

## **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public:

### **1. QUESTION From: Emma Andrews**

What would the council call the East side children's play and amusement area if the children's amusements were removed and vacated?

At the last TECC Committee in June we asked the council for valid objections to the King Alfred Temporary Ice Rink project.

The objection given was that the Council disagreed with our term "unused area" and they insisted that it was called "the roof of a vacant, aging building".

On that basis the East side of the King Alfred site is the children's play and amusement area, which has been earning the Council income for decades, is also really situated on the "the roof of a vacant, aging building". So the objection was clearly not a valid one.

### **2. QUESTION From: Ricky Perrin**

**Would Members of the committee accept an invitation to visit some of the multi-sport community venues in other cities with my organisation so that those plans are made after seeing proven successful venues in other cities?**

I've spoken with many councillors about basketball, disability sports, community sports roles, and return of The Brighton Bears.

It appears surveys, reviews, assessments, and sports needs plans are underway to make the leisure offer and sports facilities improve shortly. Everybody within the council I have engaged with shares the passion for this city to bring the community leisure sports facilities into the 21st century.

### **3. QUESTION From: Adrian Hart**

Is it the case that new rules on petitions and post-codes ratified last May puts into question petitions debated at Full Council and which formed (and still forms) part of a mandate for BHCC policy?

