2.3 Following publication of the agenda, Sutton officers met with Councillor Matthey where he requested that the Committee's attention be drawn in particular to the second point in the prayer. He acknowledged that the questions he and others had raised over the last few months, about the relationship between Viridor Credits, Viridor Ltd and Sutton Council members, raised in the first part of the petition, amount to speculation and allegation. He asked the Committee to disregard these issues.

#### Outcome

- 2.4 An addendum report was subsequently written, and considered alongside the original report. The Standards Committee considered the petition and information supplied in the two reports and following discussion agreed the following recommendations:
1. That the Committee notes the request to set up an independent inquiry and determines that this is not required for the reasons set out in section 4 of the report.
  2. That the Committee agrees to commission a further report on the council's member development programme, setting out how the council is ensuring that all members are fully aware of their obligation to follow the Nolan Principles and to uphold the Code of Conduct at all times in their behaviour as elected members.
- 2.5 There will be no further action taken by Sutton regarding this matter.

### **3 Recommendations**

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Joint Waste Committee:
- a) Note the contents of this report

### **4 Impacts and Implications**

#### Legal

- 4.1 None.

#### Finance

- 4.2 None

### **5 Appendices**

- 5.1 Report to Sutton's Standards Committee and addendum report.