

CABINET – 17 DECEMBER 2013

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members' Questions

Question (1) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:

What action is being taken to improve the reliability of the webcasting of meetings including of full Council and Cabinet meetings, following a number of failures in the webcasting of meetings?

Question (2) from Mrs Nikki Barton (Haslemere) to ask:

I am writing to request that the Cabinet consider a separation of the current cycling strategy into 2 parts: a cycling events strategy and a separate cycling strategy, which specifically excludes this. This would mean the work to date could lead to two effective strategies, better able to focus on their aims, have separate action plans, targets and budgets, as set out below.

Currently two strategies have been co-presented. Firstly, the cycling events strategy is important as this is an emerging event/series of events which Surrey CC wish to have clearer control of. This would logically be owned by the Communities Committee.

Secondly, the Cycling (promotion and infrastructure) strategy should be about promoting and facilitating cycling; including continuing with external funding successes like the LSTF in Woking, Guildford and Reigate/Redhill; with the aim of increasing commuter and leisure cycling. This logically should be coordinated with other transport strategies such as for rail, congestion, bus travel and pedestrian access (which we understand will follow in 2014) and it would therefore make sense to be managed by the Transport and Environment Committee.

The consultation on the cycling strategy was dominated by a focus on cycling events. This has resulted in a cycling strategy that does not clearly signpost external funding opportunities (such as LSTF), or provide a guide/leadership to local committees drawing up plans for LTP3. It could have a target for overall cycling levels (by journey for example) and also proposed budget to achieve this, including from partner bodies (who could be co-signatories) and government.

To achieve the best cycling events and cycling strategies it would be good to separate these two from each other, and have clear measurable targets and budgets for both. This would enable both to be effective and link to other strategies: eg for other types of event management and with other transport modes as noted above, to give a coherent and well supported overall sustainable transport strategy for Surrey.

Therefore, I request that the Cabinet consider that the two strategies be separated such that action plans and targets might be developed for both - and the twin aims - one to limit the impact of cycling and the other to promote cycling - are achieved better on their own rather than overshadowed by each other.

Question (3) from Mr Alan Young (Cranleigh & Ewhurst) to ask:

- (1) Can the Leader explain why the county council's draft *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway* does not recognise the clearly documented wish of Parish Councils in the Surrey Hills (including Brockham, Shere, West Horsley, Headley, Ewhurst, Capel, Newdigate, Abinger, Buckland, Ockley, Wooton, Mickleham) to only allow races conducted under a rolling road block (see Surrey County Council's minutes of the meeting of Parish Councils held on 12 August 2013)?
- (2) Can the Leader please explain why the Cabinet is being asked to take a decision on 17 December to hold further Ride-London races in Surrey, before these events have been subject to the council's own procedures for approving such events, as set out in the *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway*?
- (3) Does the leader see any risk in the council abrogating all responsibility for consultation with local stakeholders on major events to event organisers, as set out in the *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway*, not least as that document contains no guidance on what form that consultation should take?
- (4) Can the Leader confirm that the Ride-London organisers have **individually** consulted all Members and Parish and Borough Councils affected by the proposed race in 2014? I am aware that they organised a single information event in the Dorking Halls, but it is widely agreed that this does not amount to consultation.
- (5) If the Ride-London organisers have not consulted all affected parties and sought their feedback, can the Leader explain why the Cabinet is being asked to make a decision on approving the Ride-London race for the next four years in the absence of consultation and feedback from the people of Surrey, as required in the *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway*?

Question (4) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

1. Does the Cabinet Member now have the figures for the economic costs to the Surrey Economy from the Ride London Surrey Prudential Classic in 2014. This must include the losses as well as the gains by District or Borough?
2. What consultation does the Cabinet Member expect Ride London Surrey Partnership to undertake with communities in my Division and others that do not have Parish Councils in 2014 as there was none in 2013 before this Cabinet when the route is being agreed.
3. How does the Cabinet Member intend to measure the risk that the problems with the 2013 Ride London Surrey Prudential Classic have seriously damaged community support particularly in Mole Valley and Elmbridge? As listed in the risk register.
4. What steps is the Cabinet Member taking to make sure the lessons for the trials race in 2011 are communicated and acted on by the Ride London Surrey Partnership? As they seem to have been oblivious in 2013.
5. What information does the Cabinet Member have on visitor and spectator numbers in Surrey for the 2013 Ride London Surrey Prudential Classic. Who provided this information and how was it audited? How does that compare with the previous two years cycle races?