

FULL COUNCIL MEETING – 11 NOVEMBER 2015

**AGENDA ITEM 3 – PUBLIC QUESTION TIME – ORDER IN WHICH THE
CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL WILL INVITE QUESTIONS BELOW RECEIVED
IN WRITING IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING**

1. From Mr Butcher to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities, Councillor Dendle
2. From Mr Newman to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities, Councillor Dendle
3. From Mrs May to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities, Councillor Dendle
4. From Mr Clark to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown

**THE FULL DETAIL OF THE QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED IS DETAILED
BELOW**

NOTE: The Chairman will:

- invite questions from members of the public who have submitted in writing their questions in line with the Council's Constitution;
- explain that the questions received will be answered by the appropriate Members of the Cabinet or the Chairman of the Overview Select Committee
- confirm that Public Question Time allows Members of the public to ask one question at a time and that a maximum of one minute is allowed for each question.
- state that questions will be invited in the order in which they have been received and that if there is time remaining from the 15 minutes allowed for Public Question Time, questioners will be allowed to ask a supplementary question.

QUESTION ONE

From Mr Butcher to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities, Councillor Dendle **Question**

Why has there not been full and definitive consultation with residents in the whole eastern area of Arun District regarding the needs and wishes of local people for the provision and potential location of services and amenities in any new Swimming and Sports Centre?

Response

The initial options appraisal conducted by The Sports Consultancy considered twenty potential sites on publically owned land. The study identified the land at Cornfield/Daisyfield as the preferred site. Cabinet agreed, following representation from the Leisure, Tourism and Infrastructure Working Group that detailed feasibilities be undertaken on the Cornfield/Daisyfield site and the existing location of the centre on Sea Road.

The facts speak for themselves given that the detailed feasibility study has clearly identified the existing location as the better in terms of deliverability then there is no alternative option to put to public consultation. It should also be noted that recent surveys and petitions have clearly indicated a public preference for the existing site.

Supplementary Question

Why was the Cornfield/Daisyfield site selected as the second option having previously been identified two year's earlier as not being a viable option and what was the criteria for the rest of the sites which were a considerable list of sites in the recent report?

Supplementary Response

There were key issues that were considered and were the reason for this. There was real risk that the new road from the Lyminster by-pass would not be completed in time. There were also key issues surrounding the quality of the site in terms of ground issues and the need to have West Sussex County Council's (WSCC's) agreement to buy the site, coupled with issues surrounding access and costs which would all have impacted the viability of the overall project.

QUESTION TWO

From Mr Newman to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities, Councillor Dendle

Question

Under the proposal recommended to Full Council to build the new Swimming and Sports Centre to the back and side of the current centre are you able to guarantee that there will be no development either for residential or other uses (with the exception of the provision of other leisure facilities) on what remains of the old site within the existing boundaries when the old centre is demolished?

Response

The scope of the project is to deliver a new leisure centre. There are no plans to further develop the site beyond returning the land occupied by the existing building to parkland.

QUESTION THREE

From Mrs May to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities, Councillor Dendle

Question

If the District Council's preferred new leisure provider comes to a point in their Contract where the demand for use of the facilities at the proposed location on the existing sites is in excess of the facilities provided, and are there any risks, restrictions or impediments associated with the site which would preclude any necessary expansion to the facilities to meet the increased demand?

Response

The detailed Feasibility Study confirmed the facilities mix proposed in the Options Appraisal. This assessed the current and future needs of the town. At this time there is no reason to assume that the proposed facility will not fulfill the needs of the community for the next thirty years.

If further development were required, there is underground infrastructure serving the pumping station that could restrict further development. There is also Mewsbrook Park which is part of the town's greenspace.

Supplementary Question

There were eleven other sites up for consideration. What/where were these sites and were they discounted in the same context as Daisyfields?

Supplementary Answer

Councillor Dendle confirmed that a written response would be sent to the questioner.

In line with the Council's Constitution this response will be sent within ten working days from the date of the Full Council meeting.

QUESTION FOUR

From Mr Clark to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown **Question**

The Re-Invigoration Group is a collaboration of passionate local residents who presented a Community-led proposal as part of the original invitation for submissions process in February 2015. We have established significant grassroots support amongst the local community with representative surveys and activity to inform and support our submission. We see our role as seeking to represent the thoughts of those who took part in this work.

With this in mind, we would like the Council to consider the opportunity of inviting the Re-Invigoration group to be an active part of the forthcoming regeneration process and to serve as Community representatives as part of a steering group with a view to supporting positive outcomes.

Response

Thank you for your question. First of all may I thank you and your colleagues for your continued interest in this matter.

You will no doubt be aware that in the report being considered tonight reference is made at Paragraph 3.5 to involving key stakeholders in developing and defining the required outcomes for any enhancement of the theatre. Groups such as 'Re-Invigoration' who have responded positively with ideas for the regeneration of these key sites are clearly in our mind when it comes to involving others. However, exactly what form any involvement will take has yet to be decided and is dependent upon the decisions of the Council tonight.

Please be rest assured that the Council is keen to continue working with your group, as it is with others.