

## Item 4a:

### **Public Questions to be answered at the Executive meeting on 25 March 2021. Additional questions received in relation to agenda item 9 (Response to the Council Motion relating to the demolition of the former Newbury Football Ground Clubhouse)**

Members of the Executive to answer questions submitted by members of the public in accordance with the Executive Procedure Rules contained in the Council's Constitution.

(n) **Question submitted by Vaughan Miller to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development:**

*"One of the justifications for rejecting the Motion relating to the demolition of the football ground clubhouse states:*

*Council Strategy Priorities: The redevelopment of the London Road Industrial Estate is a key priority for the council and any delay in the demolition of the building and entering into a new single sports use occupancy of the old football pitch could have an impact on the project.*

*Could you please explain what negative impact opening up the ground, for example for youth football, could possibly have on the project?"*

(o) **Question submitted by Gary Norman to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development:**

*"One of your 'justifications' for rejecting the Motion relating to the demolition of the football ground clubhouse states:*

*"Financial: There are ongoing costs associated with the maintenance and security arrangements for the existing structure. These would rise in the event that the proposal as laid out in the motion was accepted."*

*Could you provide current costings and how and why this would rise if the motion was accepted?"*

(p) **Question submitted by Jark Harness to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development:**

*"The report associated with agenda item 9 states that "delays in implementation (to demolish the club house) could have serious financial implications for the Council". Please can you explain what these serious financial implications are?"*

(q) **Question submitted by Paul Morgan to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development:**

*"By rejecting the motion (Agenda item 9) outright, prior to any planning applications being heard and contrary to public opinion, has the Council left itself open to a charge of predisposition, predetermination or bias (contrary to Probity in planning: Advice for councillors and officers making planning decisions - Guidance December 2019)?"*