

## ***Report to Council***

***Date of meeting: 28 September 2010***

**Subject: Overview and Scrutiny report to Council –  
September 2010**

**Chairman: Councillor Richard Morgan**



---

### **Recommendation:**

**That the Overview and Scrutiny progress report from August 2010 to the present be noted.**

---

### **Report.**

#### **Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting – 06 September 2010**

1. At the September meeting the Committee received a presentation from Tim Jones, the CEO of 'Connect Plus' the company that has the contract to maintain the M25 and had been appointed the preferred bidder to design, build, finance and operate the M25 project. He informed the Committee that the company had a thirty year contract with the Highways Agency and were spending the equivalent of a million pounds a day on remedial works and updating and enlarging some carriageways. They are at present refurbishing the Hatfield Tunnel.
2. The company worked closely with the Highways Agency and 'Metronet', with the Highways Agency also having a seat on their board. Their contract will end on September 2039.
3. We noted that the government were considering of turning the area around the Dartford Crossing into a managed motorway, putting in a free flowing tolling section for the crossing.
4. They were also particularly proud of their Health and Safety record, having had no reported accidents in over 1.6 million hours worked.
5. The Committee then considered a call-in of a Cabinet decision on part of the Leisure and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder Report on the suspension of the new sports hall at Waltham Abbey Swimming Pool. The call-in had cited that any net savings should be re-invested in Waltham Abbey, a known area of deprivation. The lead member of the call-in, Councillor Mrs P Brooks, said it seemed like the Waltham Abbey resident's wellbeing had been sacrificed. King Harold School now runs the sports centre successfully, but cannot handle the long term needs or has disable access.
6. The responsible Portfolio Holder, Councillor Rolfe, argued that there were no obvious benefits on taking this forward at this time, but it would be taken to the planning application stage. It would be good if the scheme could proceed but the current financial position made this impossible for now.

7. After a long and involved debate the Committee agreed to confirm the original decision.

8. The Committee then considered two consultation papers, one on 'Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century' and one on 'Rebalancing the Licensing Act'. Both had been considered by the recent Safer Cleaner Greener Standing Panel. We agreed with the responses given and added some of our own. The Policing Consultation paper went on to the Cabinet for their information. The Licensing consultation document had a short time scale and was sent directly back to the government.