

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 22nd APRIL 2009

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Set out overleaf are the questions submitted by members of the public, for response by the appropriate Lead Member at the Council Meeting on 22nd April 2009.
2. The Council's Constitution provides a maximum time limit of thirty minutes for this item.
3. A questioner who has put a question in person may also put one brief supplementary question without notice to the Member who has replied to his or her original question. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original or the reply. Supplementary questions and Members' responses to written and supplementary questions are each limited to two minutes.
4. Any question which cannot be dealt with during the thirty minutes allocated for public questions, either because of lack of time or because of non-attendance of the questioner or the Member to whom it was put, will be dealt with by way of a written answer.
5. Unless the Mayor decides otherwise, no discussion will take place on any question, but any Member of the Council may move, without discussion, that the matter raised by a question be referred for consideration to the Cabinet or the appropriate Committee or Sub-Committee.

QUESTIONS

One question has been submitted as set out below:-

6.1 Question from Ms. Dinah Glover to the Lead Member for Culture, Councillor Rofique U. Ahmed:

“The ‘Get Active’ scheme launched for LAP1 residents to use York Hall gym facilities funded by Government money allows any resident (16 -74 years) who is not currently a member of the Wellness gyms to pay a one off payment of £2.70 plus £1 per session.

Monthly membership of the gym is £27.95 (£335.40 pa). Under the ‘Get Active’ scheme you can use the gym 3 x 52 weeks of the year and the total cost is £158.70.

The Government money was meant to target people that are inactive. This scheme mainly subsidises anyone who was a member of a different gym or has recently moved into the area. Why was this money not targeted at inactive people who need the encouragement and secondly why allow a situation that current gym members have a double whammy of both paying more and subsidising their neighbours who may be wealthier than them?”