

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 30 NOVEMBER 2018

SUBJECT: Public Question:

DIVISION: GODSTONE



Cllr Tony Elias asks:

Question 1 - What procedures are in place for preparing complete and accurate draft minutes of meetings of the Tandridge Local Committee in particular (a) who prepares them, (b) who reviews them, (c) who edits them, (d) who authorises their release to Committee members and (e) who authorises their posting on the Surrey website?

Response - The committee officer present at the meeting will advise the chairman on the meeting, and take the notes. The officer drafts the minutes after the meeting, and circulates to the officers who were present, to capture any amendments or inaccuracies. The draft minutes are then circulated to the chairman and vice-chairman for their approval. They are then published as draft by the officer. They remain draft until agreed by the committee at the next meeting. On the odd occasion where a member of the committee, or member of the public who spoke, informs us that they feel we did not capture their comments adequately, then the officer will review their notes, and discuss with the chairman and vice-chairman, and relevant officer if needed, and if they feel the comments are correct, then they will incorporate the changes, and re-publish. Should any member of the committee wish to propose an amendment to the minutes, then they can do so either before the next meeting, or at the meeting, and the committee members will determine if they agree with the amendment proposed. Once the minutes have been agreed, the chairman signs them, and they subsequently have the word 'draft' removed from the website, and become the public record of the meeting.

With regards to the meeting on 21 September 2018, you advised that you were not satisfied with how the item you spoke on was minuted. It was a particularly complex meeting for the committee officer, given the amount of public speaking, and detailed amendments being put forward on the day. The officer reviewed her notes, and the recording, to see if the points raised required amendments to be made. A number of small amends were made. This was then agreed with the chairman and vice-chairman and the minutes were re-published, still as draft. On being informed that there were still concerns, the Partnership Lead officer then reviewed the minutes and the recording and incorporated a number of amendments. These were agreed with the chairman and vice-chairman. The minutes were re-published as draft with the papers for the next meeting. They remain draft until agreed by the committee.

Question 2 - Bearing in mind the Chairman's comments at the last meeting (Zcast 2:21:36 onwards) to the effect that she feels constrained in expressing her feelings as a Local Divisional Member on behalf of residents because she is also Chairman of the Local Committee, what procedures are in place for residents of a Division to be represented on the Local Committee by a County Member when their Divisional Member also happens to be Chairman?

Response: In terms of the role of chairman generally, then the chairman is not constrained from giving a view on matters within her division because of their role. The role of local committee chairman is set out in our constitution

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/g6958/Public%20reports%20pack%20Tuesday%2009-Oct-2018%20Constitution%20of%20the%20Council.pdf?T=10&Info=1> . However, the nature of the role of chairman, being to lead the committee, guide and facilitate the members' discussion, also places a responsibility on the chairman to lead a fair and balanced debate. The chairman retains a casting vote in the event that the committee is split on a decision.

Question 3 -The village gateway enhancement design at the entrance to Bletchingley coming from Godstone was reported in Local Committee minutes of the meetings on 14th December 2012 and 1st March 2013 as having been completed and to be implemented in the 2012/13 municipal year. Bearing in mind the width of the verges at that location has not changed, on what date was the decision made not to proceed with this gateway enhancement and on the basis of what new technical information? Who made the decision and was it referred back to the Local Committee for further discussion?

Response: During the 2012/13 financial year, works were carried out to install a gateway feature to support the introduction of the 30mph speed limit. This gateway feature included the following measures;

1. Yellow backed 30mph speed limit terminal signs.
2. Dragons teeth road markings.
3. Buff coloured surfacing.
4. 30mph roundel road marking.

Prior to the installation of the above measures there was a "Bletchingley" village sign, at the location of the gateway feature, that was designed and installed by Bletchingley Parish Council. White fencing is sometimes installed as part of a gateway feature to enhance the visual impact of the change in the speed limit. However, following discussions with the county councillor at the time, under delegated authority, it was agreed to not install the white fencing. The white fencing would need to have been narrower than the existing "Bletchingley" village sign, due to the narrow verge on the opposite side of the carriageway. Because this decision was made under delegated authority it was not referred back to the Local Committee for further discussion.



Question 4 - With reference to Surrey's Setting Local Speed Limits policy of July 2014 in particular Step 4 'Conduct feasibility of supporting engineering measures', does the cost of certain measures such as speed cameras preclude them from being considered and included for discussion in reports to Local Committee meetings when considering reductions in speed limits? If so, is consideration given to the income that such cameras generate?

Response: When conducting an assessment of the feasibility of supporting engineering measures, as set out in step 4 of Surrey's Setting Local Speed Limits policy of 2014, the cost of certain engineering measures would certainly have an effect on their feasibility. If the cost of installing such engineering measures exceeds the budget available then this makes such measures unfeasible. Any measures that are not feasible would not be included for discussion in reports to the Local Committee.

Surrey County Council's policy for safety cameras is that they are reserved for the very worst collision hotspots where there has been a history of personal injury collisions involving vehicles exceeding the speed limit. This is so that they are reserved for the most dangerous roads, where evidence shows that they are being installed in order to try to reduce the number of people already being injured on Surrey's roads, rather than being used in order to generate revenue. Engineering measures which are considered unfeasible and where their installation would be against existing county policy would not be considered or included for discussion in reports to the Local Committee meetings when considering reductions in speed limits.

Contact Officer: Vicki Eade, Partnership Lead (East) and Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (South East).

This page is intentionally left blank