

## CABINET – 14 JULY 2015

### PUBLIC QUESTIONS (ITEM 4)

Under Rule 16 of the Executive Procedure Rules, members of the public may question the Executive and Portfolio Holders at meetings. There is a time limit of 15 minutes for the asking and answering of public questions.

1.

**Questioner:** Sarah Bishop

**Asked of:** Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Business, Planning and Regeneration

**Question:** “Rather than alienating thousands, what could you do to encourage Harrow School to see the value of the golf course, for its biodiversity, as a community sports facility; and that by keeping this asset it enhances their reputation locally?”

2.

**Questioner:** Simon Bishop

**Asked of:** Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Business, Planning and Regeneration

**Question:** “What specifically can the Council do to prevent developers claiming that coach or car parking is ancillary to use for sports pitches on Metropolitan Open Land when everyone is fully aware that the prime objective is in fact for car/ coach parking on the land in question?”

3.

**Questioner:** Asif Iqbal, MBE - President of Harrow United Deaf Club

**Asked of:** Councillor David Perry, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Partnerships and Corporate Leadership

**Question:** **“British Sign Language Charter**

We at Harrow United Deaf Club are extremely disappointed by the lack of progress as this has taken over two years since BSL Charter was put forward by Harrow United Deaf Club as result of Harrow Deaf Awareness Day May 2013. Clearly, the excessive delays could be seen as a waste of taxpayer money and resources to take this so long when it could have easily achieved in a shorter space of time. A London Council became the first

London borough to sign up to BSL Charter two months ago after 4 months of consultation with the Council and their local Deaf community. Sadly Harrow Council lost out from being the first London Borough Council as it is now 2 years since May 2013 and I had to chase up for update on progress.

I would respectfully call for the Cabinet to look into this further and for the senior management who were aware of the BSL Charter project, to explain what are the reasons for delaying this amount of time and if this is largely due to inactions then what the Council is doing to prevent further delays of inactions?"

4.

**Questioner:** Raksha Pandya - Mind in Harrow

**Asked of:** Councillor Anne Whitehead, Portfolio Holder for Adults and Older People

**Question:** "Is the Council aware of the CNWL Shifting Settings of Care discharges of mental health service users from secondary care to primary care, in view of the cuts to the voluntary sector what is the Council doing to provide access to preventative, wellbeing and support services in the community for the discharged mental health service users?"

5.

**Questioner:** Joanna Russell

**Asked of:** Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Business, Planning and Regeneration

**Question:** "Is Harrow School planning to try and change right of access ways to Churchfields park area within their plans?"

6.

**Questioner:** Denise Robertson

**Asked of:** Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Business, Planning and Regeneration

**Question:** "It is not entirely clear from the revised SDP what the implication are for the school's desire to reduce parking on the High Street. Can you please confirm that the removal of the Highways aspect means there will be NO reduction in parking?"

7.

**Questioner:** Eileen Kinnear

**Asked of:** Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Business, Planning and Regeneration

**Question:** "Recommendation 4 on this Agenda item is that . . . authority shall be delegated

"to the Divisional Director of Regeneration and Planning following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Business, Planning and Regeneration, to make typographical corrections and any other **necessary non-material amendments to the Harrow School SPD prior to formal publication of the SPD**".  
Given

- the list of Proposed Amendments detailed at Paragraph 6.0 including the whole chunks deleted from the Document
- the comment in Paragraph 6.3 that
- the strength of feeling shown at the lack of proper consultation (no matter how many on the Council's database were apparently consulted, many living on the Hill were not)
- and the lack of real information about what actually WILL be altered

what is the precise basis for your reasoning that the SPD should not be put out for a second and proper round of Consultation?"