Supplementary Council Agenda



Council Tuesday, 26th September, 2017

Place:

Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

Time: 7.30 pm

Committee Secretary:

Council Secretary: Simon Hill Tel: 01992 564249 Email: democraticservices@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Pages 3 - 4)

The questions attached have been asked after notice in accordance with the provisions contained within Part 4 of the Council Rules of the Constitution.

- (a) Future Crèche Facilities at Loughton Leisure Centre
- (b) Closure of the Crèche at the Loughton Leisure Centre
- (c) Local Plan Call for Sites Methodology

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

Questions to the Leisure & Community Services Portfolio Holder, Councillor H Kane

(a) Future Crèche Facilities at the Loughton Leisure Centre

Given the documented concerns to Councillors and Places for People Leisure about the intended closure of the crèche on the Loughton Leisure Centre site and support for maintaining a crèche: We would like to know what plans are in place by the Epping Forest District Council to ensure that crèche facilities are maintained on the Loughton Leisure Centre site by the Places for People Leisure who have a 20 year contract.

(b) Closure of the Crèche at the Loughton Leisure Centre

Given that the Places for People management have now written informing of the closure of the crèche facility (which has been there over 14 years) at Loughton Leisure Centre on 20th October 2017 with no consultation with users, how does the council justify this discrimination against these users, many of whom have been members for years and have exercised up until the birth of the children using the crèche?

Question to Planning and Governance Portfolio Holder, Councillor J Philips

(c) Local Plan – Call for Sites Methodology

Bearing in mind the examples given below in respect of sites that have not been included in the Council's preferred sites lists, are the Council and Portfolio Holder satisfied that the process and criteria are being applied rigorously enough and do they agree that where the reasons given for sites not being selected are incorrect, sites ought to be re-checked and the precise reason for inclusion and exclusion ought to be re-checked against the agreed set of criteria with consideration being consistent across sites ?

This page is intentionally left blank