

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority at each ordinary meeting of the Council.

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

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

(a) Ms Emma Andrews (Mr Simon James)

“Many Councillors are aware that the King Alfred Ice Rink project represents an independent investigation into the opportunity to site a temporary enclosed ice skating facility on the disused land, to the west of the King Alfred Leisure Centre, for a minimum term of 3 years. The project has received support from many sections of the community including several local Councillors, Keep Sussex Skating and the National Ice Skating Association who share the vision of this important amenity for all those who live in Brighton & Hove and all who visit our city.

We recognise that there are significant planning concerns regarding the structural integrity of the site and it would not be sensible to begin to address these concerns without understanding the basic structural issues first. We would like to emphasise, clearly, that we do not require any Council funding to progress this project, nor do we take permission to survey the site to be any indication whatsoever of Council approval for this scheme.

It is essential that we determine whether the site is structurally suitable for this project, and if not, what structural works would need to be incorporated into any business plan and proposal to establish this new serious ice skating venue for our city. We will then be in a position to decide whether or not to progress with this vision.

In order to determine whether this opportunity has any chance of progressing, we request permission from the Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation & Tourism for Jon Orrell of Hemsley Orrell Partnership to undertake a qualified inspection of the site?”

Councillor Bowden, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Tourism, will reply.

(b) Mr Chris Cooke

“The LDV has identified 499 properties across the City for refurbishment; please may we have a breakdown as to which wards these properties are located in, and a time-frame for when such properties will become habitable once more”

Councillor Wakefield, Cabinet Member for Housing, will reply.

(c) Ms Katia Richardson

“Residents have emailed numerous questions and freedom of information requests relating to the proposed Elm Grove parking ban that have so far been ignored or evaded. Including about the:

- Decision maker and process to introduce the proposal with relevant meeting minutes,
- Comparative data on accidents that evidences high levels and increasing danger on Elm Grove cited as the rationale for the ban,
- Origin of ‘feedback’ cited as rationale and evidence that community feedback has been used fairly, and
- Role of NSL Service Group in relation to this proposal.

Can I ask when will residents be given transparent answers?”

Councillor Davey, Cabinet Member for Transport & Public Realm, will reply.

(d) Ms Tanya Richardson

“Many locals welcome the Elm Grove parking consultation; but the community’s concerns need to be addressed for the consultation to be meaningful. Management of this proposal has fuelled community distrust over the lack of evidence, lack of communication and lack of answers.

Residents want transparent management and a community led consultation, including:

- Provision of data to residents on request,
- Consultation parameters set by the community (not pre-empted by council),
- An independent working group chair.

What assurance can the council give that residents’ concerns will be taken seriously and that this issue will be managed transparently going forward?”

Councillor Davey, Cabinet Member for Transport & Public Realm, will reply.

(e) Ms Emily Jenkins

“The 9th September notice warned that pavement parking would not be tolerated beyond 3rd October. Despite this being a major imminent change to parking affecting thousands the council failed to inform affected residents beyond Elm Grove; locals had to organised themselves to raise awareness wasting both time and money. Many locals expressed significant distrust of the council believing your approach to be strategically intended to rush the proposal through unnoticed or to divide opposition to it. Community trust needs to be rebuilt.

How will communication with residents be improved and will the council apologise for the poor management so far?”

Councillor Davey, Cabinet Member for Transport & Public Realm, will reply.

(f) Mr Wilf Nicholls

“Last year Elm Grove Residents Action Group campaigned against the council's plan to introduce CPZ to the Elm Grove Area. At the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 16th Sept 2010 discussing Community Consultation, a strong commitment was made by the council that it would work with residents and to get ‘clear written support from residents’ before going ahead with any further proposals. The council is clearly going against the spirit of this commitment which has unsurprisingly angered and outraged many residents they made this promise to.

Why then was the community, including Elm Grove Residents Action Group, not informed of the proposed plan to change parking arrangements on Elm Grove and how will you ensure that you keep your promises to the community of Hanover and Elm Grove going forward and include us in decisions on parking provision in our local area?

Will you explain why the council has put forward a proposal that goes against the spirit of this commitment?”

Councillor Davey, Cabinet Member for Transport & Public Realm, will reply.

