**CABINET – THURSDAY 9 JULY 2020**

**AGENDA PART 1**

**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:** | Martin Siddy |
| **Asked of:** | Councillor Graham Henson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Partnerships, Devolution and Customer Services |
| **Question:** | “Given the public anxiety and level of objection to the development on the Ridgeway with over 3000 objections in different format, can you Councillor Graham Henson, Leader of the Council,  allow an exceptional conversation to occur between yourself, Councillor Keith Ferry, the Head of Planning, the relevant officers/councillors and some Harrow representatives via Zoom [before 20th July](x-apple-data-detectors://0)”. |
|  |  |

**2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questioner:** | Siobhan Siddy |
| **Asked of:** | Councillor Graham Henson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Partnerships, Devolution and Customer Services |
| **Question:** | “Mr Henson, as you are aware there is a major development at the Ridgeway, can you give me answers and assurances you will investigate what has already been highlighted and dismissed, to the planners that this Site is NOT registered brownfield - in fact recommendations have stated it has significant tree cover in areas and as such should be taken into consideration which it hasn’t. How is this process being allowed to continue given this major discrepancy?” |
|  |  |

**3.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questioner:** | Victoria Widenka |
| **Asked of:** | Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Planning and Employment |
| **Question:** | Please can I ask Councillor Keith Ferry to confirm a consideration for public use of P/1492/20 – 265 The Ridgeway as a D1 status by the council be made given there is no obligation to change the terms of the existing covenant, and the land would better serve the area as something that benefits the community - community hall or sports/leisure/NHS facility. |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **4.**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Questioner:** | Mike Williams | | | **Asked of:** | Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Planning and Employment | | | **Question:** | “Do you share our concern that the historic traffic projections are based on a generic model that it is so far removed from the reality that we end up with the assertion in the planning application that traffic will actually be reduced when that is clearly not the case?”. | | |  |  | | | **5.**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Questioner:** | Mari Tomkins | | **Asked of:** | Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Planning and Employment | | **Question:** | “Have you conducted a local impact assessment on the health and education infrastructure of the 265 Ridgeway development and if yes, what were the outcomes”. | |  |  | | |  | |  |