

To: The Borough Secretary and Solicitor to the Council

1. NOTICE OF CALL-IN OF EXECUTIVE DECISION

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22, we, the undersigned, hereby give notice that we wish to call-in the Executive decision detailed in section 2 below:-

<u>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</u>	<u>SIGNATURE</u>
..... JOHN NICKOLAY <i>J. M. Nickolay</i>
..... MARILYN ASHTON <i>M. Ashton</i>
..... JOYCE NICKOLAY <i>Joyce Nickolay</i>
..... CIMS MOTÉ <i>CIMS</i>
..... DON BILLSON <i>Don Billson</i>
..... RAYMOND ARNOLD <i>Raymond Arnold</i>

2. DETAILS OF EXECUTIVE DECISION

The details of the Executive decision are as follows:-

Decision:
PWD 068/04. LETTS HILL BRIDGE - SCHEME DESIGN &
CONSULTATION RESULTS

Made by:
Cllr PAUL O'DEN
(Cabinet/relevant Portfolio Holder)

Published On:
20th DECEMBER 2004
(Date)

3. GROUNDS FOR CALL-IN

Please specify below the grounds for the call-in, in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22.5 (the grounds on which an Executive decision may be called in are set out overleaf). Please note that the considerations of the Call-in Sub-Committee will focus on the grounds stated, and the Sub-Committee will seek evidence to support them. Please therefore also set out below details of the evidence to support the grounds for call-in, continuing on a separate sheet if necessary.

.....
22.5 (a) - INADEQUATE CONSULTATION

.....
22.5 (b) - LACK OF EVIDENCE

.....
(See detailed reasons attached)

.....
Once completed, please forward this form to Claire Vincent in Room 138, Civic Centre or send it by fax to 020 8424 1557 WITHIN 5 WORKING DAYS OF THE DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THE DECISION.

Reasons for call-in of PHD 068/04

Petts Hill Bridge – Scheme Design and Consultation Results

22.5 (a) – The consultation undertaken in September 2004 was inadequate in that it was confined to only two questions, the response to which was unlikely to be negative viz:

Q1 – Do you feel that something needs to be done about the bottleneck at Petts Hill Bridge?

Q2 – Do you feel that this scheme will help to improve the situation?

Bearing in mind that elected Members had questioned the adequacy of the proposed scheme and the potential threat to pedestrian security in the tunnels at the TARSAP meeting in December 2002, it would have been more meaningful to have included questions on those aspects in the consultation exercise. (This is borne out by the significant number of comments made on these aspects by those consulted.)

22.5 (b) – Minutes for the TARSAP meeting on 1st December 2004 when this matter was last raised (following a request from the Conservative Nominated Member) have not yet been made public. Indeed, Nominated Members have not yet seen draft minutes (as was requested at that meeting following a serious omission from minutes of the September 2004 meeting.) However, the Portfolio Holder's decision purports to be based on the Panel's minutes!

At the 1st December meeting TARSAP Members were glibly told that neither TfL nor Network Rail were willing to make further funds available for bridge replacement that would have enabled four traffic lanes and normal pedestrian facilities to be provided. This was the first time for two years the Panel had been formally told of the funding situation, although some Members had been informed privately during the intervening period by the Acting Director of Environmental Services that modifications were being made to the walls of the pedestrian tunnels to enable eventual bridge replacement to take place. The Panel was not provided with details of what negotiations (if any) had taken place between LBs of Harrow/Ealing and TfL/NetworkRail/Mayor of London, although it has subsequently come to light that a meeting of sorts took place sometime during November 2004 following a visit to the site by Mr Livingstone.

The Conservative Nominated Member wrote to the Portfolio Holder on 15th December 2004 urging that an "eleventh hour" attempt be made at Member level to persuade the funding authorities to enable bridge replacement to take place (instead of the adaptations at present intended) but has yet to receive a response.

For the reasons above it is recommended that the call-in should be upheld and further time allowed for urgent negotiations to take place at a political level before the stage is reached in March/April 2005 when preliminary works have been completed and a start has to be made on highway reconstruction.