

LRAG News Update – 19 September 2023

STRG Meeting 13th September 2023

Minutes - The STRG chair, when presented with a challenge about the Minutes of the previous meeting (already published, unapproved, on its website), claimed that he could not reach a conclusion about their accuracy, because he did not know the details of the dissent. This was untrue as he had twice been written to, well in advance, with details of objections by 3 stakeholders. It reinforced an impression that inputs concerning the conduct of the development of the public engagement, if not in accord with SCC's objectives, would not be acted upon.

Survey Questionnaire – There were many criticisms, from multiple stakeholders, made of the draft survey questionnaire, created from inputs to the earlier Miro Board exercise. Four major issues were highlighted:

- The survey concentrated on the principles of Active Travel, and underplayed seeking views about the specific details of its incorporation. There was little request for feedback on its potential impact on all road users, local communities, schools and businesses, during construction and after completion.
- Questions were included about road safety policy matters, for which there was no need to express an opinion – e.g., whose safety was paramount, pedestrians and cyclists or other road users? – this has been clearly defined by the recent Highway Code revision.
- Phrasing of the preambles to the questions attempted to persuade respondents into a positive mindset – a confirmation bias or “leading the witness”.
- Demographic questions were unnecessarily prurient, partly irrelevant and potentially off-putting to some respondents.

It was assured that modifications would be made, but not subject to a further review by stakeholders. SCC and its advisors control the agenda, and seem unwilling to consider any contrary views.

Design Presentation

Only comments about the style of presentation were sought. There are 2 different sets of drawings for public viewing: the first will be on the Commonplace.is project page, and the second, of A0 size displays, at the drop-in events. The online set was of a low resolution and would not allow close inspection of detail. Stakeholders requested that both should be of adequate resolution, and there are now downloadable high-resolution versions – if you can find them!

Repeated requests for cross-sectional drawings had never been addressed, and stakeholders again asked for all variations to be clearly presented and identified at locations. Another opportunity to see if stakeholder influence exists.

Traffic Management Plans

Only the style of presentation of the plans was discussed, not the actual traffic management. Full daytime, 2-way transit is promised, but multiple, post-8-p.m. closures are planned. Presentation of these closures is scattered on various drawings, but with no comprehensive summary or indication of sequencing, during the 78 -80 weeks of disruption.

No potential diversion route plans are promulgated, nor loss of parking spaces, and overnight noise was assured as acceptable, though GBC Environmental Health needed to be firmly alerted for any potential harm.

Meeting Closure

The chair closed the meeting as being the final gathering, with no mention of design and implementation workshops. An email query has been raised.

Letter to Households and Engagement Launch

Some notification letters have been received, though the circulation area only includes areas west of the railway, and east of the A3. The project is now live on Surrey Says – Commonplace.is, as [Burpham to Guildford Active Travel Scheme](#), with details of the design layout, traffic management plans and an online survey.