

KATE HOEY MP
Member of Parliament for Vauxhall



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Sir Peter Hendy CBE
Transport for London
Windsor House
42-50 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0TL

18th March 2013

Dear Sir Peter

In conjunction with Caroline Pidgeon, I have been closely involved with the Clapham Gateway scheme for approximately three years and have had regular meetings with TfL Board members and officers, GLA members, local Councillors and Officers and a number of my constituents.

Caroline and I have been involved for such a time because we are very concerned that the Council throughout the design process have been lacking in competence and I am afraid to say that TfL have also had their shortcomings.

This can be illustrated by when I got involved, the Council had been pursuing a scheme for a year which TfL had approved in principle. This was despite some of my constituents for over 9 months advising the Council and TfL that the scheme had been based on an inaccurate bus survey and that the scheme did not actually work in terms of the bus operations as there were not enough bus stands. In addition there was a large local petition requesting the Council to revise their design.

It was only after intervention from myself that TfL agreed some 12 months after conception that the scheme did not work. It is a sad reflection on both the Council and especially TfL that local residents had to point out such basic facts that at least 8 bus stands were required rather than the 6 stands that the initial scheme proposed. This point is proven in that each of the current schemes has 8 stands.

Since then the Council have put forward some 16 alternative schemes. Local residents have pointed out the shortcomings in these schemes and TfL have rejected all of them.

A number of meetings were held with Leon Daniels, David Rowe and the Council with Caroline and me present. At these meetings Leon and David carefully laid out what TfL required in order that funding could be given. One such simple example being that bus stops (especially when in 24 hour use) should not be located close to residential property - for obvious reasons.

The Council continued to show a lack of competence and TfL have even had to give the Council a design of how they would like the bus stands laid out. After some three years you will appreciate the amount of TfL money (and time) that has been wasted on fees on the many abortive schemes.

At one stage at Officer level, in principle TfL approve a scheme. This was also flawed and Caroline Pidgeon and I first met with Leon who agreed with us on every point concerning the shortcomings of the scheme. During the meeting Leon sent an email to David asking; "how did we get to this position"?

Caroline and I then met with Daniel Moylan to explain the fundamental problems with the scheme and Daniel rejected the scheme the same afternoon - and asked the Council to reconsider the whole scheme.

The Council after Daniel had left Office, presented a very similar scheme to the one which had been rejected and TfL at officer level performed a total "U" turn and gave outline approval.

The Council then rushed out to Consultation using biased plans and especially biased visuals which had not been seen or approved by TfL, as required by TfL.

I understand that Steve Reed wrote to you in August last year advising that the Council's preferred scheme had received an 85% vote and requesting that you gave approval to the scheme.

Various new factual information has come to light about the Consultation and elements of the design which are highly relevant in TfL coming to the right decision. I have recently tried to arrange a meeting with Leon and Ben Plowden to explain these new issues but your side did not respond - let alone meet or listen.

I had been assured that I would be told the date of the TfL Board which would consider the proposed scheme in order that I could make representations.

This disappointedly has not been the case. At a meeting on the 28 February David Rowe said that Ben Plowman (TfL) had only just drafted his report on the Gateway and that David did not know which Board meeting the Gateway would go to. David added that there were two Board meetings in March which the Gateway might go to. This was queried as David was reminded that he had previously said in an email to me that any papers that went to the Board should be sent three or four weeks before the date of the Board meeting (in order that the Board could properly consider the matter). In response to this, David said he could not remember this timescale.

I told David that in view of the three week timetable for papers to be submitted, it appeared that if the Gateway was discussed at a meeting in March it would not be in line with the normal protocol and would appear to be being "rushed through". David assured me that it was not being rushed through.

I have now been told that the Board met on Tues and approved funding for the scheme. I am astonished and sad about this.

I believe that at the Board meeting on Tuesday the Gateway was not properly discussed and that the right decision was not achieved for the following reasons;-

- The scheme was rushed through the Board to try and get approval.
- Leon has advised Caroline that he did not even know that the Gateway was on the agenda for the meeting. Therefore by inference Leon must not have received the papers beforehand, or even if he did so he did not read them.
- The papers cannot have been sent to each Board member three weeks before the meeting.
- I have been deliberately prevented from making the representations that I was assured I would be able to make on behalf of my constituents. This is not right.

There is cross party support that the scheme is flawed. There are fundamental problems that could be overcome but the Council will not listen and your officers do not seem to care.

These points have been reinforced by an Independent report from Allan Baxter Associates which also identifies the problems and a solution. This report was sent to the Council and TfL but seemingly ignored.

I would ask that you look into this so that we can avoid TfL funding "fundamental problems" which will lead to a continuous stream of complaints to TfL.

Funding is scarce and valuable so we must avoid TfL having to fund a further scheme to undo the problems they helped create.

I would be very grateful if, in the light of the above you could investigate this and respond to me so that I can consider if it is necessary for me to take further action

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kate Hoey', written in a cursive style.

Kate Hoey MP

CC Boris Johnson, Isabel Dedring and Caroline Pidgeon