NOTE RECEIVED FROM MRS GROOM ON FRIDAY 3rd MARCH 2006

- (i) RIGHTS OF A MEMBER FOR SCRUTINY?
- (ii) CAN A MEMBER REQUEST THAT A MATTER BE TAKEN TO SCRUTINY AND BE ASSURED THAT IT WILL BE CONSIDERED AND, IF NECESSARY, INVESTIGATED BY THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE?
- (iii) HOW WOULD IT REFLECT ON THE LEADERSHIP OF THE COUNCIL IF A MEMBER'S REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY IS REFUSED, WHERE THERE HAVE BEEN SEVERAL INSTANCES OF MISLEADING INFORMATION.
- 1. Why did WCC not insist in 2003 that alternatives were looked at? It should be noted that:
 - (a) The Swindon Local Plan Inspector commented in his report that it seemed that a comprehensive comparison of alternative routes had not been carried out;
 - (b) The EU Directive of 2003 stipulates the need to consider all alternatives in order to have sustainable development;
 - (c) The Judgment of Webster J shows that planning authorities have to look at issues as they affect the area as a whole.
- 2. Scrutiny need to ask why the County Council's Assistant Director Planning and Development did not know the answer to the question:

Under which of two headings were WCC consulted about this project? and

Why did he not know about the Judgment of Webster J?

- 3. If the terms of reference for the consultants are tightly drawn to accord with the wording of the Lead Member's amendment concerning rat runs, why is this so when they should have included evaluating traffic flow from the bridge over the railway route and the difference in traffic flows resulting from the tunnel under the motorway route?
- 4. Why was an issue as important in this case as responding to the planning application delegated to officers? Why has there never been a report on the tunnel route versus the rail-bridge route?
- 5. Were Councillors misled over the adoption of the Structure Plan?
 - (a) Was it correct to say that Swindon could sign off the Condition 99, regardless of any objection from WCC? Does WCC own and administer part of Hay Lane and Wharf Road to M4 J16?
 - (b) Was it correct to say that if the Structure Plan were delayed there would be many applications for development in different areas?
- 6. Please see attached second audit report from Halcrow. I have asked for terms of reference given to independent consultants and also for the independent consultants to be named.