

Scrutiny Areas of Focus following Call In request relating to the A62 to Cooper Bridge Improvement Scheme report which was considered by Cabinet on the 12th of October 2021

Following consideration of the call in request form, the following areas have been validated as the focus of the call in review meeting [2 November 2021].

Decision making principle	Area of focus
1. Relevant considerations	<p><i>A number of technical questions were asked at Cabinet , following the staff presentation at the start of the meeting and no answers were given meaning that Cabinet were taking a decision without assessment of all the facts</i></p> <p><i>[Council has previously agreed that these works and others which affect the B6118 and subsequently Grange Moor/Flockton should have an impact assessment report, this did not and when questioned cabinet failed to respond]</i></p> <p>Issues Moved from elsewhere: <i>The decision by cabinet to build the major works at Cooper bridge “online” i.e. on or largely on the existing highway will have a massive impact on the locality for the period of the works yet no data is given on this , what impact there is on traffic flow at the strategic junction, no details of the impact on air</i></p> <p><i>No reference or proof of compliance has been had with modern transport design guidance and criteria</i></p> <p><i>The plan has no clear bus priority measures, other than possibly transponders when the bus is at the front of a queue, getting there being the main delay. Yet bus travel and modal shift is a key priority for kirklees and west Yorkshire with agreed targets to increase usage</i></p>

	<p>List supporting evidence: Cabinet webcast and supporting agenda papers</p>
<p>2. Clarity</p>	<p><i>The project does not with clarity set out objectives and the measurable outcomes it hopes to achieve, the air quality for example needs to be a holistic view of not only the potential at the end of the project but to factor in any detrimental impacts during construction, offset against the end result and how many years it is to “break even”</i></p> <p>List supporting evidence: cabinet papers and webcast</p>
<p>3. Options</p>	<p><i>Members in the debate said a number of alternatives had been considered but no details were presented for consideration and no reason and data on why some more effective options were not pursued</i></p> <p>List supporting evidence: Cabinet papers and webcast</p>